U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
Blog Round-up
Prepared by the Office of Public Affairs

Friday, February 15, 2013

Table of Contents

Blog Round-up
June 28, 2010

ROUND-UP OF MAJOR BLOGS 2
BP SPILL 2
Is It Raining Oil in the Gulf? (*Treehugger*) 2
CLIMATE CHANGE 3
In Praise of Bureaucrats (*Grist*) 3
ENERGY 6
Reid Calls The Bluff Of Climate Peacocks (*Wonk Room*) 6
PESTICIDES 8
U.S. should follow Europe and put the brakes on nanotech food (*Grist*) 8
TOXICS 10
Pennsylvania Fracking Fluid Found To Contain Neurologically Harmful Chemicals (*Huffington Post*) 10
WATER 12
Deal aims to stop sewage spills on Waikiki beaches (*Huffington Post*) 12
Natural Gas Drilling: 80 Chemicals Possibly Contaminating Water Systems (*Huffington Post)* 13

ROUND-UP OF MAJOR BLOGS

BP SPILL

Is It Raining Oil in the Gulf? (*Treehugger*)

You may have seen this video, which has surfaced on a number of blogs and has registered over half a million hits: It purports to show oil literally raining from the sky in Louisiana. And watch the clip -- which I've embedded right after the jump -- and you'll see that it certainly looks a lot like oil. But can oil from really evaporate and then get dumped down miles away as rain?

Under normal circumstances, absolutely not -- remember that whole thing about water and oil? It's a saying for a reason. But what if some experimental chemical dispersant had been dumped onto the oil in question? Could Corexit-altered crude turn into oil-rain? Rain that looks like this?

Still most likely not. : For the most part, oil itself doesn't actually evaporate, though some of the chemical elements in crude oil can. (The sticky tar balls washing ashore are the remnants.) That hasn't stopped some from hypothesizing that, given the dispersants BP has been applying in unprecedented quantities in the Gulf and the lack of information about how they work, it's possible that dispersant-altered oil may indeed be entering the atmosphere. The EPA says this isn't the case. "EPA has no data, information or scientific basis that suggests that oil mixed with dispersant could possibly evaporate from the Gulf into the water cycle," the agency said in a statement. (But then again, the EPA also has very little science on the environmental or health effects of dispersants, as it has admitted previously.)NOAA says such oil rain is impossible, saying that the "notion of oily rain is a myth."

But Sheppard notes that the video is valuable whether or not it depicts oily rain or not -- it serves as a reminder that there are unseen toxins that do evaporate during spills. "There's a bigger concern than oil visibly raining from the sky; it's the toxins you can't see," she writes. "Gases in oil that can evaporate are known as volatile organic compounds, or VOCs. A 2003 National Academy of Sciences (NAS) report notes that light crude can lose up to 75 percent of its initial volume due to evaporation of VOCs after a spill."

Those VOCs can cause headaches and respiratory problems, and potentially a host of other ailments. They pose the real problem. The oily rain in the video? Most likely just the runoff from oil previously spilled onto the road.

CLIMATE CHANGE

In Praise of Bureaucrats (*Grist*)

by Sara Robinson
28 Jun 2010 3:03 PM
Brad Johnson at The Wonk Room calls out the "Climate Peacocks" in Congress who are ostentatiously shaking their tailfeathers in mock outrage over the very idea that the Environmental Protection Agency might actually act as agents of environmental protection:

Earlier this month, 47 senators — every Republican and six Democrats — voted for Sen. Lisa Murkowski's (R-AK) resolution to overturn the Environmental Protection Agency's scientific global warming endangerment finding, finalized after years of delay in following a Supreme Court mandate to obey the language of the Clean Air Act.
Twenty of Murkowski's supporters claimed they voted to reject science in order to preserve the "balance of power" between the legislative and executive branch. They said that they had to overturn the EPA's scientific finding because setting pollution limits should instead be the job of the elected members of Congress. Sen. Mike Enzi (R-WY) even said he voted for Murkowski to "ensure that Congress keeps its responsibility to establish our nation's environmental regulations.

Like "deficit peacocks" who pretend to be hawkish on budgets but refuse any real solution, these "climate peacocks" claim to care about science, energy reform, and the environment, but have yet to find solutions to the threat of climate change. Reid is now calling the bluff of these twenty "responsible" senators, who will be proven to be fossil-fueled hypocrites if they fail to support policies that bring the swift reduction of carbon pollution that science demands.

