

APPENDIX N
Summary of Submissions
to the Newfoundland and Labrador
Hydraulic Fracturing Review Panel

**Summary of Submissions
to the Newfoundland and Labrador
Hydraulic Fracturing Review Panel**

Report Prepared for the Newfoundland and Labrador
Hydraulic Fracturing Review Panel (NLHFRP)

Keith Storey Consulting
November 2015

BACKGROUND

The Newfoundland and Labrador Hydraulic Fracturing Review Panel (NLHFRP) was appointed by the Minister of Natural Resources, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, in October 2014 to conduct a public review of the socio-economic and environmental implications of hydraulic fracturing in Western Newfoundland. The mandate of the Panel is also to make recommendations on whether or not hydraulic fracturing should be undertaken in Western Newfoundland. The work of the Panel includes gathering information through a variety of sources including written submissions from individuals, community organizations and groups, and industry and industry groups.

At the request of the Panel, Keith Storey Consulting was asked to prepare a summary/synthesis of the written submissions received as an aid to the Panel in its deliberations. The report that follows is an overview of those submissions. The report does not, nor is it intended to, stand in place of those submissions. Rather it attempts to summarize any collective views and the emphases/concerns given to or expressed regarding particular themes. As with any overview, it is a simplification of the views and arguments presented. Detail is necessarily lost, as is the tone or passion expressed in many of the submissions. Likewise it cannot adequately convey the intentions of those who submitted artwork, poetry, music and film in support of their views.

The approach adopted in summarizing the information was to review each submission, code and record the areas of concern/statements of values expressed in a spreadsheet format. While the Panel's Terms of Reference provide a structure for the themes explored in the report, many of those making submissions did not feel bound by those themes or the associated questions posed by the Panel. As such the categorization of content in the submissions was a subjective process.

In addition, where it was provided, information about the source of the submission was recorded, e.g. whether the person submitting the input was located in the immediate area likely to be affected by the proposed activity, elsewhere in the Province, etc.). These summary data form the basis of this report. The results reported are, and are intended to be, of a high level, aggregate nature, and at best indicative of general concerns and views. No attempt is made to judge the accuracy or validity of any of the arguments presented or of the sources cited.

The Panel also commissioned a province-wide telephone survey of a sample of residents to determine their knowledge of and attitudes towards the oil and gas industry in the province, and more specifically their knowledge about the Panel Review process and attitudes towards hydraulic fracturing. The terms of reference for this survey and the results are available at nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/MQO-Fracking-Report.pdf. As part of the terms of reference for this Report the Panel asked if any comparisons might be drawn between the results from the telephone survey and the written submissions. On review it was concluded that findings from these two sets of information were not directly comparable given the differences in the purposes, questions asked and methods of information collection associated with each and so this task was not pursued.

While hydraulic fracturing is the technical term for the process under review, "fracking" is the term used by virtually all of those making submissions and is the term used here.

The report is divided into two sections. The first is a high level summary of the submissions received. The second provides a more detailed summary organized by the themes identified by the Panel as part of the review process, plus other concerns that those making submissions wished to raise. The appendices list the sources of information used by those who chose to include them in their submissions.

SECTION 1: OVERVIEW

1.1 Submissions

The written submissions, which form the database of this report are listed on the Panel's website (nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/NLHFRP-Master-List-July-23-4pm.pdf). Submissions on the site are grouped in three categories, letters from:

- individuals (488 submissions);
- community organizations and groups (38 submissions); and
- industry and industry groups (four submissions)¹

Individual submissions ranged from personal letters to the Panel (82%²) to form letters (18%) but, given their content, it appears that a number of the personal letters were also influenced by form letter models. Many of the form letters were based on a generic model generated by the Council of Canadians,³ while a number of submissions from residents of Lark Harbour and York Harbour, for example, utilized a different, but still common letter format.

Individual submissions ranged from single statements, e.g. "Don't Frack", to detailed discussion of specific themes, e.g. public health implications. Group and organization submissions tended to focus on the specific themes of particular interest to them and were typically more detailed in their comments than many of the individual submissions. Three of the four industry/industry organization submissions were highly detailed and addressed all or most of the issue categories listed in Scope section of the Terms of Reference for the Panel (nlhfrp.ca/terms-of-reference/).

Of those making individual submissions, most (49%) did not indicate where they lived, but 22% indicated that they were "local" (defined here as the Port au Port Peninsula and Bonne Bay), 10% were from elsewhere on the west coast of Newfoundland including the Gros Morne area, 8% were from elsewhere in Newfoundland and Labrador, and 9% from elsewhere in Canada or the United States.

Of the 40 submissions from community groups and organizations, 10% were local (as defined above), 29% were based elsewhere on the west coast of Newfoundland, 40% were from or had a base elsewhere in the Province, and 25% were based outside of the Province.

Submissions were made by groups/organizations with a wide variety of interests, some of which overlap (e.g. groups with both environmental and health interests). These groups/organizations included those with primarily:

- Environmental interests (seven groups/organizations)
- Church-based membership (5)
- Fracking awareness/opposition interests (4)
- Health-based membership (3)
- Social Justice interests (3)
- Business interests (2)
- Local/Regional Government representatives (2)

¹ Two of the individual submissions indicate that they are made on behalf of community organizations and groups and are included with these in the summary analysis. One individual submission appears to have been included twice. The total submissions summarized were thus from 485 Individuals, 40 Community Organizations/Groups and 4 Industry/Industry Groups.

² Percentage values are rounded to the nearest whole number and totals may not equal 100. Where percentage values are less than 1% or otherwise distort the picture, the number of submissions is given.

³ secure.canadians.org/ea-action/action?ea.client.id=1899&ea.campaign.id=38606

- Tourism sector membership (2)
- Other (12)

Of the four industry/industry group submissions, two were from junior energy exploration companies operating in the Province, one from CAPP, a Canadian organization that acts on behalf of Canadian upstream oil companies, and one from PSAC (Petroleum Services Association of Canada), a trade association representing the upstream service, support and manufacturing sectors in the Canadian petroleum industry.

1.2 Summary of Attitudes and Recommended Actions

Attitudes towards fracking are summarized as follows:

Of the 485 individual submissions received:

- 95% were opposed to fracking;
- 2% were in favour;
- 2% did not state a view; and
- one submission was neutral.

Of the 40 organizations/groups making submissions:

- 87% were opposed to fracking;
- 7% were in favour;
- 2% (1 submission) was neutral; and
- one submission did not offer a view

Of the four industry/industry group submissions:

- four were in favour of fracking

Most submissions to the panel recommended some form of action.

Of those making individual submissions:

- 82% wanted to see an outright ban on fracking;
- 5% wanted a moratorium/continuation of the moratorium on fracking;
- 1% wanted a buffer zone established around Gros Morne National Park;
- 2 submissions wanted any activity to only take place away from residential areas;
- 6% wanted more research/a go-slow on any decision/careful consideration of any action taken;
- 2% recommended proceeding (in most cases recommending that this be done with caution); and
- 5% did not recommend any specific action.

Of the groups/organizations making submissions:

- 57% wanted fracking banned;
- 12% wanted a moratorium on fracking;
- 5% wanted to see more research/a go-slow on any decision/careful consideration of any action taken;
- 7% suggested proceeding with caution (e.g. with appropriate regulatory/monitoring arrangements in place);
- 17% did not offer specific recommendations for action;

Of the industry/industry groups:

- All four indicated that fracking should be allowed to proceed, albeit within an appropriate regulatory framework and in most cases with the explicit understanding that current 'best practice' procedures would be adopted by the operating and service companies.

1.3 Views on the Panel and the Consultation Process

The panel and the consultation process were criticized on several grounds in a number of individual and group/organization submissions:

Panel Bias

- 8% of the individual and 22% of the community group/organization submissions expressed the view that the Panel was biased or in a conflict of interest (several respondents stating that three of the Panel members had previously made statements in favour of fracking and that one member had a patent on a fracking-related process).

Panel Composition

- Many of these submissions also suggested that, for example, the absence of women, West Coast Newfoundland residents, Aboriginal persons and specialists in areas such as Health, meant that the Panel was not representative of all stakeholders or adequately able to assess the full range of concerns expressed.

