

**COMMENTS TO DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL
GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

I.

OMITTED OR MISSING FROM THE DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (“DSGEIS”): We are concerned that various topics and analyses are missing, in violation of State Environmental Quality Review Act (“SEQRA”, the Environmental Conservation Law (“ECL”) and/or the mandate of the Department of Environmental Conservation (“DEC”), including:

A. Cumulative Effects (§§ 6.13, 6.13.2.1, 7.13):

1. The DSGEIS expressly but inappropriately fails to address the requisite cumulative effects of unconventional gas extraction from the Marcellus and other shales, since the methods, effects and intensity of this process will transform and industrialize an area of New York currently dependent on tourism and agriculture as afforded by its rural nature. See (Second Home Owner Study October 2008 Prepared By: Division of Planning & Environmental Management Dr. William J. Pammer, Jr., Ph.D. Commissioner, <http://co.sullivan.ny.us/documentView.asp?docid=683>.

To wit,:

- a. Agriculture represents one of the largest economic sectors in Sullivan County, with the combined output value of agriculture exceeding \$60,000,000 in 2004. (Sullivan County website);

- b. The 2008 Second Home Owner Study Prepared by Sullivan County's Planning & Environmental Management Commissioner, demonstrated that
- (1) The second home market – which is a major part of the tax base, could be devastated by drilling (Second Homeowners (“SHOs”) account for 24% of the homes in Sullivan County (“SC”) and an even greater percent of the tax base);
 - (2) “When asked about the quality of local community attributes, over 80 percent felt that the scenic and visual qualities of their town were either good or excellent.”
 - (3) “the top ranked amenities that influence purchasing are the scenery/surroundings” of the County...”
 - (4) “I bought here because of the recreation, air and water quality...” (survey respondent);
 - (5) “The natural beauty of the County sells itself and instills a high level of satisfaction in home owners.”
 - (6) “70.6% of SHOs say Landscape and Views are the most appealing qualities of a second home.”

(7) “70% of respondents indicated that *rural features* and *viewsheds* appealed to them the most when buying their home.”

(8) “The housing boom can be attributed to a sudden increase in the second home market coupled with rapidly growing demand for housing from people who commute to other areas in the New York metropolitan region. Another trend and ever-growing phenomenon in the County is the development of high-end second homes. These high-end second homes contribute to the area tax base while placing little burden on area schools.” (Sullivan County Chamber of Commerce).

2. To the extent that DEC is unable to gauge cumulative impacts of high volume hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling implemented at a rate determined by the market, high volume hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling should be limited in activity to an extent which would allow for the prospective analysis of cumulative impacts. (§§ 9.1-9.2).

B. There is no Analysis of Best, Intermediate and Worst Case Scenarios with Mitigation and Remediation Measures (Chs. 6-7. 9), including:

1. No conclusion, after consideration of alternatives and remediation of consequences in each alternative, that least adverse impact course has been chosen.
 2. No analysis of the consequences of complete prohibition (§ 9.1).
- C. The DSGEIS completely omits any identification or analysis of the unavoidable adverse impacts (Ch. 6).
- D. The DSGEIS Contains No Modeling of Post-Spill Consequences (Chs. 6-7).
- E. There is No Consideration of Whether to Require Advance, Contemporaneous, and/or Post-Drilling Monitoring Wells.
1. Advantages of monitoring wells include the ability to provide early, unbiased samples and detection of contamination.
 2. However, repeated, unnecessary penetration of geological stratum may increase instability and contamination.
- F. The DSGEIS Lacks Any Meaningful Discussion, Analysis and Conclusions of Alternatives to the System of High Volume Hydraulic Fracturing with Horizontal Drilling Proposed and Employed by Drilling Companies in Other States and Countries (Ch. 9).
- G. There is No Assessment of Regional Ozone Impacts (§§ 6.5, 6.6).