Johnson pulled together statements from 20 such peacocks -- a lot of noisy squawking about how the EPA is usurping the prerogatives of Congress. Here's a sample (but they all sound exactly like this):

Lamar Alexander (R-TN): It's Congress' job — not a bureaucrat's or agency's — to take action on carbon in a way that preserves jobs.

Scott Brown (R-MA): We cannot allow these decisions to be made by an unelected bureaucracy; this is an issue that deserves a full debate in Congress.

Susan Collins (R-ME): I also have serious concerns about unelected government officials at the EPA taking on this complicated issue instead of Congress. It is Congress that should establish the framework for regulation of greenhouse gas emissions.

Bob Corker (R-TN): I don't believe it's appropriate for the EPA to mandate large-scale carbon emissions reductions through administrative regulations. If there is any action taken in this regard, it should be done through Congress.

Mike Crapo (R-ID): Such an important debate as climate change, and the potential to drive up costs on consumers and small businesses, should not be left in the hands of Washington, D.C., bureaucrats.

Mike Enzi (R-WY): I rise in support of Senator Murkowski's resolution that would ensure that Congress keeps its responsibility to establish our nation's environmental regulations.

It's refreshing to see so many Congress members asserting their authority over something, after being phobically reluctant to use it on Wall Street, predatory bankers, or BP. But the argument they're making is one that goes to the very heart of American governance, and deserves to be questioned straight up.

The question is: Isn't this precisely the kind of wonky, technical thing we want bureaucrats handling?

The conservatives have spent 40 years trying to convince Americans that bureaucrats were agents of the Devil, power-hungry know-nothings who suck down our tax money and give nothing in return, and the best argument going against the evil of unions. This anti-bureaucrat smear job has been so effective that the very word "bureaucrat" creates a sort of reflexive surge of gut acid in most Americans -- even some of us on the left.

Amid all the acrimony, though, we've largely forgotten what bureaucrats are good for, and why we hire them in the first place. And this peacock parade is as good a moment as any to start to reclaim the B-word. Let's start with the basics, since so few of us seem to remember what they are:

Bureaucrats are government employees. In agencies like the EPA, they're very often degreed, certified professionals in a specific field of expertise -- hydrology, or wildlife biology, or range management, or soils geology. In short: they're trained experts who are far more entitled than most of us to have an informed opinion in their area of competence. And that education, expertise, and insight is precisely what we pay them for.

It's true that they enjoy a level of job security that few people in the public sector can even imagine these days. It's not uncommon for a government professional to work at the same agency for 30 or even 40 years, rise through the ranks of middle management, and retire with a good pension. But it's also arguable that that long constancy gives them an equally long perspective about where the public interest lies, and how to make the best policy around it. Over time, they see political factions and theories come and go; they see what works and what doesn't. That long, deep knowledge of the field can make the difference between success and failure, miracles and boondoggles -- if we let them bring it to bear.

Bureaucrats are, by law, apolitical. They're a permanent part of the government, serving Congress and the White House through conservative and liberal administrations. They're not allowed to participate in political campaigns, or make public statements for or against candidates. They can't speak as private citizens on issues, either. Like everybody else, they've got

their personal biases and interests, and those occasionally leak through into their decisions -- but unlike most of us, they've also got serious legal incentives to keep those biases out of their work.

The bigger danger is that they're very susceptible to being leaned on by the White House or Congress if some powerful donor doesn't like what they're up to. In the land of bureaucrats, being tagged as "not a team player" by resisting a Congress member's demands will put a quick end to a career. In better days, when government had a stronger role, this kind of intimidation was considered unethical, and legislators who tried it opened themselves to the risk of being investigated and sanctioned. The fact that it's a problem now has less to do with individual bureaucrats than it does with the level of corruption in the system. If we don't like this, blaming the victims won't fix it. But. despite all of this, it's still true that bureaucrats have several more layers of insulation keeping them out of the heavy winds of politics that buffet Congress constantly.

So, back to the question. Do we want important technical decisions about pollution limits made by people with actual technical expertise -- people who've spent their entire careers dealing with both the science and the politics of this issue inside and out? Or do we want them being made by Congress members for whom this is one issue among a thousand; who may not have had more than one or two undergraduate science courses; and who are usually relying on a too-brief assessment by some junior environmental affairs staffer who possibly has his or her own agenda, and may not be an expert either?