Public Consultation Sessions

- 9% of the individual and 32% of community group/organization submissions included some reference to Community Engagement. Many suggested that the consultation process was too limited by only having two Public Consultation sessions scheduled, compared, for example with Nova Scotia, for which 11 such sessions were reported.
- Many saw fracking as an issue of Province-wide interest/importance and called for additional sessions in, for example, Bonne Bay, St. John's and Labrador.
- A further limitation of the public engagement process expressed (two submissions) was that there was no opportunity for oral presentations to be made to the Panel.

Terms of Reference

- Many of those commenting on the public engagement process also expressed concern that the Terms of Reference for the Panel were inadequate as a number of important issues were not included in the list published on the website as subject areas for review. These included, health impacts, climate change implications, effects on tourism and the marine ecosystem of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Many of those who specifically addressed these themes also noted that they had not been explicitly included in the Panel's terms of reference.

1.4 Overview of Primary Concerns

Concerns/Issues were recorded for each submission. In some cases those concerns were explored in detail, in other cases simply stated as a concern. Primary areas of concern, other than those associated with the review process and community engagement, as reflected in the frequency with which they were mentioned in the submissions were, in descending order, as follows.

Individual Submission Concerns

>300 references to:

- Groundwater/Surface Water

151-200 references to:

- Environmental impacts generally
- Public Health
- Waste Management – primarily waste water management

101-150 references to:

- Socio-economic Impacts
- Seismicity/Geological Risk
- Air emissions/pollutants
- Management of Additives
- Land – primarily environment/ecology/sustainability issues
- Tourism
- Traffic/Transportation/Accidents

51-100 references to:

- Fisheries
- Regulatory Oversight
- Water Usage
- Sea/Marine Ecosystems
- Fires/Explosions/Flares
- Wildlife/Birds/Plant life
- Climate Change
- Real estate values
- Quality of life for residents
- Lack of baseline data

26-50 references to:

- Social License to operate
- Spills
- Risks/Rewards of fracking
- Noise

11-25 references to:

- Long term community effects
- Wellbore integrity
- Site restoration/rehabilitation
- Long-term environmental effects
- Fossil fuel use
- Lack of trust in companies
- Smell

3-10 references:

- Stress/Mental Health – local residents
- Public Safety/Emergency Planning
- Future risk of lawsuits
- Financial Security/Insurance in the event of spills/restoration needs
- Worker health

Community Group/Organizations Concerns

>20 references:

- Ground/Surface water
- Waste Management – primarily waste water management
- Public Health

16-20 references:

- Environmental impacts generally
- Regulatory oversight

10-15 references:

- Management of Additives
- Tourism
- Air Emissions
- Seismicity/Geological Risks
- Climate Change
- Socio-economic Impacts
- Fisheries
- Spills/Leaks
- Lack of baseline data

Industry and Industry Group Concerns

As noted earlier three of the four industry/industry group submissions directly addressed most or all of the themes listed in the Panel's Terms of Reference. In addition in three of the submissions emphasis was also given to fracking technology and legislation/regulations pertaining to fracking. In two cases concern was expressed over whether what was described as "biased science" utilized by opponents of fracking to make their case would influence the Panel's decision.

1.5 Overview of Considerations in the Decision-Making Process

Many submissions addressed the larger context within which the proposed fracking activities are set and the broader considerations that the authors felt the Panel should take into consideration when making a decision. These included:

Interrelationships Among Elements

While those making submissions that simply advocated banning fracking did not identify specific concerns, others in their submissions made reference to multiple issues/concerns. The majority of individual submissions (41%) made reference to 1-4 different issues/concerns, a further 29% referenced 5-9. In the case of community groups/organizations 30% referred to between 10-14 issues/concerns while 27% noted between 5-9.

In many cases these were simply stated as concerns, e.g. "I am concerned about the impact of fracking activity on tourism." However, many submissions discussed the relationships between and among issues. For example, while oil exploration in the area might bring some economic benefit, there was fear that it could negatively impact other sectors, particularly tourism and the fishery. Others spoke to specific issues of noise, dust, light, traffic and other nuisances and the overall cumulative impact that these and other changes could have on the quality of life for local residents. Similarly any groundwater contamination, air emissions, waste management and disposal issues, spills and other negative environmental outcomes were perceived to have both potential particular and cumulative health consequences. The point made in many submissions was that potential outcomes from allowing fracking were complex and far-reaching and that these interrelationships and cumulative consequences should not be ignored in the decision process in favour of an individual issue-based approach.

Social Licence to Operate

9% of individual and 10% of community group/organizations stated that exploration companies did not have such a licence, i.e. the support of the local communities to carry out fracking in their area.

Other Precedents

6% of individual and 30% of community group/organizations felt that there were sufficient examples of other jurisdictions banning fracking or declaring a moratorium on fracking to justify adopting similar approaches in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Risks and Rewards

6% of individual and 27% of community group/organization submissions expressed the view that the potential risks associated with fracking were not worth the potential rewards. Some submissions explicitly noted that those individuals, groups or communities most likely to benefit from the rewards were not likely to be the same as those likely to bear the costs.

Precautionary Principle

6% of individual and 20% of community group/organizations suggested that there was insufficient data, too many unknowns and/or sufficient 'reasonable doubt' to justify a recommendation to approve fracking, hence the precautionary principle should be invoked and fracking not be allowed.

Fossil Fuel Use

3% of individual submissions and 15% of community group/organization submissions explicitly expressed concerns about our current dependence on fossil fuels and the need to reduce such dependence by sourcing other types of renewable energy with fewer negative environmental consequences. Allowing fracking was seen as being inconsistent with this goal.

Biased Science

As noted above, two (50%) of the industry submissions were concerned that public information about fracking and its implications were based on insufficient or incorrect information and that this might influence the Panel's decision.

While not as explicit on the question of the quality or merits of the science used, 3% of the individual and 5% of the group submissions indicated that they did not trust the companies involved in fracking. This lack of trust was based in part on direct experience (including past experience with site restoration), but there were also concerns about overstatements regarding the potential benefits of fracking activity versus understatements about potential costs.

SECTION 2: SUMMARY OF VIEWS/CONCERNS EXPRESSED ON SPECIFIC ISSUES/THEMES

The mandate of the Panel includes gathering public input on a number of specific topic areas regarding fracking in oil and gas operations in Western Newfoundland and to provide specific responses to a set of associated questions. Many of the individual and community group/organization submissions addressed topic areas in a more general fashion and were not structured in a way that addressed the specific questions posed in the Terms of Reference. In addition, since most submissions advocated banning fracking completely or declaring/continuing a moratorium on it, there were few submissions in either of these groups that offered suggestions on best practices, regulations or other actions that might reduce potential risks or negative outcomes.

Views/concerns regarding each of the identified topics are summarized below, together with views and concerns on other topics of concern to those making submissions, but which had not been explicitly included in the scope of the Panel's mandate. Excerpts from the Scope of Work for the Panel used to introduce each topic are italicized.

2.1 Protecting and Monitoring Water Quality

The risk of water contamination, particularly groundwater, is one of the biggest concerns raised by the public with respect to hydraulic fracturing. Two key areas to address are the potential effects of hydraulic fracturing on groundwater and on surface water.

2.1.1 Potential Impacts on Groundwater

The Panel will assess the short and long-term risks to groundwater and water wells. This may include such activities as water acquisition, additives mixing, well injection, flowback/produced water and wastewater management.

2.1.1.1 Groundwater

Groundwater and waterwell (drinking water) issues, were the most frequently mentioned concerns in individual (65%) and community group/organization (70%) submissions to the Panel. A number of submissions discussed the reliance of many people in the area on shallow wells and expressed concern that surface water pollution might also affect drinking water sources.

One industry organization provided information concluding that there was no indication that the McCully gas field in New Brunswick has affected water wells there.

2.1.1.2 Wastewater Management

Waste management and particularly wastewater management was seen as a major concern (referred to in 32% of individual and 52% of community group/organization submissions).