- H. Despite the Recognition of Huge Increases in Trucking, The DEC has omitted any thorough Assessment of Traffic Impact and the Anticipated Average Trucking Trip is Absurdly Low (§ 7.11).
- I. Nor is there a complete Quantitative Analysis of Noise Impacts (§ 7.10)
- J. Without an Analysis of the Opportunity Cost of Deep Shale Gas Extraction, which Accounts for the Economic Value of the Current Landscape, Economy and Infrastructure, the DSGEIS Is Inadequate.
- K. Most Egregiously, the DSGEIS Contains No Post-Permit Rules and Regulations
 1. The DEC places inappropriate reliance on regulations which have not been updated since 1985
 2. The absence of new regulations places far too much reliance on matters within the DEC's discretion, leaving too much variability and no accountability
 3. The DSGEIS does not provide for independent verification of any data at any point in the permitting, drilling and capping process, thus relying entirely on the integrity of the gas companies.
 4. The DSGEIS offers no enforcement or compensatory framework for violations, contamination or damages caused.
- L. The DSGEIS Fails to Afford any Disclosure of the DEC's Present and Future Personnel and Capacity

1. The DSGEIS provides no analysis or plan for the number of visits by DEC staff to each site (Ch. 7).
 2. The Cornell University Law School Water Law Clinic has identified 187 new duties tasked to the DEC by the DSGEIS, but the DSGEIS fails to indicate how these tasks can be accomplished given its present staff and funding limits.
 3. No funding or budgetary structure or restraint is identified, nor future funding needs proposed.
- M. There is No Requirement that Other Active and Abandoned Oil and Gas Wells be Located, Considered in Connection with Permit Process Due to the Elevated Risk of Contamination Inherent in Multiple Geological Penetrations.
- N. The DSGEIS Does Not Propose, Let Alone Afford Any Meaningful Neighboring or Local Involvement or Comment Period with Respect to the Permit Process.
- O. There is No Coordination of Pipeline Activity Nor Consideration of Impact Directly Resulting from Gas Drilling (§ 8.1).
- P. Despite the Release of a Recent Independent Study Demonstrating Their Substantial Public Health Consequences, the DSGEIS Contains No Consideration of Compressor Stations (§§ 5.16.18, 6.5, 7.5). See Health Survey Results of Current and Former DISH/Clark Texas Residents, December, 2009, http://earthworksaction.org/pubs/DishTXHealthSurvey_FINAL_hi.pdf; Dish

Results Released, Denton Record Chronicle, December 17, 2009,

http://www.dentonrc.com/sharedcontent/dws/drc/localnews/stories/DRC_dish_1218.3635bf257.html.

1. Not considering compressor stations, pipelines and other activity attendant to the focus of the DSGEIS is illegal segmenting.

Q. The DSGEIS Does Not Regulate Nor Consider the Impact of Facilities Anticipated to Be Installed for Water Withdrawals—pipes, pads, access roads (§§ 6.1.1, 7.3).

R. The DSGEIS Offers No Consideration of the Effects of Gas Drilling on Property Values (Ch. 6).

S. Nor Is There Consideration of the Effects of Gas Drilling on Other Industries, Such as Tourism, Agriculture (Ch. 6).

T. Long-term Analysis of Well Safety, Including Casing, below Ground-migration and Contamination Is Entirely Lacking (Ch. 6).

1. There is no analysis of durability and/or deterioration of well casings over intermediate, long-term timeframe, despite the uncontradicted facts that:

a. 50-80% of fracking fluid is not withdrawn and treated, but, in fact, stays in the well; and

- b. Even conventional drilling poses contamination risks when well penetration of geological strata and deteriorated or damaged well casings allow migration of brine into drinking water supplies.
- U. The DSGEIS Does Not Analyze Whether the Increased Seismic Activity Experienced in the Barnett Shale as a Result of Unconventional Gas Extraction Would Be Repeated Here, Nor the Possible Effects Thereof.
- V. Funding of Necessary Testing, Monitoring, Mitigation and Remediation is not addressed.
 - 1. Appropriate fees, taxes and bonding requirements should be considered, and, if necessary, imposed at every stage of the drilling and extraction process to insure:
 - a. Adequate DEC staffing;
 - b. That funds exist to protect communities;
 - c. The increased use of and repair of damage to local infrastructure is paid for by the users who profit from such use;
 - d. Failed companies do result in unfunded disaster remediation.

II. ERRORS IN THE DSGEIS: Various Aspects of the DSGEIS Are Simply Wrong, Based on Factual Errors and the DEC's Failure to Consider and Weigh Negative Impacts:

- A. Multi-well Pits/impoundment Ponds Are Inherently Dangerous and Cannot Be Made Safe (Ch. 6; §§ 5.7, 5.12.2.1, 7.1.7).