Furthermore: do we want these decisions made by people who are at least somewhat insulated by the bureaucracy from the interests of big donors, and are thus more able to fairly, equitably assess what's really in America's long-term best interest? Or do we think it's better to leave them in the hands of people whose jobs are utterly dependent on the largesse of powerful donors, and who (as we already know, all too well) must consistently put the wishes of their clients ahead of the interests of the American people?

If there's one thing we've learned over the last ten years, it's that Congress is structurally incapable of doing what's right for the average American if some rich donor has other ideas. This is, in fact, why conservatives delegitimized bureaucrats in the first place: they couldn't stand having well-trained experts challenging their plans on behalf of the public interest. They could buy off Congress, but they couldn't buy off our scientists. As I've written before (here and here), this war on planning was part of the larger war on science; and we are now paying the delayed costs of this war almost everywhere we turn.

If we're going to change that trend -- if we want to restore evidence-based policy and reassert the primacy of science in public decision-making -- the first thing we need to do is reclaim the dignity and reassert the authority of the government bureaucrat. These people are our designated experts. We hired them to defend our interests and make policy without political interference. They don't always get it right -- no system run by human beings ever does -- but they're considerably more trustworthy and knowledgeable than Congress is.

It's the height of arrogance for these squaking peacocks in Congress to think that they're smarter than the EPA's bureaucrats, and can do everything real scientists can do. They can't. And their

contempt for "the bureaucracy" also reveals their contempt for the benefits of higher education; for scientific expertise; for government based in calm disinterested reason; and for the Enlightenment values this country was founded on.

Bring on the bureaucrats. Love 'em or hate 'em, they're almost always smarter than Congress -- and that's why the peacocks need to shut up and listen to the people who actually know what they're doing.

ENERGY

Reid Calls The Bluff Of Climate Peacocks (*Wonk Room*)

Sen. Harry Reid (D-NV) is giving obstructionist senators a chance to finally take action on climate and clean energy, after they attempted to block the “unelected bureaucracy” of the Environmental Protection Agency from doing so. After holding a “thrilling” climate caucus with his members last week, the Democratic majority leader plans to bring an “impenetrable” comprehensive package of legislation to repair the damage caused by fossil fuels to our economy and our planet.

Earlier this month, 47 senators — every Republican and six Democrats — voted for Sen. Lisa Murkowski's (R-AK) resolution to overturn the Environmental Protection Agency's scientific global warming endangerment finding, finalized after years of delay in following a Supreme Court mandate to obey the language of the Clean Air Act.

Twenty of Murkowski's supporters claimed they voted to reject science in order to preserve the “balance of power” between the legislative and executive branch. They said that they had to overturn the EPA's scientific finding because setting pollution limits should instead be the job of the elected members of Congress. Sen. Mike Enzi (R-WY) even said he voted for Murkowski to “ensure that Congress keeps its responsibility to establish our nation's environmental regulations.”

Like “deficit peacocks” who pretend to be hawkish on budgets but refuse any real solution, these “climate peacocks” claim to care about science, energy reform, and the environment, but have yet to find solutions to the threat of climate change. Reid is now calling the bluff of these twenty “responsible” senators, who will be proven to be fossil-fueled hypocrites if they fail to support policies that bring the swift reduction of carbon pollution that science demands.

The Climate Peacock Caucus

Lamar Alexander (R-TN): “It's Congress' job — not a bureaucrat's or agency's — to take action on carbon in a way that preserves jobs.”

Scott Brown (R-MA): “We cannot allow these decisions to be made by an unelected bureaucracy; this is an issue that deserves a full debate in Congress.”

Susan Collins (R-ME): “I also have serious concerns about unelected government officials at the EPA taking on this complicated issue instead of Congress. It is Congress that should establish the framework for regulation of greenhouse gas emissions.”

Bob Corker (R-TN): “I don't believe it's appropriate for the EPA to mandate large-scale carbon emissions reductions through administrative regulations. If there is any action taken in this regard, it should be done through Congress.”

Mike Crapo (R-ID): “Such an important debate as climate change, and the potential to drive up costs on consumers and small businesses, should not be left in the hands of Washington, D.C., bureaucrats.”

Mike Enzi (R-WY): “I rise in support of Senator Murkowski's resolution that would ensure that Congress keeps its responsibility to establish our nation's environmental regulations.”