The quantity of wastewater requiring treatment, the technical and regulatory requirements for treatment, transport of wastewater and its final disposal were expressed as concerns. These were mainly because of a lack of information and knowledge about how these matters would be addressed and a lack of confidence in the ability of regulators to design, implement and monitor systems that would adequately address the problem together with a lack of trust in the willingness of operators to implement appropriate measures.

Industry/industry group submissions that addressed these issues felt that there were examples of best practices, appropriate regulatory management arrangements and other actions that could be adopted that would minimize any potential risks.

2.2 Potential Impacts on Surface Water

The Panel will assess the use of surface water for hydraulic fracturing operations. This assessment will include an assessment of the quantity of water required for exploration and operations, and the effect on water sources in the areas where exploration and development activities could take place. The Panel will also assess the sourcing of fresh water alternatives and recycling of water for use in hydraulic fracturing operations. The Panel should also assess the potential impact of surface water use on other users.

2.2.1 Water Usage

The large quantities of water required for fracking was a concern expressed in 17% of the individual and 22% of the community group/organization submissions insofar as it was seen as both a waste of an important resource and would lead to competition for that resource among different users.

Industry/industry group submissions noted that looking for ways to reduce water usage is an ongoing process. This includes use of seawater, which, if possible in this context, could minimize competition for local supplies of fresh water. One submission outlined examples of preferred sources for water and tools for water-use approvals and licences.

2.3 Protecting Communities and the Environment

Environmental protection measures are in place for the province's oil and gas industry. While there is no recommendation at this time to allow hydraulic fracturing operations to occur in the province, it is useful to review, and, where appropriate, recommend improvements to existing environmental and technical standards to ensure our communities and the environment are protected. The Panel will assess the challenges that hydraulic fracturing activities may represent for social and physical environments. This should include assessing opportunities for minimizing/mitigating surface infrastructure development and associated impacts such as footprint, linear disturbances, vehicular traffic, dust, emissions, odours, noise and environmental impacts such as pollution, waste management and geological risks.

2.3.1 Impacts on Land

The panel will assess the potential impacts on land as a result of hydraulic fracturing operations. This should include an assessment of potential risk for soil contamination from site development and from the storage and handling of additives, wastes and petroleum products. The panel will also review impacts to land from site development and transportation of chemicals to and from the site.

"Land"-related issues were included in 23% of individual and 25% of community group/organization submissions. Most of the individual and group submissions addressed land concerns in the broader context of the potential for degradation of landscapes, watersheds and wildlife habitat and the environment generally, rather than the specific context of soil contamination. Even more submissions (39% individual, 45% community group/organizations) expressed concern about the implications for the environment generally.

Specific concerns included the implications for wildlife/wildlife habitat/plants (12% individual, 12% community group/organizations), and of spills or leaks into the environment (8% individual, 27% community groups/organizations). An additional concern expressed in this context was the unknown of how much land would be required for fracking exploration activity.

Other submissions extended the concern about environment to the marine context, raising issues about the marine environment and ecosystems (16% individual and 20% community group/submissions) and by extension the fishery (see Section 2.3.12.1, below).

The industry/industry group submissions on this topic had a different focus, emphasizing a land use planning approach. One submission noted that once activities on the ground are ready to occur, industry best practices call for land-use methods that integrate environmental, low impact techniques, species conservation and biodiversity. In addition it noted that companies are changing from a well-by-well approach to a project- or area-based approach to try to minimize cumulative impacts on the land.

2.3.2 Waste Management

The Panel will assess the potential risks to the environment of current and available waste management technologies for treating fluids used in hydraulic fracturing and the associated outcomes. This assessment will include, but is not limited to, issues such as storage areas, deep well injection, and solid wastes.

32% of individual and 52% of community group/organization submissions mentioned or discussed waste management issues, most of which were concerned with wastewater management and disposal. Three industry/

industry group submissions discussed how waste could be managed.

Industry submissions described the ways in which waste fluids are dealt with and regulatory approaches adopted in both New Brunswick and British Columbia. FracFocus.ca is referenced as a collaboration between provinces, territories, regulators and industry to provide Canadians with information on hydraulic fracturing, the legislation and regulations that are in place to protect the environment, including groundwater, and transparency on the ingredients that make up hydraulic fracturing fluids.

2.3.3 Management of Additives

The Panel will assess the potential risks of additives used in hydraulic fracturing fluids, including the use of additives, potential environmental impacts, and the storage and handling of these additives.

25% of individual, 37% of community group/organization submissions referenced management of additives as a concern. Many expressed concerns that there would not be full disclosure of what additives might be used, in part because of proprietary rights and in part because of a lack of confidence in government or other regulatory authorities to ensure that there was full disclosure.

Three of the industry/industry group submissions stated that the transport, handling, storage and use of additives used for fracking are highly regulated and provided examples from Alberta, British Columbia and Canada. Disclosure of chemical use for each well is indicated as being a requirement in British Columbia, Alberta, the Northwest Territories and New Brunswick. PSAC notes that in addition to federal and provincial regulations PSAC members commit to following its *Hydraulic Fracturing Code of Conduct*.

2.3.4 Wellbore Integrity

The Panel will assess the requisite regulatory requirements and best practices to ensure wells are drilled, completed, stimulated, produced, suspended and abandoned in a manner that assures wellbore integrity, considering the risks imposed by the unique reservoir characteristics of the play and the technologies being employed, such as inter-wellbore communications.

Wellbore integrity was noted in 4% of individual and 12% of community group/organization submissions, the main theme being that a loss of wellbore integrity could negatively affect groundwater and water wells.

One industry association submission commented on the need for good regulatory practice complemented by industry best practice. A number of directives from Alberta's Energy Regulator regarding wellbore integrity are cited in the industry/industry submissions. The CAPP submission also indicates that to the extent that groundwater and water well incidents have occurred, this has almost always been related to well construction issues and a loss of wellbore integrity allowing gas or fluids to migrate from one geological zone to another. In such cases companies are required by regulation to undertake necessary repairs.

2.3.5 Seismicity and Geological Risks

The Panel will assess the potential geological risk associated with hydraulic fracturing operations, including induced seismicity. This may include wellbore placement and drilling design, procedures to monitor for induced seismicity and procedures to mitigate and respond to induced seismicity.

Seismicity and geological risk was a matter of concern in 29% of the individual and 30% of the community group/organization submissions. The overall sense was that the geology of this area is distinctive and as a consequence the potential outcomes from the use of fracking here unknown.

One individual submission (nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Letter-from-E.-Burden.pdf) provides an explanation and commentary on the general state of geological knowledge available for western Newfoundland.

One industry submission discusses the issue of scale in relation to induced seismicity. Micro-seismic events generated are designed not to be felt at the surface, where this has occurred the events have been studied. In Alberta none of the recent seismic events are said to have resulted in injuries or property damage. New regulatory requirements in Alberta and additional monitoring are intended to increase understanding between fracking and seismic activity.

2.3.6 Regulatory Oversight and Responsibility

The Panel will assess the regulatory oversight requirements for hydraulic fracturing operations. This would include regulations regarding how wells are drilled, completed, stimulated, produced, suspended and abandoned in a manner that assures wellbore integrity, considers the risks imposed by the unique reservoir characteristics of the play and the technologies being used (such as inter-wellbore communication). This review will also include the application and approval process, filing requirements and design of hydraulic fracturing operations, including the chemicals used.

Concerns about regulatory oversight and responsibility were expressed in 17% of individual and 40% of community group/organization submissions. Here the concern was rather less about the ability of government to establish rules and regulations than the willingness of government to enforce them, ensure compliance and assign liability. In addition there was concern whether government would be transparent about incidents and outcomes and whether it would be willing to establish independent monitoring of fracking activities and outcomes.

3% of individual and 5% of community group submissions indicated a lack of trust in companies involved in fracking to act in the best interests of the environment and people. Government would thus need to be the watchdog, but past experience was suggested as reason to be concerned about its effectiveness in this regard.

Industry submissions suggest that oil and natural gas exploration and development is one of the most highly regulated industries in Canada. Regulatory systems in Alberta, British Columbia and Saskatchewan are suggested as proven regulatory systems that have and could serve as examples for newer jurisdictions establishing their own onshore oil and natural gas industries. New Brunswick established its Rules for Industry in 2013. Industry operating practices are seen to complement provincial regulations and are suggested for inclusion in those regulations.

