

RECEIVEDBY *CmH* | 9/25/14 DATE**Yorksupr****From:** Jonathan Canning [jcannin2@u.rochester.edu]**Sent:** Thursday, September 25, 2014 9:08 AM**To:** yorksupr@rochester.rr.com**Subject:** Hydrofracking in York

Hi Mr. Demming,

My name is Jonathan Canning. I am currently a sophomore at the University of Rochester, but I have lived in Piffard all my life. So naturally, I was distressed when I saw posts by my friends on Facebook about the York Town Board planning to allow fracking in York. Some friends had even posted a map that highlighted areas that would be "targeted for fracking," areas that are very close to my own home. Even the Abbey of the Genesee is right in the middle of one of the target areas.

Mr. Demming, I urge you to work against this proposal. Fracking is dangerous and irresponsible, and it has the potential to lay waste to our beautiful town. The short-term gains of fracking are not worth the environmental destruction it causes.

Nearly all of the people I have discussed this subject with agree with me, and from what I hear, so did many of the people who attended a meeting on this subject just last night. The Town Board cannot ignore the voices of the people whom it governs. Please, Mr. Demming, listen to our voices. York is my home, and it would sadden me greatly to see my home destroyed.

Thank you for your time,

Jonathan Canning

9/25/2014

RECEIVED
BY PAB | 9/25/14 DATE

Yorksupsr

From: Jamie E. Amburgey [jeamburg@rochester.rr.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2014 11:00 AM
To: yorksupsr@rochester.rr.com
Subject: Hydrofracking in York

Good morning Mr. Deming:

My husband, Roger, and I want to voice our opinion on hydrofracking. We are completely against this being allowed. We live in such a beautiful area and the thought that this may be destroyed by fracking is very frightening. Hydrofracking comes with increased traffic, damage to our roads, loud machinery and the possibility that our water will be poisoned. We have already dealt with loss of volume in our well after the salt mine in Retsof collapsed in the early 90s. Our Town consists of a large farms which have the potential to be poisoned by this process. The companies do not need to declare the chemicals that they are pumping into the ground and the disposal method of this toxic liquid will be difficult to properly enforce. Hydrofracking has the potential to cause health problems for all of us for years to come if allowed.

Please consider the potential ramifications of hydrofracking. Think of what our children and grandchildren will inherit from us if fracking destroys our properties. All of the money in the world does nothing when you are faced with cancer, cannot sell or insure your property, have no safe drinking water are stuck in a wasteland.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Roger & Jamie Amburgey
2028 Federal Road, Linwood, NY 14486

RECEIVED

RV *CmH* | *9/25/14* DATE

Christine Harris

From: Davies Nagel <dgnagel@rochester.rr.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2014 3:20 PM
To: harris chrissy
Subject: Letter to the York Town Board...

*passed out to
T.B. members at
9-25-14 meeting,
also put a copy in
the hydrofracking folder
for further discussion*

Dear York Town Board,

One thing I forgot to mention last night is the following recommendation. At the present time I believe it would make very good sense to just add this to our zoning:

SECTION 4. AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE III. ZONING DISTRICTS.

303 Interpretation of Permitted Uses

"Any land use not specifically identified in the listing of permitted or specially permitted uses within each zoning district shall be deemed to be a non-permitted use"

This would not necessarily be a pro or anti fracking measure but would simply add some protection to what ever might come down the road that might have a negative impact on our community (geothermal plant, solar power facility, etc.)

It would give the Town the future option of changing the zoning to bring something in or leave the zoning as is to keep it out. I believe it would definitely have the support of the townspeople and I can't see why the Board wouldn't support it as well.

Dave Nagel =

RECEIVEDBY *PAB* | *10/9/14* DATE**Yorksupsr****From:** Mary Kummer [mekatt1790@yahoo.com]**Sent:** Thursday, October 09, 2014 10:23 AM**To:** yorksupr@rochester.rr.com**Subject:** Fracking

Good morning,

I would like to be on the record as opposing fracking and/or the storage of any fracking waste in the Town of York. We all have our opinions on the safety of the issues, which if you are pro-fracking you can refute. However, how can you deny the quality of life issues which come along with fracking?? Do I want 100 trucks a day coming down my road? Do I want to hear the machinery 24 hours a day, even if it's a mile away from me? Do I want the lighting issues, the personnel issues, the invasion of our town by a business that will most assuredly run us over (both figuratively and physically)?? How can you let this happen here? Forget about the school - who the heck wants to bring their family in to a fracking area - our school's declining student body will radically go down and I'm afraid the school as well.