Lindsey Graham (R-SC): “This is a balance-of-power issue and it has long been clear to me that Congress should write the rules when it comes to the regulation of carbon, not the EPA.”

Chuck Grassley (R-IA): “These decisions should be made by Congress, where officials can be held accountable by the people, rather than by an unelected bureaucracy, in this case the same agency that tried to penalize farmers for the fugitive dust that kicks up from the tractor on windy days.”

Orrin Hatch (R-UT): “Hatch and Murkowski believe it is Congress's job to establish any carbon control program, not the executive branch.”

Jon Kyl (R-AZ): “I believe it's wrong for the administration to try to advance its goals by any means possible, in this case, by going around the legislative branch and using the EPA to enact sweeping economic and energy regulation.”

Mary Landrieu (D-LA): “If the federal government is serious about reducing carbon emissions, Congress needs to develop the right goals, guidelines and tools necessary to do the job.”

Blanche Lincoln (D-AR): “Congress – not unelected bureaucrats – should be making the complicated, multi-faceted decisions on energy and climate policy.”

John McCain (R-AZ): “What this debate, and this resolution, is really about whether the American people get a say in our Nation's energy policy through their elected representatives or if they will be bound to the whims of the unelected bureaucrats at the EPA.”

Lisa Murkowski (R-AK): “We should continue our work to pass meaningful energy and climate legislation, but in the meantime, we cannot turn a blind eye to the EPA's efforts to impose back-door climate regulations with no input from Congress.”

Ben Nelson (D-NE): “Controlling the levels of carbon emissions is the job of Congress. We don't need EPA looking over Congress' shoulder telling us we're not moving fast enough.”

Mark Pryor (D-AR): “Although I agree with the science, I firmly believe that Congress, and not the EPA, should determine policy on greenhouse gas emissions.”

Jim Risch (R-ID): “The merits of global warming and how to address it should be debated in the legislative bodies of Congress, not decided by an unelected bureaucratic agency of the federal government.”

Jay Rockefeller (D-WV): “I intend to vote for Senator Murkowski's Resolution of Disapproval because I believe we must send a strong message that the fate of West Virginia's economy, our manufacturing industries, and our workers should not be solely in the hands of EPA.”

Olympia Snowe (R-ME): “It is Congress – and not unelected bureaucrats – that should be responsible for developing environmental policies that integrate our nation's economic well-being as an urgent priority along with the reduction of carbon emissions, and I do not accept that these are mutually exclusive goals.”

George Voinovich (R-OH): “Unfortunately, the Obama Administration and Senate Democrats today rejected an attempt to put our nation's environment and energy policy back into Congress' hands.”

PESTICIDES

U.S. should follow Europe and put the brakes on nanotech food (*Grist*)

by Jaydee Hanson
29 Jun 2010 5:00 AM
One month ago, the Committee on Environment, Health and Consumer Protection of the European Parliament voted in favor of excluding nanotechnology from the EU list of novel foods allowed on the market. This committee vote represents one of the first times ever that a legislative body has weighed in on the issue of nanotech particles in food. (Nanotechnology refers to materials or devices developed on an atomic or molecular scale, sized between 1 to 100 nanometers -- basically, really, really, really tiny novel particles that our skin and other organs have never before encountered at this scale.)

For those of us watching how government views nanotechnology, this was welcome news.

Whether we are focusing on food or other consumer goods, so far more than a thousand products containing nanoparticles are currently available in the U.S. These nano-enabled products have been put on the market without testing their possible impacts on human health or the

environment. And, without stringent government review and without regulation, these products are foisted on an unsuspecting public. People are using nanotechnology, such as sunscreen containing nanoparticles of zinc oxide, on a daily basis, almost completely unaware of what they're putting on their bodies.

In some cases, nanotechnology has proven benefits, but without a clear understanding of the health and environmental impacts, how can the Environmental Protection Agency, the Food and Drug Administration, and the public assess whether or not use of nanotech products is worth the risks? Nanotechnology practically cries out for regulation.

It is a clear, prudent recognition of the overwhelming need for testing in the name of public safety.