2.3.7 Site Restoration

The Panel will assess final site restoration requirements for hydraulic fracturing operations. This may include well decommissioning, removal of infrastructure, soil assessment, soil remediation, long-term monitoring and holding tank decommissioning.

4% of individual and 22% of community group/organization submissions were concerned that if allowed to proceed sites would not be appropriately restored. Many of these statements of concern were from local residents and based on previous experience with the industry in the area. Examples, accompanied by photographs, of abandoned sites that had deteriorated resulting in leaks or spills were offered. As a consequence there was a lack of trust in operating companies and a lack of faith in government and current regulations regarding site restoration (see also Section 6. *Regulatory Oversight and Responsibility*, above).

Industry submissions suggest that wellsites are appropriately managed and all follow the same restoration procedures, rules and regulations. Alberta's legislation is briefly summarized in one submission and in another the BC OGC's *Draft Certificate of Restoration Application Manual* (May 2015) is given as an example of recent standards.

2.3.8 Financial Security and Insurance

Various financial securities and insurances are required throughout the different phases of resource development. The Panel will assess the financial security requirements for hydraulic fracturing operations to ensure that they address the potential risks associated with hydraulic fracturing activities.

Only 1 community group/organization submission addressed this. This organization was in favour of fracking and indicated that should it proceed financial security requirements would need to be established.

The industry group submission from CAPP notes that industry and regulators want to ensure that abandonment and reclamation liabilities are estimated appropriately and that adequate funding is in place to reclaim oil and gas sites at the end of their life. Examples of Liability Management Rating (LMR) programs for British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan are given.

2.3.9 Air Emissions

The Panel will assess the potential risks to air quality from hydraulic fracturing operations. This may include setting emissions limits, monitoring emissions from hydraulic fracturing operations and planning for emission reductions.

28% of individual and 32% of community group/organizations expressed concerns about air emissions in their submissions. These were primarily concerns about the potential impacts on human health (see Section 3.13, below).

In addition 3% of individual at 20% of community group/organization submissions were concerned about emissions and long-term environmental effects, while 12% of individual and 30% of community groups/organizations were concerned about the bigger issue of climate change. Many of this last group expressed concern that climate change was not explicitly included in the Panel's terms of reference.

The PSAC submission provided links to air quality/emission regulations and guidelines. The CAPP submissions also drew attention to the life-cycle approach which involves quantifying emissions from the fuel at every stage during its life cycle including: production, manufacture, distribution, use and disposal, as well as all of the intervening transportation steps needed or caused by the fuel's existence. A 2012 Natural Resources Canada-commissioned study is referenced which states that, "life-cycle emissions of natural gas produced from shale are only slightly higher than those of natural gas produced from more conventional sources."

2.3.10 Public Safety and Emergency Planning

The Panel will assess potential risks to public safety from hydraulic fracturing operations and associated emergency response planning needs.

Concerns about public safety and emergency planning in general were expressed in 7 individual and 2 community group/organization submissions, but many had specific concerns relating to transportation and storage of fracking-related materials and products.

22% of individual and 25% of community group/organization submissions included concerns about traffic volume and traffic type (large, heavy vehicles, vehicles transporting dangerous goods/hazardous materials).

More specifically, 17% of individual and 20% of community group/organization submissions expressed concerns over fire and explosions associated with the storage and transport of volatile materials, while 8% of individual and 27% of community group organization submissions included concerns about spills and leaks that could be harmful to the environment and people.

Three individual submissions also expressed concerns about fracking and worker health and safety.

Of the industry/industry group submissions CAPP provided information on process safety regulations and best practices in Canada and elsewhere and described emergency preparedness and response requirements in New Brunswick and Alberta. PSAC described its Community Partners Program which provides guiding principles regarding dust, noise, communications, driving safety, traffic etc., recommended courses and training programs for workers regarding spills of fracking-related materials during transportation and outlined its principles for health and safety training for service sector workers.

2.3.11 Community Engagement

The Panel will assess how to inform and involve the local communities and other stakeholders throughout the full life cycle of a project, from early exploration through to abandonment, to determine which issues are of particular concern and how they might be addressed.

Individual and community group/organization submissions that raised the question of community engagement focused on engagement during the review phase, not on the full life cycle should fracking be allowed.

Two of the four industry/industry group submissions provided examples of community engagement practices currently employed by Canadian operators and service companies.

2.3.12 Socio-Economic Impacts

Technology such as hydraulic fracturing has made it possible for many communities to benefit from economic gains due to the production of oil and gas, including employment opportunities, supply and service contracts and local infrastructure development. In addition to recognizing the economic benefits for local communities, care must be taken to minimize disruption during operations and consider social and environmental responsibilities to individuals and communities.

2.3.12.1 Economic Benefits

The question of whether fracking would bring socio-economic benefits to the immediate or greater area, or the province as a whole was raised in 30% of the individual and 27% of the community group/organization submissions. Three of the four industry/industry group submissions also commented directly on this.

Of those supporting fracking (11 individuals, three community groups/organizations and four industry/industry groups), all advance the view that the activity will benefit the economies of the local area, region and/or the Province. The focus of the submissions varied, but employment, business and government revenue benefits were the main themes.

Of those opposing fracking there was frequently a recognition of the need for further economic stimulus to the region, but there were questions as to whether the benefits from fracking would be as great as the proponents of the proposed activity claimed, whether jobs and business would in fact go to local/regional workers and companies, whether any revenues accruing to government would be reinvested in the area where fracking would take place, and whether there would be any significant long term benefits given the boom-bust cycle in the industry.

As indicated in the lists of sources cited by those making submissions (see Appendices) there are many sources that support both the case that fracking can bring economic benefits and the case that costs to the local area in particular outweigh any benefits received.

Those opposed to fracking also question what impact it might have on other existing industry sectors in the region. The potential for negative impacts on tourism was a key concern expressed in 21% of individual and 35% of

community group/organization submissions. The potential threat to the UNESCO World Heritage Site designation for Gros Morne Park was mentioned by some (eight individual and five community group organizations) and the potential loss of tourists and tourist revenues to an area that has invested a lot of human and financial capital over a long period, by many more. Fracking was seen as a potentially short-term activity (exploration might not be followed by development, development might only be short-term), but one that could significantly damage both the immediate and long-term prospects for tourism.

The fishery in the Port au Port Bay and Bay St. George and the Gulf of St. Lawrence more generally, has a long history. Fishers and others (18% individual and 27% community group/organizations) expressed concern that fracking through spills, leaks, waste disposal and other activities could negatively impact the marine ecosystem and the commercial fisheries in the area. A number of abandoned drilling sites on Shoal Point are now reported to be in coastal waters as a result of coastal erosion, and tidal surges and extreme weather conditions associated with climate change were believed to make the area more vulnerable to pollution from past and any future onshore fracking activity.

Agriculture also is important to the local economy and notes about the incompatibility of fracking and agriculture are noted by two (one in considerable detail) individual and two community submissions.

While revenues from fracking activity might accrue to government there was concern that fracking would be a cost to local communities. Some submissions discussed the lack of infrastructure and services available to the industry in the area, which might impact a variety of factors from waste management handling to transportation to emergency preparedness. Others commented on the demands and associated costs that exploration activity would place on existing infrastructure, particularly roads, and ultimately on the budgets of local and provincial governments. In addition a number of local residents (11% of individual submissions) were concerned about the potential for negative impacts on real estate values if fracking were allowed to proceed.

At the provincial level six individual and one community group/organization submission expressed concern about the risk of investor-state lawsuits under trade agreements such as NAFTA and CETA and the potential costs to the Province should fracking be allowed to go ahead,

2.3.12.2 Social Impacts

Those opposed to fracking expressed a variety of concerns over social impacts. 5% of individual and 20% of community group/organization submissions expressed a variety of concerns about the long-term community and cultural implications if fracking were allowed to proceed.