I would also like to see those board members who themselves or their family will stand to profit from fracking be prohibited from voting on this issue. That is dirty, just dirty.

Thank you. Please do the morally correct thing.

Mary Kummer

10/9/2014

RECEIVED

BY PAB | 10/14

Yorksupsr

From: Colin Ward [colinward333@yahoo.com]

Sent: Monday, October 13, 2014 9:50 AM

To: yorksupr@rochester.rr.com

Subject: No to Fracking

My name is Colin Ward and I do not want to see fracking in York or Livingston County. Keep my home safe and clean.

Thank you.

Colin

- [Suspicious Test Scores \(Denver Post\)](#)
- [Dollars For Docs \(Colorado Public Radio\)](#)
- [Tax Breaks For Movie Stars \(Denver Post\)](#)

- [TV SCHEDULE](#)
- [EVENTS](#)
- [EDUCATION](#)
- [VIDEO](#)
- [ABOUT US](#)
- [KIDS](#)
- [SUPPORT US](#)
- [SHOP](#)

- [Rocky Mountain PBS: Home](#)

RECEIVED

BY Cmth 10/14/14 DATE

* received link from Councilman
Dene

State questions study linking fracking to birth defects

A gas well at the edge of a residential neighborhood in Erie, Colo., on Feb. 7, 2014. A University of Colorado study concluding that certain birth defects are as much as 30 percent more common among mothers living near natural gas wells has come under question by the state public health department.

(Joe Mahoney/I-News at Rocky Mountain PBS)

[Media partners click here to download the story and photos](#)

A University of Colorado study concluding that certain birth defects are as much as 30 percent more common among mothers living near natural gas wells has come under question by the state public health department.


The tussle comes as an entrenched political conflict over the future of oil and gas drilling in the state has made a Rorschach test out of epidemiology, with each side seeing what they want to see when it comes to health risks.

The research, led by scholars at the Colorado School of Public Health and published last week in the journal *Environmental Health Perspectives*, found that mothers living within 10 miles of natural gas wells in rural Colorado were more likely to give birth to babies with congenital heart defects. The research didn't prove that drilling caused the defects.

The study made use of state health department records of 124,842 births from 1996 to 2009. But in an unusual show of dissension, the health department threw water on the findings. Chief Medical Officer Larry Wolk, appointed in August by Gov. John Hickenlooper, cautioned in a lengthy statement that "people should not rush to judgment."

The state official criticized the study's design and highlighted its limitations. Inactive wells weren't distinguished from active wells, Wolk noted, while findings on neural tube defects didn't account for factors like prenatal health care, drinking or smoking. On top of that, the study only made use of the mothers' addresses at the time of their babies' birth, and didn't account for women who might have moved after the first trimester, when most birth defects occur.

"As Chief Medical Officer, I would tell pregnant women and mothers who live, or who at-the-time-of-their-pregnancy lived, in proximity to a gas well not to rely on this study as an explanation of why one of their children might have had a birth defect," said Wolk. "Many factors known to contribute to birth defects were ignored in this study."

 A gas well at the edge of a residential neighborhood in Erie, Colo., on Feb. 7, 2014. A University of Colorado study concluding that

A gas well at the edge of a residential neighborhood in Erie, Colo., on Feb. 7, 2014. A University of Colorado study concluding that certain birth defects are as much as 30 percent more common among mothers living near natural gas wells has come under question by the state public health department. (Joe Mahoney/I-News at Rocky Mountain PBS)

The state health department's volley is set amid a pitched battle over energy development in Colorado. Environmentalists have faced off against industry groups, and local moratoriums on the drilling process known as hydraulic fracturing, or fracking, have butted against the relatively industry-friendly approach of Hickenlooper.

Questions about fracking's health impacts rest uneasily at the center of the political storm. Fracking sends a slurry of water, sand and chemicals deep underground to break up horizontal layers of oil and gas. The process has re-animated oil and gas drilling in the U.S., leading to a domestic energy boom. It has also enlivened the environmental movement in the country, as opponents of the practice raise concerns about air and water pollution from the often-mysterious brew of chemicals used by energy companies.

The way each side frames the health risks of the practice can be revealing, says Chuck Davis, a political scientist at Colorado State University.

