

From: www@pennstate.edu
To: www@pennstate.edu
Subject: New comments for application NY-20230503ENV
Date: 17 April 2023 16:45:44

New comments have been received for application NY-20230503ENV from Max Kim Hwang.

Comments:

Re: Planning Ref. No. NY-2023-0503ENV

Enbridge Oil and Gas application for approval drilling at Hamilton, MD file.

I am fully object to the application made by Enbridge Oil & Gas to drill for gas via preprint square hydraulic fracturing.

An other very global, there are increasing and decreasing in the development of the development and the adjacent documents such that the planning committee cannot be clear on the details of the proposed operation, and which support committees should not take process that the application is only for test drilling of face value.

Disruption include, but are not limited to the plans to retain equipment for a production phase of their plan. This letter is reflected both in Enbridge's communication with shareholders (they have produced various numbers, including that they hope to yield 152 billion cubic feet of gas from the site over the 20 years, making Enbridge the biggest UK onshore gas field). The planning documents themselves are also contradictory on the subject of long-term production. While Chapter 4 of the Planning Document requires decommissioning the well following testing, Section 2.4.3 of the Environmental Assessment Volume 1 makes it clear the decommissioning steps would only follow if "long-term" production were not commercially viable.

The application should therefore not be approved as an exploratory operation, but as the first phase of the company's large-scale extraction plan.

The Enbridge company's Energy Company (EPC) document also states, "It is noted that the development effects of testing the gas produced should be considered on climate change grounds when considering the application." (The U.S. Energy Information Administration calculates CO2 emissions at around 120.85 million pounds of CO2 per billion cubic feet of produced gas, plus methane, which has a significantly higher global warming potential over shorter timeframes.)

Along the other information and information from the volume of that placed (see this article for detail <https://www.foxnews.com/energy/2023/04/17/enbridge-drilling-creating-key-points-and-reaction/>).

It is noted that the development effects of testing the gas produced should be considered on climate change grounds when considering the application. (The U.S. Energy Information Administration calculates CO2 emissions at around 120.85 million pounds of CO2 per billion cubic feet of produced gas, plus methane, which has a significantly higher global warming potential over shorter timeframes.)

It is noted that the development effects of testing the gas produced should be considered on climate change grounds when considering the application. (The U.S. Energy Information Administration calculates CO2 emissions at around 120.85 million pounds of CO2 per billion cubic feet of produced gas, plus methane, which has a significantly higher global warming potential over shorter timeframes.)

It is noted that the development effects of testing the gas produced should be considered on climate change grounds when considering the application. (The U.S. Energy Information Administration calculates CO2 emissions at around 120.85 million pounds of CO2 per billion cubic feet of produced gas, plus methane, which has a significantly higher global warming potential over shorter timeframes.)

To sum up, this is a no.