



***Summary of Public Comments***  
***University of Maryland Study of***  
***Potential Public Health Impacts of***  
***Natural Gas Development and***  
***Production in the Marcellus Shale in***  
***Western Maryland***

**Presentation of the Report to the Marcellus Shale  
Safe Drilling Initiative Advisory Commission  
November 5, 2014  
Frostburg, Maryland**



# Presentation Outline

- Summary of Public Comments

# Background

- More than 1,000 comments received
- Many e-mailed comments from citizens based on standard messages
- Specific comments and documents from a number of sources
- Comments from over entire State, as well as other states



# Commenters

Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments

American Petroleum Institute/ ENVIRON

Environmental Integrity Project

Garrett County Shale Gas Advisory Committee

Groundswell

Jeff Zimmerman on behalf of himself, Damascus Citizens for Sustainability, NYH2O

Maryland Children's Environmental Health Coalition

Maryland Environmental Health Network

Maryland Pesticide Network

Physicians for Social Responsibility

Rodney Glotfelty, Garrett County Health Officer

# Baseline Health Assessment

- Baseline health assessment covered many items without regard to their relationship to UNGDP activities (API)
- Inaccurate assessment of cancer risk (Berg and Brannigan)
- Ignores “healthy worker effect” in classifying workers as *vulnerable* (API)
- Point estimates presented without confidence intervals (API)
- “Significance” not used in statistical sense in all cases (API)

# Baseline Health Assessment

- Baseline health assessment did not include actual survey of residents (Glotfelty)

# Impact Assessment

- Lack of air modeling is a major limitation of the study (API)
- Use of occupational exposure data to estimate population exposures is not relevant, given transport of particulate matter
- Radon impact more significant than in report (Zimmerman, Savage River)

# Impact Assessment

- Impact on health delivery system did not adequately capture capacity and resiliency of the existing system (Glotfelty)



# Hazard Ranking

- No indicators of *direction* or *magnitude of positive health benefits*; no *magnitude* or *likelihood* [probability] of *exposure* (API)
- Because of the methodology used in calculating risks, it is likely the risks to public health are **HIGHER** than even stated in the report (PSR)

# Recommendations

- R8 – R13 require a large, experienced onsite staff (Brown, SWPA)
- R14 not sufficiently health protective due to insufficient data (Brown, SWPA)
- R16 needs to look at all diesel emissions together, regulate as a unit (Brown, SWPA)
- Recommendations on setbacks critiqued on data, protection

# Recommendations

- Study did not have information (released subsequently) on diesel use in fracking fluids – relates to recommendations on fracking fluids, air quality, and chemical disclosures (EIP)
- Support the recommendations of the report (Maryland Pesticide Network)

# Overall

- Structure of study and DHMH-MDE Memorandum of Understanding precluded the possibility of the MIAEH making a recommendation to delay any decision or development (PSR)
- Many comments regarding need for delay and further research before making a decision

# Overall

- Several comments regarding failure to include costs of health care, emergency response
- Study should have included climate change as an outcome (Groundswell)

# Thank You

- Questions/Comments from the Commissioners?
- Questions/comments from the public?