That's what's encouraging about the European Parliament committee's action, which also included a declaration that food produced from nanotechnology processes must undergo risk assessment before being approved for use and must be labeled on packaging. The decision was approved by the influential committee almost unanimously, with 42 votes in favor, two against, and three abstentions. While the final plenary vote on the issue is expected to take place in the European Parliament in July, the lopsided committee vote speaks to the absolute logic of such a move. It is a clear, prudent recognition of the overwhelming need for testing in the name of public safety.

It now looks as though U.S. regulatory agencies may be coming around to the point of view that testing should not be considered a burden, but rather an urgent need. The EPA is promising that it will release proposed regulations on nano pesticides soon. We hope the regulations will require companies to report the presence of nano-silver and other nanomaterials in hundreds of consumer products ranging from children's pacifiers to athletic clothing.

EPA has broad authority under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) over all substances intended to kill pests, including germ killers, but has not addressed until now the growing nano-silver market (primarily as an anti-microbial agent in food packaging), or the market for most other nanochemicals. The proposed rules would be a response to a legal petition filed with the EPA by the International Center for Technology Assessment and the Center for Food Safety in May of 2008, on behalf of a coalition of 12 other public interest organizations, calling on EPA to regulate nano-silver products as pesticides.

The nanotechnology industry often touts the benefits to humanity that their discoveries and applications have created. Lawmakers and regulators should carefully review those real advances, but with balance and logic. We shouldn't rush to include technology in foods and other products without a clear understanding of the long-term risks these products may pose. The European Commission should follow the directive of the Parliament and to put strong policies in place that will adequately protect human health and the environment from the potential hazards of these novel products. And in the U.S., the EPA and the FDA should do likewise.

TOXICS

June 29, 2010

Pennsylvania Fracking Fluid Found To Contain Neurologically Harmful Chemicals (*Huffington Post*)

MARC LEVY | 06/28/10 07:30 PM |
EPA, Fracking, Fracking Fluid, Natural Gas, Denver News
HARRISBURG, Pa. — More than two years after the start of a natural gas drilling boom, Pennsylvania is making public a complete list of the chemicals used to extract the gas from deep underground amid rising public fears of potential water contamination and increased scrutiny of the fast-growing industry.

Compounds associated with neurological problems, cancer and other serious health effects are among the chemicals being used to drill the wells, although state and industry officials say there is no evidence that the activity is polluting drinking water.

The Associated Press obtained the list from the state Department of Environmental Protection, which assembled what is believed to be the first complete catalog of chemicals being used to drill in Pennsylvania's gas-rich Marcellus Shale. The department hopes to post it online soon.

It counts more than 80 chemicals being used by the industry in a process called hydraulic fracturing, or "fracking," as it pursues the gas in the mile-deep shale.

Many of the compounds are present in consumer products, such as salt, cosmetics, gasoline, pesticides, solvents, glues, paints and tobacco smoke.

Environmental advocates worry the chemicals are poisoning underground drinking water sources. However, environmental officials say they know of no examples in Pennsylvania or elsewhere.

"If we thought there was any frack fluid getting into fresh drinking water ... I think we'd have to have a very serious conversation about prohibiting the activity completely," said Scott Perry, the director of the department's Bureau of Oil and Gas Management.

Conrad Volz, who directs the University of Pittsburgh's Department of Environmental and Occupational Health, said state and federal agencies haven't done enough research to come to that conclusion.

A decades-old technology, hydraulic fracturing was coming under increased scrutiny even before the Gulf of Mexico oil spill.

Its spread from states such as Texas, Colorado and Wyoming to heavily populated watersheds on the East Coast has led to worries about water contamination and calls for federal regulation.

Hydraulic fracturing is exempt from the federal Safe Drinking Water Act, leaving states to regulate the activity. In New York state, regulators have effectively held up drilling on the Marcellus Shale while they consider new regulations. Last year, they published a list of more than 250 chemicals that could potentially be used there.

In Pennsylvania, where approximately 1,500 Marcellus Shale wells have been drilled and many thousands more are expected in the coming years, the state is working to buttress its regulations even as rigs poke holes in large swaths of the state.

Last week, HBO aired a documentary called "Gasland" that portrayed the natural gas industry as an environmental menace that spoils water, air and lives. The industry has challenged the film's veracity, saying it botches facts, exaggerates evidence and spotlights citizens whose claims already have been investigated and debunked.

Pennsylvania assembled the list in recent months from information the industry is required to disclose and decided to prepare it for the public as public interest grew, Perry said.