The most significant of these concerns were potential impacts on the quality of life of local residents (11% of individual submissions). Traffic issues (volume/risk of accidents/dangerous goods) were of concern in 22% of individual and 25% of community group/organization submissions). Noise (6%; 20%), smell (2%; 2%), lights (one submission; 7%), visual blight (three submissions; 5%), presence of transitory workers and the potential for social disruption, and overall stress (2%; 2%) were all seen as potential negative outcomes on the quality of life. In more general terms many of those making submissions felt that those in the local area would bear the costs of development, while the benefits would go elsewhere.

One industry submission from Shoal Point Energy offered a proposal to financially compensate landowners and communities around Port au Port Bay for increased traffic and noise disturbance if the proposed project is allowed to proceed.

2.3.13 Public Health

34% of individual and 50% of community group/organization submissions raised concerns about the relationships between fracking activity and health. As noted earlier, many were critical of the Panel's Terms of Reference for not explicitly including this as theme for review and were likewise critical that no one with specific expertise in the potential health implications had been appointed to the Panel.

In general terms those making submissions were concerned about the implications of exposure to individual elements (air emissions, water pollution, etc.), the cumulative implications of exposure to multiple pollutants (in the air and water and soil, etc.), and the long-term consequences of each of these.

The implications for the health of the fetus, newborns and children in particular was the focus for one individual submission (nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Letters-from-I.-Simpson3.pdf) and included discussion of potential associated acute and chronic illnesses.

Several submissions (e.g. nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Letter-from-P.-W.-Allderdice.pdf, which includes annotated references), pointed to the lack of information on this topic including, lack of baseline studies, health impact assessment studies, information to assess toxicity risks and lack of participation of public health agencies in regulatory regimes of jurisdictions where fracking is currently permitted.

A related topic raised in three individual and two community group/organization submissions was that of worker health.

For the industry, CAPP referenced the 2014 study, *Detailed Human Health Risk Assessment of Oil and Gas Activities in Northeastern British Columbia*, which finds that "while there is some possibility for elevated COPC (chemicals of potential concern) concentrations to occur at some locations, the probability that adverse health impacts would occur in association with these exposures is considered to be low."

APPENDICES – SOURCES CITED

The Terms of Reference for this report included a request to indicate, where possible, the sources of information on which those making submissions had drawn.

Most of those making submissions did not indicate the sources of information upon which their submissions were based. In the case of individual submissions 85% of the 485 gave no indication of the sources they had used and 9% provided a single source.

Of those making submissions from community groups/organizations 45% of the 40 submissions provided no information on the sources/reference materials consulted, 27% provided from 1-4 sources and 15% provided 10 or more referenced sources.

Of the industry and industry group submissions three of the four submissions were each supported by lengthy lists of sources.

The sources cited by individuals, community groups and organizations and industry/industry groups are listed separately. The sources are categorized by the issues/themes discussed in Section 2, together with additional categories for citations that did not fit these themes or were not theme specific.

This compilation of sources cited has a number of limitations and qualifications. For example, time constraints did not allow all citations to be converted to a single, standard bibliographic format, or for bibliographic details to be verified. Neither could all websites provided be checked for accessibility/availability. Some websites include additional sources not cited here. For these and other reasons the list of sources cited may be neither complete nor are individual sources guaranteed to be accessible. The listings do, however, serve to illustrate the large volume and wide variety of information sources available on this subject.

APPENDIX A – SOURCES CITED BY INDIVIDUALS

Ground Water

- Jackson, R.B., Vengosh, A., Darrah, T.H., Warner, N.R., Down, A., Poreda, R.J., Osborn, S.G., Zhao, K., Karr, J.D., 2013. Increased Stray Gas Abundance in a Subset of Drinking Water Wells near Marcellus Shale Gas Extraction. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110, 11250-11255.
- Llewellyn, G. T., F. Dorman, J. L. Westland, D. Yoxtheimer, P. Grieve, T. Sowers, E. Humston-Fulmer, and S. L. Brantley "Evaluating a groundwater supply contamination incident attributed to Marcellus Shale gas development". *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*, vol. 112 no. 20 >Garth T.
- Myers, T., 2012. Potential Contaminant Pathways from Hydraulically Fractured Shale to Aquifers. *Ground Water* 50, pp. 872-882.
- Osborn, S.G., Vengosh, A., Warner, N.R., Jackson, R.B., 2011. Methane Contamination of Drinking Water Accompanying Gas-Well Drilling and Hydraulic Fracturing. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA* 108, 8172-8176. www.pnas.org/content/108/20/8172.abstract
- Parfitt, B., 2010. Fracture Lines: Will Canada's Water be Protected in the Rush to Develop Shale Gas? Program on Water Issues, Munk School of Global Affairs, University of Toronto, Toronto. powi.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/Fracture-Lines-Will-Canadas-Water-Be-Protected-in-The-Rush-to-Develop-Shale-Gas-20101.pdf
- Rozell, D.J., Reaven, S.J., 2012. Water Pollution Risk Associated with Natural Gas Extraction from the Marcellus Shale. *Risk Analysis* 32, 1382-1393.
- Vidic, R.D., Brantley, S.L., Vandenbossche, J.M., Yoxtheimer, D., Abad, J.D., 2013. Impact of Shale Gas Development on Regional Water Quality. *Science* 340.
- Warner, N.R., Christie, C.A., Jackson, R.B., Vengosh, A., 2013. Impacts of Shale Gas Wastewater Disposal on Water Quality in Western Pennsylvania. *Environmental Science & Technology* 47, 11849-11857.
- knowledgecenter.csg.org/kc/content/preliminary-doe-study-finds-no-migration-fracking-chemicals-drinking-water
- thinkprogress.org/climate/2015/05/08/3656499/california-lawsuit-seeks-to-stop-polluting-clean-water/
- wivb.com/2014/08/28/243-cases-in-pa-where-fracking-contaminated-wells
- www.env.gov.nl.ca/env/waterres/reports/hydrogeology_westernnl/final_report.pdf
- bcinfo.com/images/uploads/documents/ShaleGasinBC-RiskstoWaterResources-Horne-Campbell-2011.pdf
- thinkprogress.org/climate/2015/05/05/3655025/something-in-the-water-its-fracking-chemicals/
- keepapwatersafe.org/global-bans-on-fracking/
- www.globalresearch.ca/fracking-suicide-capitalism-poisons-the-earths-fresh-water-supplies/5368362
- albertavoices.ca

canadians.org/search/node/fracking%20chemicals

theyee.ca/Blogs/TheHook/2014/02/06/Fracking-Water-Stress/

www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/documents/hf_study_plan_110211_final_508.pdf

www.engr.mun.ca/~ccoles/Publications/103.pdf

www.WaterWorld.com

www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3222989/

albertasurfacerights.com/articles/?id=1654

www.ernstversusencana.ca/the-lawsuit

www.desmogblog.com/fracking-the-future/danger.html

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Discussion-Paper-Water.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Water-Paper-Response.pdf

www.pnas.org/content/108/20/8172.full.pdf

canadians.org/sites/default/files/water/fracking/submission-nlhfrp-0515.pdf

Surface Water

www.env.gov.bc.ca/wat/wq/quality/peace_alces/peace_river_alces_river.pdf

onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/etc.2619/abstract;jsessionid=3C12F1F7709062F1BBDDE6A2FADA92AF.f01t02

www2.cce.cornell.edu/naturalgasdev/documents/pdfs/entrekin%20et%20al%20frontiers%20in%20ecology%20and%20the%20environment.pdf

Land/Environment

Council of Canadian Academies, 2014. Environmental Impacts of Shale Gas Extraction in Canada: The Expert Panel on Harnessing Science and Technology to Understand the Environmental Impacts of Shale Gas Extraction, Ottawa. www.scienceadvice.ca/uploads/eng/assessments%20and%20publications%20and%20news%20rel%20eases/shale%20gas/shalegas_fullreporten.pdf

Drohan, P.J., Brittingham, M., Bishop, J., Yodeer, K., 2012. Early Trends in Landcover Change and Forest Fragmentation due to Shale-Gas Development in Pennsylvania: A Potential Outcome for the Northcentral Appalachians. *Environmental Management* 49, 1061-1075.