1. By aggregating enormous amounts of toxic fluids, they substantially increase damage in the event of a spill or leak.
2. No safe procedure has been established for the disposal of pit liners (§ 5.13.1).
3. Interstitial spill sensors throughout the double liner system should be mandatory (§ 7.1.7).
4. For a safe perimeter which protects against the effects of human inhalation of volatilized materials, hundreds of acres would have to be fenced.
5. No meaningful protection for wildlife can be employed (§ 7.7).
6. The permitting process fails to consider topographical requirements relative to siting and setbacks (§ 7.7).
7. The lack of formal, express considerations for permitting impoundment wells prevents public comment on whether proposed discretionary considerations are adequate.

B. Drilling Setbacks Insufficient (§§ 7.1.12, 7.7).

1. No explanation is offered for the minimal setbacks proposed.
2. Setbacks should be comprehensively formulated to account for topographical aspects of each site.
 - a. For example, at a site where any watercourse or source is located downgrade from a proposed well or other related facility, the

setback should be greater to account for the increased likelihood that any spill will migrate downward.

3. Additionally, the DEC's ability to modify setback requirements eliminates predictability and protection. There should be a formula, with limits on modification, absent public participation.

C. The DEC Has Not Provided Correct Data Nor Adequate Provisions for Waste Treatment Facilities (§§ 5.12, 5.13)

1. Many of the waste water treatment facilities identified can/will not accept fracking fluid (§ 5.13.3.4).
 - a. This demonstrates a fortiori that the DSGEIS has not been adequately researched prior to release.
2. There is no end-to-end metering of water withdrawn for fracking and produced thereby, which raises the risk of “midnight dumping” (§§ 3.2.2.5, 5.12, 5.13).
3. Drilling companies should be required to present signed contracts with monitoring information (§§ 5.12, 5.13).
 - a. The DEC must independently verify the ability and capacity of every identified waste water treatment facility to accept and adequately treat produced water according to permit applications and post-permitting extraction, on an ongoing basis, including

aggregation and accumulation, so that no wastewater is unaccounted for and no individual waste water treatment plan fails because of inadequate treatment facilities.

- b. The treatment plants must demonstrate that they can safely process the type and quantity of wastewater they contractually agree to accept and their total capacity and the percentage already allocated should be disclosed in each contract (which should be made available to the public.)

D. Well Casing Procedures Are Inadequately Analyzed and Limited: Insufficient Cure Time, Testing for Well Casing (Appendix 8). See generally Some Cementing Problems, http://www.logwell.com/tech/cbl/cement_problems.html

1. Independent verification of cure time and strength should be required with DEC staff present and conducting testing of tensile and compressive strength of all elements of well casings.
2. Further study of long-term durability is warranted.

E. Administrative and Remediation (of Emergencies) Responsibilities Are Inappropriately Placed on Local Governments without Funding, Regulation and Advance Planning (Ch. 7, § 8.1).

1. While generally proposing to expand statewide existing agreements with a handful of county health departments, the DEC does not indicate how it

would handle counties which lack health departments or lack sufficiently staffed and/or funded health departments to implement vital safety procedures and protections.

2. Road damage is not adequately considered nor addressed. (§§ 7.11, 7.12).
3. Water monitoring inappropriately assigned to local governments without funding, equipment, personnel, identification of chemicals and/or substances to be tested for (§ 7.1.4.1).
4. Increased burden on local emergency safety personnel not addressed.

F. Various Requirements of the SEQRA Have Either Been Violated and/or Insufficiently Followed.

1. The DEC has violated SEQRA's express requirement that the general public have equal access to hard copy of the DSGEIS.
 - a. The DSGEIS was not provided in hard copy to the general public until well after online availability.
 - b. Nor has the DSGEIS been made freely available in hard copy. Instead, the DEC is charging \$35.00 per copy.
2. The DEC has not afforded the general public adequate opportunity for review and comment.