Industry officials say the chemicals pose no threat because they are handled safely and are heavily diluted when they are injected under heavy pressure with water and sand into a well. Industry officials say the chemicals account for less than 1 percent of the fluid that is blasted underground.

The mixture breaks up the shale some 5,000 to 8,000 feet down and props open the cracks to allow the gas trapped inside to flow up the well to the surface.

One compound, naphthalene, is classified by the federal Environmental Protection Agency as a possible human carcinogen.

The EPA said central nervous system depression has been reported in people who get high levels of toluene by deliberately inhaling paint or glue.

In its online guidelines on xylene, the U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration cites an industrial hygiene and toxicology text that says chronic exposure to xylene may cause central nervous system depression, anemia, liver damage and more.

The chemicals are used to reduce friction, kill algae and break down mineral deposits in the well. Various well services firms make different proprietary blends of the solutions and supply them to the drilling companies, which blend them with water at the well site before pumping them underground.

In recent years, some makers of the solutions have sought to replace toxic ingredients with "green" or food-based additives. For instance, Range Resources Corp., one of the most active drilling companies in Pennsylvania, is close to rolling out a 100 percent biodegradable friction reducer, spokesman Matt Pitzarella said Monday.

Get HuffPost Denver On Twitter, Facebook, and Google Buzz! Know something we don't? E-mail us at denver@huffingtonpost.com

WATER

Deal aims to stop sewage spills on Waikiki beaches (*Huffington Post*)

MARK NIESSE | June 28, 2010 07:20 PM EST
HONOLULU — To prevent another sewage spill from contaminating Waikiki's famous beaches, the Honolulu government announced Monday it must upgrade sewer lines under a settlement with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

The deal ends years of lawsuits and sanitation warnings caused by an aging sewage system that suffered from decades of neglect.

The threat spilled over in 2006, when 48 million gallons of sewage was flushed into a Waikiki canal and reached beaches after weeks of heavy rain. If the wastewater hadn't been released into the ocean, sewage could have backed up into hotels, homes and businesses.

"My biggest nightmare was to have a sewage spill in Waikiki ... and that's what happened," said Mayor Mufi Hannemann. "This is a clear case of pay now or pay later."

Details of the settlement weren't disclosed, but they require the city to improve wastewater collection and sewage treatment.

"No one in Hawaii should be at risk of swimming in raw sewage," said Donna Wong, executive director for Hawaii's Thousand Friends, one of the groups that filed the lawsuits.

The upgrades likely mean more increases to sewer charges paid by island residents and businesses, which will pass their costs on to tourists.

"Everyone from residents to tourists care about clean water, especially when they come to a pristine place like Hawaii," said Jared Blumenfeld, regional administrator for the EPA. "This is the right decision, the right time, and we're very proud to be part of this settlement."

The agreement calls for improved wastewater collection pipes called force mains, as well as upgrades to pump stations.

The deal also sets an extended timeline for the city's two largest wastewater treatment plants, at Sand Island and Honouliuli, to begin handling secondary treatment of sewage that contains pesticides, toxins and pathogens found in water tests, Blumenfeld said.

Honolulu is the largest city in the country that hasn't required its wastewater treatment plants to handle secondary treatment, said Hannemann, who maintains that the city's water is safe even without it.

"I'm confident that once we upgrade the system and we take care of our structural deficits that we're no longer going to be seeing these type of problems," said city Environmental Services Director Timothy Steinberger, referring to spills like those in Waikiki.

The proposed settlement resolves four lawsuits, filed between 1994 and 2010 by environmental groups including the Sierra Club, Our Children's Earth Foundation and Hawaii's Thousand Friends.

It still needs to be approved by the city council and the federal court.

"This is a significant long sought-after win for the environment," said Robert Harris, director for the Sierra Club's Hawaii chapter. "Under the settlement, the city will improve our wastewater system in a systematic long-term fashion to protect the health of citizens and our coastal environment."

Although the cost of the sewage system upgrades wasn't revealed, Hannemann said last year it would cost the city about $1.2 billion to add secondary treatment capabilities to its two major wastewater plants, forcing the city to raise sewer fees.

Average monthly sewer service charges have already gone up from $33 in 2005 to nearly $79 this year. Those increases have helped pay for increased sewer line inspections, more sewer repairs and a drop in gravity main spills.