Jantz, C.A., Kubach, H.K., Ward, J.R., Wiley, S., Heston, D., 2014. Assessing Land Use Changes due to Natural Gas Drilling Operations in the Marcellus Shale in Bradford County, PA. *The Geographical Bulletin* 55, pp. 18-35.

Krupnick, A., Gordon, H., Olmstead, S., 2013. Pathways to Dialogue: What Experts Say about the Environmental Risks of Shale Gas Development. Resources for the Future. [www.rff.org/Documents/RFF-Rpt- PathwaystoDialogue_FullReport.pdf](http://www.rff.org/Documents/RFF-Rpt-PathwaystoDialogue_FullReport.pdf)

Meng, Q., 2014. Modeling and Prediction of Natural Gas Fracking Pad Landscapes in the Marcellus Shale region, USA. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 121, pp. 109-116.

Meng, Q., 2015. Spatial Analysis of Environment and Population at Risk of Natural Gas Fracking in the State of Pennsylvania, USA. *Science of the Total Environment*, 515-516, 198-206.

Office of the Auditor General of Canada, 2012. Chapter 1: Atlantic Offshore Oil and Gas Activities, Report of the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development, Ottawa. www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/docs/parl_cesd_201212_01_e.pdf

Werner, A.K., Vink, S., Watt, K., Jagals, P., 2015. Environmental Health Impacts of Unconventional Natural Gas Development: A Review of the Current Strength of Evidence. *Science of the Total Environment* 505, 1127-1141.

news.sciencemag.org/earth/2015/04/thirty-thousand-square-kilometers-land-lost-oil-and-gas-development

theyee.ca/News/2013/01/08/Shale-Gas-Hard-On-Landscape/

newszoom.com/life/oil-spill-may-island-disappear-2-years/

blueandgreentomorrow.com/2013/11/29/pope-francis-speaks-out-against-fracking-and-environmental-devastation/

www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/blo/are-we-fit-stewards-of-earth

www.thewesternstar.com/News/Local/2011-03-15/article-2329490/Nalcor-defends-Parsons-Pond-drilling/1

dontfrackpei.com/web/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/Texas-fracking-aerial.jpg

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Discussion-Paper-Environment-Impacts.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Environmental-Impacts-Paper-Response.pdf

Waste Management

Rahm, B.G., Bates, J.T., Bertoia, L.R., Galford, A.E., Yoxtheimer, David A., Riha, S.J., 2013. Wastewater Management and Marcellus Shale Gas Development: Trends, Drivers, and Planning Implications. *Journal of Environmental Management* 120, pp. 105-113.

thechronicleherald.ca/novascotia/1237768-fracking-waste-water-in-kennetcook-still-awaits-disposal

savethebayoffundy.ca/stop-lafarge-usingfracking-wastewater

www.vancouversun.com/health/Fracking+waste+water+being+injected+into+wells+northeastern/9942146/story.html

halifax.mediacoop.ca/story/fracking-waste-company-tries-again-dump-it-colches/32506

Management of Additives

Maule, A.L., Makey, C.M., Benson, E.B., Burrows, I.J., Scammell, M.K., 2013. Disclosure of Hydraulic Fracturing Fluid Chemical Additives: Analysis of Regulations. *New Solutions* 23, pp. 167-187.

norj.ca/2013/08/nwt-fracking-water-license-allows-for-company-to-keep-trade-secrets/

rt.com/usa/255813-drilling-chemicals-pennsylvania-water/

Wellbore Integrity

catskillcitizens.org/learnmore/PSECementFailureCausesRateAnalysisIngraffea.pdf

www.google.ca/

url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&ved=0CDgQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fscience.uwaterloo.ca%2F~mauriced%2Fearth437%2Frequiredreading%2Fassignment_6_readingReservoirandDrilling%2FModule%2520C_Hydraulic%2520Fracture%2520Geomechanics.ppt&ei=BMQVUeaZMsSi2AX7kIDYBA&usg=AFQjCNEHMIT8mkErfQG8QcaZGJ-_WMGt7g&sig2=6-zkgfnAD-O8mOAJ49JUqQ&bvm=bv.42080656,d.b2l

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/BkRevUndSurfaceFinal.pdf

www.bape.gouv.qc.ca/sections/mandats/gaz_de_schiste-enjeux/

Seismic/Geological Risks/Geology

Burden et al (2005) – Tectonostratigraphy of an Exhumed Blow Me down Brook Formation Hydrocarbon Reservoir, Sluice Brook, Western Newfoundland. Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Natural Resources Geological Survey Report 05-1, pp. 63-71

Burden et al. (2006) - Geological Survey Division, Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Natural Resources Map 2006-03 – Geology of the Humber Arm Allochthon, Lark Harbour–Serpentine Lake Area, Newfoundland.

Burden et al, and released in 2014 under the Province’s Petroleum Exploration Enhancement Programme (PEEP). This report is known as: “Finding the Parts: A searchable database and report of petroleum geology and geophysics literature for Paleozoic Basins of Newfoundland and Labrador.”

Davies, R., Foulger, G., Bindley, A., Styles, P., 2013. Induced Seismicity and Hydraulic Fracturing for the Recovery of Hydrocarbons. *Marine and Petroleum Geology* 45, pp. 171-185.

Galchen, R. (2015) “Weather Underground: The arrival of man-made earthquakes.” *The New Yorker*, April 13.

Hinchey, A.M. et al. The Green Point Shale of Western Newfoundland. Geological Survey, Mines Branch, Department of Natural Resources, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. www.nr.gov.nl.ca/nr/energy/pdf/green_point_shale_west_nl.pdf

Kim, W.Y., 2013. Induced Seismicity Associated with Fluid Injection into a Deep Well in Youngstown, Ohio. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth* 118, 3506-3518.

Shapiro, S.A., Dinske, C., 2009. Fluid-Induced Seismicity: Pressure Diffusion and Hydraulic Fracturing. *Geophysical Prospecting* 57, pp. 301-310.

Williams, 1985 – Geological Survey of Canada Map 1579A - Geology Stephenville Map Area.

Williams and Cawood, 1989 – Geological Survey of Canada Map 1678A - Geology Humber Arm Allochthon, Newfoundland

globalnews.ca/news/1891922/experts-trying-to-stop-fracking-earthquakes-in-alberta/

theyeye.ca/News/2014/01/31/Shale-Gas-Earthquakes/

www.cbc.ca/news/technology/fracking-and-earthquakes-exploring-the-connection-1.3030910

www.usgs.gov/blogs/features/usgs_top_story/man-made-earthquakes/

www.bcogc.ca/node/8046/download

dontfrackpei.com/web/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/Geology_and_Fracking.pdf

earthquake.usgs.gov/research/induced/

Regulatory Oversight/Responsibility

Considine, T.J., Watson, R.W., Considine, N.B., Martin, J.P., 2013. Environmental Regulation and Compliance of Marcellus Shale Gas Drilling. *Environmental Geosciences* 20, pp. 1-16.

East Coast Environmental Law. (2014). *Failure to enforce? Time for transparent and effective environmental enforcement in Nova Scotia*. www.ecelaw.ca/92-failure-to-enforce-finaljune-2014.html

Hydraulic Fracturing for Natural Gas Extraction: Research and Regulatory Impacts, dep.sc.delaware.gov/Agenda%2003-17-15/Whitepaper%20JRS.pdf

Konschnik, K., 2013. Legal Fractures in Chemical Disclosure Laws: Why the Voluntary Chemical Disclosure Registry FracFocus Fails as a Regulatory Compliance Tool. Harvard Law School Environmental Law Program Policy Initiative. blogs.law.harvard.edu/environmentallawprogram/files/2013/04/4-23-2013-LEGAL-FRACTURES.pdf

Jaffe, A.B.; Newell, R.G.; & Stavins, R.N. (2005). A tale of two market failures: Technology and environmental policy. *Ecological Economics*, 54(2-3), pp. 164-174.

Tietenberg, T.; Wilman, E.; and Tracey, (2009) *Environmental Economics and Policy*, Canadian Edition, Pearson, pp. 56-59.

Wiseman, H., 2013. Risk and Response in Fracturing Policy. *University of Colorado Law Review* 84, 729-817. Wiseman, H., 2013. The Private Role in Public Fracturing Disclosure and Regulation. *Harvard Business Law Review* 3, pp. 49-66.