- a. First, it is clear that industry participants had ample input into the DSGEIS prior to release, serving as sources of data and analysis, as well as proposed plans for exploration, drilling and extraction.
 - b. The public, however, has been effectively limited in participation.
 - (1) Public Comment Hearings were not sufficient.
 - (a) The DEC failed to hold Public Comment hearings in all counties affected by proposed unconventional gas extraction, limiting itself to four hearings in four counties.
 - (b) The Public Comment Hearings were insufficient insofar as they were truncated to allow only a portion of the participants who sought the opportunity to comment actually to be heard.
 - i) For example, at the Hearing held in New York County, approximately 1/3 of the participants were allowed to speak before the hearing was terminated. Requests for Additional Sessions were “taken under advisement” and never afforded.
3. Changes to online version did not re-start the public comment period.

III. INSUFFICIENCIES IN THE DSGEIS: The DSGEIS Is Insufficient in Terms of its Scope, Data, Analysis and Conclusions.

- A. Chemical Disclosure: Certain Chemicals Identified in Fracking Fluid in Other States Is Not Listed on the Industry-provided Disclosure (§ 5.4).
- B. The Employment of Chemical Tagging of Fracking and Flowback Fluids Should Be Considered So as to Enable More Accurate Identification of the Sources and Causes of Any Contamination. See Frack-Fluid Tagging Part of Model Grand Junction, Palisade Watershed Plan, Colorado Independent, 12/18/09, <http://coloradoindependent.com/44519/frack-fluid-tagging-part-of-model-grand-junction-palisade-watershed-plan>.
- C. A Comprehensive Analysis and Plan for the Handling and Disposal of Naturally Occurring Radioactive Materials Is Necessary Particularly in Light of Recent Sampling Which Shows That the Marcellus Shale Is Highly Radioactive. (§§ 5.2.4.2, 5.16.7). See Lustgarten, A. (2009) Is New York's Marcellus Shale Too Hot to Handle? ProPublica. <http://www.propublica.org/feature/is-the-marcellus-shale-too-hot-to-handle-1109>.
- D. Under SEQRA, We Understand That the DSGEIS must Include an Identification and Analysis of the Worst Case Scenarios and Remediation Plans but We Cannot Locate Either.

- E. The DSGEIS Fails to Provide for the Safe Disposal of Pit Liners, Cuttings (§§ 5.13.1, 5.13.2).
- F. The DSGEIS Does Not Address the Lack of Maps of Natural Fractures or Aquifers Made Nor Considered in Permitting Process.
- G. There Is Insufficient Involvement of Local Governments in the Permitting, Regulation and Revenue Side of Deep Shale Gas Extraction.
- H. The DEC Fails to Address or Propose Legislation, Such as That of Assemblywoman Aileen Gunther's, Which Would Impose Strict Liability Against Drillers/Operators for Contamination and Thereby Protect Those Damaged in the Process.
- I. Monitoring and Test Wells Should Be Considered (§ 7.1).
 - 1. Surrounding water should be located and tested before, during and after fracking throughout the life of the well
 - 2. Formations penetrated and worked should be mapped and monitored in advance and throughout the life of each well
- J. Air Quality Requires Separate Analysis of Pollution and Greenhouse Gas Emissions (§ 7.5).
- K. Data Relative to Anticipated Truck Traffic is Absurdly Low and Internally Inconsistent (§ 6.11).
 - 1. Fails to account for distances to/from water sources

2. Fails to account for distances to/from water treatment facilities

L. Economic Analysis: On Page 6-139, it is stated under the section on Community Character Impacts that “many of the community character impacts associated with horizontal drilling and high volume hydraulic fracturing are the same as those addressed in the 1992 GEIS, and no further mitigation measures are required.” The DSGEIS did not improve upon the deficiencies that were pointed out in connection with the 1992 GEIS. Instead, the DSGEIS cites the 1992 GEIS as the basis for its conclusions regarding economic impact. In addition to the 1992 GEIS, the DSGEIS cites an economic impact study done for Broome County and also a study done by Penn State. There are very serious and basic problems with each of these studies.