June 29, 2010

Developing: The Latest Oil Spill Photos Get Breaking News by Email

Natural Gas Drilling: 80 Chemicals Possibly Contaminating Water Systems (*Huffington Post)*

Posted: 06-29-10 11:13 AM
Chemicals Fracking, Chemicals Natural Gas, Energy, Fracking Chemicals, Fracking Water Contamination, Natural Gas Chemicals, Natural Gas Water Contamination, Water Contamination Fracking, Water Contamination Natural Gas, Green News
HARRISBURG, Pa. (AP) -- More than two years after the start of a natural gas drilling boom, Pennsylvania is making public a complete list of the chemicals used to extract the gas from deep underground amid rising public fears of potential water contamination and increased scrutiny of the fast-growing industry.

Compounds associated with neurological problems, cancer and other serious health effects are among the chemicals being used to drill the wells, although state and industry officials say there is no evidence that the activity is polluting drinking water.

The Associated Press obtained the list from the state Department of Environmental Protection, which assembled what is believed to be the first complete catalog of chemicals being used to drill in Pennsylvania's gas-rich Marcellus Shale. The department hopes to post it online soon.

It counts more than 80 chemicals being used by the industry in a process called hydraulic fracturing, or "fracking," as it pursues the gas in the mile-deep shale.

Many of the compounds are present in consumer products, such as salt, cosmetics, gasoline, pesticides, solvents, glues, paints and tobacco smoke.

Environmental advocates worry the chemicals are poisoning underground drinking water sources. However, environmental officials say they know of no examples in Pennsylvania or elsewhere.

"If we thought there was any frack fluid getting into fresh drinking water ... I think we'd have to have a very serious conversation about prohibiting the activity completely," said Scott Perry, the director of the department's Bureau of Oil and Gas Management.

Conrad Volz, who directs the University of Pittsburgh's Department of Environmental and Occupational Health, said state and federal agencies haven't done enough research to come to that conclusion.

A decades-old technology, hydraulic fracturing was coming under increased scrutiny even before the Gulf of Mexico oil spill.

Its spread from states such as Texas, Colorado and Wyoming to heavily populated watersheds on the East Coast has led to worries about water contamination and calls for federal regulation.

Hydraulic fracturing is exempt from the federal Safe Drinking Water Act, leaving states to regulate the activity. In New York state, regulators have effectively held up drilling on the Marcellus Shale while they consider new regulations. Last year, they published a list of more than 250 chemicals that could potentially be used there.

In Pennsylvania, where approximately 1,500 Marcellus Shale wells have been drilled and many thousands more are expected in the coming years, the state is working to buttress its regulations even as rigs poke holes in large swaths of the state.

Last week, HBO aired a documentary called "Gasland" that portrayed the natural gas industry as an environmental menace that spoils water, air and lives. The industry has challenged the film's veracity, saying it botches facts, exaggerates evidence and spotlights citizens whose claims already have been investigated and debunked.

Pennsylvania assembled the list in recent months from information the industry is required to disclose and decided to prepare it for the public as public interest grew, Perry said.

Industry officials say the chemicals pose no threat because they are handled safely and are heavily diluted when they are injected under heavy pressure with water and sand into a well. Industry officials say the chemicals account for less than 1 percent of the fluid that is blasted underground.

The mixture breaks up the shale some 5,000 to 8,000 feet down and props open the cracks to allow the gas trapped inside to flow up the well to the surface.

One compound, naphthalene, is classified by the federal Environmental Protection Agency as a possible human carcinogen.

The EPA said central nervous system depression has been reported in people who get high levels of toluene by deliberately inhaling paint or glue.

In its online guidelines on xylene, the U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration cites an industrial hygiene and toxicology text that says chronic exposure to xylene may cause central nervous system depression, anemia, liver damage and more.

The chemicals are used to reduce friction, kill algae and break down mineral deposits in the well. Various well services firms make different proprietary blends of the solutions and supply them to the drilling companies, which blend them with water at the well site before pumping them underground.

In recent years, some makers of the solutions have sought to replace toxic ingredients with "green" or food-based additives. For instance, Range Resources Corp., one of the most active drilling companies in Pennsylvania, is close to rolling out a 100 percent biodegradable friction reducer, spokesman Matt Pitzarella said Monday.

Get HuffPost Green On Twitter, Facebook, and Google Buzz! Know something we don't? E-mail us at Huffpostgreen@huffingtonpost.com