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/nl_hydraulic_fracturing_pt3_appendix.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Discussion-Paper-General-Regulatory-Regime.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Regulatory-Issues-Paper-Response-Final-rev.pdf

Financial Security and Insurance

Office of the Auditor General of Canada, 2012. Chapter 2: Financial Assurances for Environmental Risks, Report of the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development, Ottawa. www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/docs/parl_cesd_201212_02_e.pdf

Air Emissions

Caulton, D.R., Shepson, P.B., Santoro, R.L., Sparks, J.P., Howarth, R.W., Ingraffea, A.R., Cambaliza, M.O.L., Sweeney, C., Karion, A., Davis, K.J., Stirm, B.H., Montzka, S.A., Miller, B.R., 2014. "Toward a Better Understanding and Quantification of Methane Emissions From Shale Gas Development." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111, 6237-6242.

Roy, A., Adams, P.J., Robinson, A.L., 2014. Air Pollutant Emissions from the Development, Production, and Processing of Marcellus Shale Natural Gas. *Journal of the Air & Waste Management Association* 64, pp. 19- 37.

news.investors.com/ibd-editorials/091813-671585-study-says-fracking-does-not-produce-methane.htm

www.stateoftheair.org/2013/stateslutah/utina

www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0143622815000776

Community Engagement

Egilman, D. & Druar, N. (2011). Corporate versus public interests: Community responsibility to defend scientific integrity. *International Journal of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 17(2), pp. 181-185.

Socio-Economic Impacts

Barth, J., 2013. The Economic Impact of Shale Gas Development on State and Local Economies: Benefits, Costs and Uncertainties. *New Solutions* 23, pp. 85-101.

B.C. Ministry of Energy, Mines and Natural Gas, (BC) Employment Impact Review, Ministry of Energy, Mines and Natural Gas (2013) www.empr.gov.bc.ca/OG/Documents/Grant_Thornton_LNG_Employment_Impacts.pdf

Canadian Energy Research Institute Economic Impacts of Drilling, Completing and Operating Conventional Oil Wells in Western Canada (2010-2035) www.ceri.ca/images/stories/CERI_IO_Conventional-Oil-Report_June_2011.pdf

CBO – Congressional Budget Office of the United States Congress The Economic and Budgetary Effects of Producing Oil and Natural Gas From Shale www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/cbofiles/attachments/49815-Effects_of_Shale_Production.pdf

Economic Impact Permian Basin's Oil & Gas Industry, www.depts.ttu.edu/communications/media/downloads/PermianBasin.pdf

Economic Affairs Committee – Third Report The Economic Impact on UK Energy Policy of Shale Gas and Oil, www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld201314/ldselect/ldeconaf/172/17202.htm

Fallout of Energy-Price Crash Spreads to Towns Far From the Oil Fields (article) www.wsj.com/articles/fallout-of-energy-price-crash-spreads-to-towns-far-from-the-oil-fields-1430785965

Farren, M.D. (2104). The Impact of Shale Oil and Gas Drilling on Local Housing Markets. Ohio State University
[ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/170644/2/AAEA2014ConfPaper\(28May2014\)\(Farren\)\(Draft\).pdf](http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/170644/2/AAEA2014ConfPaper(28May2014)(Farren)(Draft).pdf)

Frackonomics: Some Economics of Hydraulic Fracturing, www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/08/hydraulic-fracturing-critical-for-energy-production-jobs-and-economic-growth

Guo, J. (2015). The Local Economic Impacts of Horizontal Drilling in Texas, Northeastern University, iris.lib.neu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1005&context=econ_theses

Hausman, C. and R Kellogg (2015). Welfare and Distributional Implications of Shale Gas BPEA Conference Draft, March 19-20, 2015. www.brookings.edu/~media/projects/bpea/spring-2015/2015a_hausman.pdf

Hydraulic Fracturing: Critical for Energy Production, Jobs, and Economic Growth www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/08/hydraulic-fracturing-critical-for-energy-production-jobs-and-economic-growth

Hydraulic Fracturing Ban, The Economic Impact of a Statewide Fracking Ban in Colorado, www.oilandgasbmps.org/docs/CO90-Economic-Impact-Of-Fracking-Moratorium.pdf

Investing in Growth, Bakken Formation Economic Impact Report, November 5, (2013)
www.southeastcollege.org/assets/files/bakken-formation-investing-in-growth.pdf

Mauro, F.; Wood, M.; Mattingly, M.; Price, M.; Herzenberg, S, & Ward, S. (2013). Exaggerating the employment impacts of shale drilling: How and why (Harrisburg, PA: Multi-State Shale Research Collaborative. www.multistateshale.org/shale-employment-report

New York State. www.dot.ny.gov/recovery/goals/distressed

Sovacool, B.K., 2014. Cornucopia or Curse? Reviewing the Costs and Benefits of Shale Gas Hydraulic Fracturing (Fracking). *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 37, pp. 249-264.

The Adverse Impact of Banning Hydraulic Fracturing in the City of Denton on Business Activity and Tax Receipts in the City and State, [d3n8a8pro7vnm.cloudfront.net/themes/540dbeeaebad643b5a000001/attachments/original/1410398621/Perryman_Denton_Fracking_Ban_Impact_6_20_2014_\(1\).pdf?1410398621](http://d3n8a8pro7vnm.cloudfront.net/themes/540dbeeaebad643b5a000001/attachments/original/1410398621/Perryman_Denton_Fracking_Ban_Impact_6_20_2014_(1).pdf?1410398621)

The Bakken Oil Boom, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis (website with useful resources)
www.minneapolisfed.org/publications/special-studies/bakken/oil-production

The Economics of Shale Gas Development www.rff.org/RFF/Documents/RFF-DP-14-42.pdf

The Economic and Budgetary Effects of Producing Oil and Natural Gas From Shale
www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/cbofiles/attachments/49815-Effects_of_Shale_Production.pdf

The Local Economic Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing and Determinants of Dutch Disease,
pages.uoregon.edu/ralphm/fracking_oct14.pdf

Westman, C. N. "Social Impact Assessment and the Anthropology of the Future in Canada's Tar Sands"
www.lfpress.com/2013/03/28/moore-greenpeace-co-founder-comes-out-in-favour-of-xl-pipeline
theindependent.ca/2013/10/29/industry-does-not-have-a-social-licence-to-frack-in-western-newfoundland/

www.texasmonthly.com/daily-post/exxonmobil-ceo-doesnt-want-fracking-operation-near-his-backyard

pennbpc.org/sites/pennbpc.org/files/MSSRC-Employment-Impact-11-21-2013.pdf

www.wsj.com/articles/fallout-of-energy-price-crash-spreads-to-towns-far-from-the-oil-fields-1430785965

www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/upstate-new-york-towns-look-secession-right-frack-pennsylvania/

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/FrackingJobs.pdf

engage.gov.bc.ca/Inginbc/files/2014/10/TC10-Benefits.pdf

Tourism

savewestcoastnl.files.wordpress.com/2013/04/frackingimpacttourism.pdf

whc.unesco.org/en/list/

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/FrackingImpactTourism.pdf

Agriculture

www.theecologist.org/News/news_analysis/1784382/livestock_falling_ill_in_fracking_regions_raising_concerns_about_food.html

cuesa.org/article/food-farms-and-fracking-california

ecowatch.com/2013/04/01/Farmers-struggle-protect-land-fracking-industry/

commonsensecanadian.ca/REPORTED_ELSEWHERE-detail/fracking-impacts-alberta-farming-families-lost-hair-dead-cows/

www.theecologist.org/News/news_analysis/2082668/fracking_poses_risk_to_UK_farm_animals_and_food_safety_experts_warn.html

www.thenation.com/article/171504/fracking-our-food-supply#

www.foodsafetynews.com/2013/10/as-California-moves-to-regulate-fracking-agricultural-concern-arise/

grist.org/natural-gas/2011-05-09-fracking-with-our-food-how-gas-drilling-affects-farming/

Public Health

Bamberger, M., & Oswald, R. E. (2015). Long-term impacts of unconventional drilling operations on human and animal health. *Journal of Environmental Science and Health, Part A*, 50(5), pp. 447-459.