"Oil and gas folks frame it in terms of scientific uncertainty," calling up the other possible forms of pollution or health conditions that might confound any attempt to identify a culprit in disease, says Davis. "The environmentalists and others will say, these are people who are immediately impacted; they'd argue for the precautionary principle."

This principle calls for taking precautions to address plausible harm to human health or the environment, even when the science is uncertain.

Davis draws a parallel to the early debate on cigarettes' link to lung cancer. Tobacco companies highlighted the uncertainty of linking a complex disease to a single cause, while activists played up the risks and advocated safeguards.

Here, as in the tobacco debate, the stakes are high.

There are now 51,717 oil and gas wells across the state, according to a recent count by the Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission.

For a growing number of Coloradans, drilling's effect on air and water is a matter of local concern. Fort Collins, Boulder and Lafayette recently enacted bans or moratoriums on fracking. Longmont did the same in 2012.

The oil and gas industry has fought the efforts by carrot and stick, suing the cities that have voted to ban or suspend fracking while launching an extensive public marketing campaign to burnish its image in the state. Major energy companies Anadarko Petroleum Corporation and Noble Energy created a non-profit, Coloradans for Responsible Energy Development, which has spent heavily on ads touting the safety of the drilling method.

Hickenlooper has sided mainly with the industry, appearing in pro-fracking ads sponsored by the energy industry and joining a lawsuit to overturn Longmont's ban. At the same time, the state has proposed rules that would restrict methane emissions and other air pollution from oil and gas drilling.

Interpreting scientific findings like CU's latest in such a din can be difficult.

So what did the study actually say? The findings described a higher rate of congenital heart defects in areas where wells are densely concentrated. Mothers living near an area of more than 125 wells per mile were roughly 30 percent more likely to have a baby with a congenital heart defect than those giving birth near no wells at all.

The researchers raised the possibility of exposure to benzene—a known byproduct of drilling—and other air pollutants previously linked to birth defects as a potential cause.

Neural tube defects were twice as common in areas of densely concentrated wells, but lead author Lisa McKenzie cautioned against reading too much into this. Neural tube defects are very rare, and only 59 were recorded in all the years studied.

The researchers also looked at oral clefts, and premature or low-birthweight infants. But they didn't find much there, except an inexplicable—and very small—association in the other direction; women living near wells were actually slightly less likely to have premature or low-weight babies.

The study was punctuated with a long list of acknowledged limitations in the available data—including many of the same caveats highlighted by the health department.

Jane McElroy, a University of Missouri epidemiologist and author of an unrelated study that found a link between birth defects and fracking fluids, applauded CU's research as a valuable foray into a field that's been largely unexplored.

Lindsey Wilson, an anti-fracking activist from Environment Colorado, read the findings as support for a policy of local autonomy when it comes to energy development.

"Communities should decide for themselves whether they want to put pregnant mothers in danger," said Wilson.

The oil and gas folks were mostly silent, preferring to let the health department make their case. Doug Flanders, a spokesman for the Colorado Oil and Gas Association, referred a reporter to Wolk's statement.

The tone of the health department's response surprised David Savitz, a Brown University epidemiologist and a co-author of the study, striking him as "defensive" and "an overreaction."

"I share many of the concerns," said Savitz. "It's certainly not a conclusive study, and it doesn't demonstrate that pollutants related to shale development have caused birth defects."

But Savitz stood behind the findings of the study as a clear step forward from anecdotal information that's been available previously.

"What I would expect from the public health agency would be to acknowledge that there are legitimate questions and that this has advanced our ability to frame it more clearly ... and to pursue better research either to show where this one went awry or to provide additional evidence on the same question," Savitz said.

In other words, to answer science with more science.

The scientific process itself, added lead author McKenzie, is intended to guard against the kind of grandstanding that has characterized the debate over fracking.

“This manuscript has gone through really extensive peer review,” said McKenzie. “Comments on the web and press releases don’t get the same review.”

[About Rocky Mountain PBS I-News](#)

Rocky Mountain PBS I-News produces **public-service journalism** and shares it with [news organizations](#) throughout the region.

News that makes a difference.

[Support Rocky Mountain PBS I-News](#)

All Coloradans deserve quality journalism that inspires people to make a difference – because you can only fix what’s wrong if you know about the problem. While most Colorado newsrooms face shrinking resources, I-News investigates the stories that would otherwise go untold and helps your news organizations do more public-service journalism. Your support can make a difference.

[Donate Now](#)

[Learn more about RMPBS sponsorship](#)

This page