1. All analysis for the 1992 GEIS appears to have been done in the 1980s. The main report (in three volumes) is titled DRAFT Generic Environmental Impact Statement and was printed in January 1988. The FINAL Generic Environmental Impact Statement is only one volume, and it primarily provides a summary of the public comments on the DRAFT report. We did not notice any public comment on the topic of economic impact. Note that the FINAL is dated July 1992 and it was reprinted without revision in 2003.
 - a. The analysis and report are dated January 1988, and are therefore terribly outdated. No decisions should be based on such outdated analysis. The economy has changed dramatically in the last 20-plus years; and the oil and gas market of the 1980s is very different from that of today. The analysis of 1988 seemed to focus predominantly on the oil industry. The economic impact analysis must be updated to reflect the current market and economy, and it should reflect accurately the actual industry and product being considered.
 - b. The outdated report states that the multiplier effect is 1.4, meaning that for every \$1.00 of well/drilling output, \$1.40 is contributed to the State’s economy through both direct and indirect effects. The report states “*the reported earnings multiplier of 1.4 for the oil and*

gas industry in New York is lower than many manufacturing and service industries, partly because the industry as a whole is not labor intensive, and also because most of the companies which provide services to the industry in New York are headquartered in nearby Pennsylvania.” If an updated economic impact analysis were to find a similar multiplier, then it would appear to make more sense to encourage an alternative industry that would provide a greater positive economic impact in the Catskills and in New York State generally. If an updated and more accurate analysis were to conclude that the multiplier effect of gas drilling is as great or greater than that of other industries, then there may be an economic reason to encourage gas drilling. The analysis done to date indicates that based on economic impact alone, gas drilling should not necessarily be encouraged.

- c. Input/output tables that are used for economic impact analyses generally are not calibrated to reflect environmental effects, and certainly in the 1980s, such impacts were not properly considered. More recently, there has been an attempt by economists to encourage the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) of the Department of Commerce, the keeper of the National Income and Product Accounts, upon which the input/output tables and multipliers are based, to become “green.” The input/output tables and multipliers are updated on a fairly regular basis. The latest available from BEA are based on 2005 national and regional data, so clearly the economic impact analysis in the GEIS does not reflect the most recently available tables. It is our understanding that even the more recent 2005 tables do not properly capture the environmental and natural resource economic impacts.
- d. The report mentions environmental issues, but makes no attempt to value them. The report states,

Unfortunately, it is difficult to assign precise monetary values to aesthetic benefits such as the beauty of an unspoiled wilderness. The monetary value for improvements in such areas as clear air, clean water, and clean soil are easier to estimate and assign by using

parameters such as increased property value, decreased health care costs, increased recreational and tourist use, and improved production from forestry, fishery and agriculture.

We question why none of these parameters was estimated. A thorough analysis should evaluate each of these. The report even states *“Most experts in this field agree that in most cases it is much cheaper to prevent pollution than to restore the environment after it has occurred.”*

2. The study done for Broome County is fraught with problems. This study fails to adequately address a number of factors that must be carefully considered in order to make informed decisions regarding gas drilling.

These include:

- a. The analysis did not appear to take account of the economic cost of building and repairing infrastructure due to the wear and tear on the roads, public buildings and other structures. This can be a significant expense for rural towns. As a result of the Millenium Pipeline, the small town of Cochection suffered road damage in excess of \$1million, a large sum for such a small town. While the Millenium Pipeline followed a single path, multiple well sites spread throughout a town could have an even more devastating impact on infrastructure.

- b. The analysis did not address the cost of mitigation as a result of environmental damage, including but not limited to drinking water contamination and fish kill. The Community Science Institute of Ithaca, New York, recently estimated that anywhere from 1 to 5% of water wells that are in the vicinity of gas wells will become contaminated. The Penn State Cooperative Extension put the figure at 8%.
- c. While the study touts the use of input-output models, and we recognize that such models are typically used to estimate economic impacts (including direct, indirect and induced impacts), these models do not capture economic impacts that result from environmental damage or natural resource use, so the positive economic impacts estimated in this analysis of Broome County are, at the very least, exaggerated. The actual net economic impact may, in reality, be negative.
- d. Full economic costs to the region, such as the potential for a decline in property values and an increase in health costs, are not reflected. In fact, the assumption in this report seems to be that property values will increase. It is quite possible that the reverse would occur as many well workers are transient and non-

permanent, and existing residents may be driven out due to an increasingly industrial landscape. Far fewer retirees will choose to settle and SHOs would certainly be vastly reduced in number.

- e. Declines in other industries are not reflected in the net economic impact. The tourism industry would be negatively affected, as well as the sport hunting and sport fishing industries, due to both the declining natural beauty of the area, increased environmental damage, and the potential declines in fisheries and wild game.
- f. The analysis focuses on a 10-year horizon that seems to be the expectation for gas extraction in the Marcellus Shale, and it ignores the longer term. This is a myopic view. What happens to the regional economy when the gas is gone in 10 years and the land and streams, etc. are polluted, potentially permanently?
- g. Other studies have shown that gas drilling is not an optimal industry on which to base an economic development strategy. We refer to a study, "Fossil Fuel Extraction as a County Economic Development Strategy: Are Energy-focusing Counties Benefiting?" prepared by the firm, Headwater Economics, and released in September 2008. This study analyzed the economic

health of counties in Western states in order to compare the economies of counties that focused on fossil fuel extraction as a strategy of economic development to the economies of counties that did not focus on such industries. The conclusions are that

while energy-focused counties race forward and then falter, the non-energy peer counties continue to grow steadily...Counties that have focused on broader development choices are better off, with higher rates of growth, more diverse economies, better-educated populations, a smaller gap between high and low income households, and more retirement and investment income.

- h. The analysis uses the IMPLAN input-output model, which by its construct assumes that all of the population (new and old, and low income and high income) would have identical patterns of spending. Such an assumption overestimates the multipliers and the resulting economic impact if the new employees are part-time residents or have their families staying in other areas, which we understand to be a fairly frequent situation for gas drilling workers. In fact, as reported in the Morning Times, Terrie Swift, executive director of the Sublette County Chamber of Commerce in Sublette County, Wyoming, said that the economic impact of the transitory workers living in temporary housing quarters has been, if anything, impermanent. “At that level of employment with the gas company we don’t see a lot of people moving permanently,” she stated.

“There’s not a lot of incentive for them to move their families because it’s not the nature of their profession to stay in one place...(drillers) are a level of the workforce that is the most short-term, and I think it’s not in the nature of the business for them to stay.”

3. The Penn State Study was done for the Marcellus Shale Committee and the House Natural Gas Caucus. The Marcellus Shale Committee is a membership organization comprised of natural gas companies and its member companies provided the underlying economic data for the study. This indicates a highly biased study. It is imperative that an independent analysis be conducted of economic impacts of such a potentially economically and environmentally devastating activity.

IV. DEFINITIONAL DEFECTS IN THE DSGEIS:

- A. The DEC Has Improperly Elected to View All Wells Individually, Not Cumulatively, Either As a Single Development or By Driller.
 1. While this facilitates permitting and eases the burden on applicants, it improperly allows unlimited development without any overall check on the cumulative impacts which the DSGEIS is designed to address.

2. The EPA has already nixed this for air pollution reasons in the West
 3. Water in and Wastewater out must be viewed cumulatively
- B. The Definition of Hydraulic Fracturing Is Unduly Limited and Should Embrace the Entire Exploration, Drilling and Extraction Process in Order Adequately to Comply with the DEC's Mandate (Ch. 5).
- C. The DSGEIS Should Adequately Define All Types of Aquifer Contamination to Include (§ 6.1):
1. Chemical contamination from fracking fluid;
 2. Brine intrusion from improper casing, spills; and
 3. Gas migration and infiltration.

V. ASSESSMENT DEFECTS IN THE DSGEIS:

- A. The DEC Has Selectively Failed to Consider Negative Data from Other States.
1. DEC Staff has admitted making no efforts to contact citizens of Wyoming, Colorado, Louisiana and Texas who have suffered contamination and health consequences of Hydraulic Fracturing.

2. Nonetheless, the DEC has considered out-of-state data supplied by gas companies proposing to exploit the Marcellus Shale in New York.
- B. The DEC Failed to Consider Negative Data from DEC's Own Website
1. The DEC's current system of monitoring spills and accidents reflects hundreds of instances of contamination resulting from conventional gas drilling, none of which is addressed in the DSGEIS. See State Files Show 270 Gas Drilling Incidents in Past 30 Years, Press & Sun Bulletin, <http://www.pressconnects.com/article/20091108/NEWS01/911080372>
 2. The DEC apparently employs a monitoring and notification database which allows it to ignore incidents rather than compile and accurately analyze or address them—without any indication in the DSGEIS that a more comprehensive database will be created or maintained.

VI. IMPLEMENTATION:

- A. The DSGEIS Does Not Indicate How The Limited DEC Staff Will Scale Up to Handle the Contemplated Challenge of Thousands of New Wells.
- B. The DSGEIS Is Equally Silent With Respect to Budgetary Concerns and Needs.