Bohme, S.R.; Zorabedian, J.; and Egilman, D. (2005). Maximizing profit and endangering health: Corporate strategies to avoid litigation and regulation. *International Journal of Occupational and Environmental Health* 11(4), pp. 338-348.

- Brisson, G., et al. (2010). "État des connaissances sur la relation entre les activités liées au gaz de schiste et la santé publique" – Rapport Préliminaire. Institut National de Santé Publique du Québec, Direction de la Santé Environnementale et de la Toxicologie: Quebec, QC. Link: www.inspq.qc.ca/pdf/publications/1177_RelGazSchisteSantePubRapPreliminaire.pdf
- Broomfield, M., 2012. Support to the Identification of Potential Risks for the Environment and Human Health Arising from Hydrocarbons Operations Involving Hydraulic Fracturing in Europe. European Commission Directorate-General for the Environment. ec.europa.eu/environment/integration/energy/unconventional_en.htm
- Cleary, E. (2012). Chief Medical Officer of Health's Recommendations Concerning Shale Gas Development in New Brunswick. Fredericton: Office of the Chief Medical Officer of Health New Brunswick.
- Colbourne, T., Kwiatkowski, C., Schultz, K., Bachran, M., 2011. Natural Gas Operations from a Public Health Perspective. *Human and Ecological Risk Assessment: An International Journal* 17, pp. 1039-1056.
- Colbourne et al. (2012). An exploratory study of air quality near natural gas operation. *Human and Ecological Risk Assessment*.
- Concerned Health Professionals of New York, "Compendium of Scientific, Medical, and Media Findings Demonstrating Risks and Harms of Fracking (Unconventional Gas and Oil Extraction)", 2nd edition, December 11, 2014 concernedhealthny.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/CHPNY-Fracking-Compendium.pdf
- Esswein, E. et al. (2013). *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Hygiene* 10 (7).
- Finkel, M. L., & Hays, J. (2013). The implications of unconventional drilling for natural gas: a global public health concern. *Public Health* 127, 889-893. concernedhealthny.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/CHPNY-Fracking-Compendium.pdf
- Hill I. Increased incidence of Low Birth Weight babies and increased Prematurity in babies born after fracking commenced, compared to the average prior to fracking. Cornell/MIT. Study.
- Kassotis, C.D., Tillitt, D.E., Wade Davis, J., Hormann, A.M., Nagel, S.C., 2014. Estrogen and Androgen Receptor Activities of Hydraulic Fracturing Chemicals and Surface and Ground Water in a Drilling-Dense Region. *Endocrinology* 155, 897-907.
- Law, A., J. Hays, S. B Shonkoff, M. L Finkel (2014). "Public Health England's draft report on shale gas extraction- Mistaking best practices for actual practices." *BMJ* 2014;348
- McDermott-Levy, R., Kaktins, N., & Sattler, B. (2013). Fracking, the environment and health. *American Journal of Nursing*, 113(6), pp. 45-51.
- McKenzie L Guo, Witter et al, 2014 Birth outcomes and Maternal Residential Proximity to Natural Gas Development in Colorado. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 122.
- McKenzie, L.M., Witter, R.Z., Newman, L.S., Adgate, J.L., 2012. Human Health Risk Assessment of Air Emissions from Development of Unconventional Natural Gas Resources. *Science of the Total Environment* 424, pp. 79-87.
- Rabinowitz et al 2014 Proximity to Natural gas Wells and reported Health status. Results from a survey in Washington County Pennsylvania. *Env. Health Perspectives* doi: 10.1289/ehp.1307732

Shonkoff, B. (2012). *Public Health Dimensions of Horizontal Hydraulic Fracturing: Knowledge, Obstacles, tactics and Opportunities – A Report for the 11th hour project.*

Steinzor, N., Subra, W., Sumi, L., 2013. Investigating Links Between Shale Gas Development and Health Impacts Through a Community Survey Project in Pennsylvania. *New Solutions* 23, pp. 55-83.

www.gov.uk/government/news/shale-gas-extraction-emissions-are-a-low-risk-to-public-health

frackingandhealth.ca/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/EHANS-HF-Review-submission-April-16.pdf

www.psehealthyenergy.org/site/view/1180

www.health.ny.gov/press/reports/docs/high_volume_hydraulic_fracturing.pdf

www.health.gov.bc.ca/library/publications/year/2012/Identifying-health-concerns-HHRA-Phase1-Compendium.pdf

www.apha.org/policies-and-advocacy/public-health-policy-statements/policy-database/2014/10/02/15/37/hydraulic-fracturing

serc.carleton.edu/NAGTWorkshops/health/case_studies/hydrofracking_w.html

www.psr.org/assets/pdfs/public-health-dimensions-of.pdf

www.businessinsider.com/scary-chemicals-used-in-hydraulic-fracking-2012-3?op=1#ixzz3bl5nsZto

www.health.ny.gov/press/reports/docs/high_volume_hydraulic_fracturing.pdf

www.biologicaldiversity.org/news/press_releases/2015/fracking-02-11-2015.html

ec.europa.eu/environment/integration/energy/pdf/fracking_study.pdf

www.nlcahr.mun.ca/Research_Exchange/F1_add_EHANS_HF.pdf

www.nrdc.org/media/2014/141216.asp

www.medact.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/medact_fracking-report_WEB3.pdf

www.youtube.com/watch?v=sdSntVkpVe0

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Allderdice-APPENDIX-1A.pdf (includes annotated references)

www.environmentalhealthnews.org/ehs/news/2015/apr/endocrine-disruption-hormones-benzene-solvents

www.precaution.org/lib/faroes_statement_pub.070801.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/SummaryScientificLitPubHealth.pdf

Worker Health

Esswein, E.J., Breitenstein, M., Snawder, J., Kiefer, M., Sieber, W.K., 2013. Occupational Exposures to Respirable Crystalline Silica during Hydraulic Fracturing. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Hygiene* 10, pp. 347-356.

www.southernstudies.org/2012/05/institute-index-frackings-dangers-for-workers.html

www.osha.gov/dts/hazardalerts/hydraulic_frac_hazard_alert.html

veomed.org/pse-cornell/node/1401

Greenhouse Gases/Climate Change

Howarth, R.W., Santoro, R., Ingraffea, A., 2011. Methane and the Greenhouse-Gas Footprint of Natural Gas from Shale Formations. *Climatic Change* 106, 679-690.

Kemball-Cook, S., Bar-Ilan, A., Grant, J., Parker, L., Jung, J., Santamaria, W., Mathews, J., Yarwood, G., 2010. Ozone Impacts of Natural Gas Development in the Haynesville Shale. *Environmental Science & Technology* 44, 9357-9363.

theindependent.ca/2015/05/20/climate-change-confusion-and-what-we-can-do-about-it/

www.turnbackthetide.ca/whatsnew/2013/NL_Climate_Projections_Full_Report.pdf

theindependent.ca/2014/11/23/climate-change-not-a-priority-for-nl-fracking-review-panel/

www.mddelcc.gouv.qc.ca/sommetClimat2015/pdf/Declaration-SommetCC-ANG.pdf

www.nature.com/nature/journal/v517/n7533/full/nature14016.html

www.turnbackthetide.ca

www.un.org/climatechange/summit/

www.un.org/climatechange/

www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/wg2/

Fossil Fuel Use

theindependent.ca/2015/04/26/the-case-for-fossil-fuel-divestment/

newsroom.unfccc.int/unfccc-newsroom/most-fossil-fuels-must-stay-in-the-ground-new-study/

www.theguardian.com/environment/keep-it-in-the-ground-blog/2015/mar/25/what-numbers-tell-about-how-much-fossil-fuel-reserves-cant-burn

Fracking Technology

www.google.ca/

url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&ved=0CDgQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fscience.uwaterloo.ca%2F~mauriced%2Fearth437%2Frequiredreading%2Fassignment_6_readingReservoirandDrilling%2FModule%2520C_Hydraulic%2520Fracture%2520Geomechanics.ppt&ei=BMQVUeaZMsSi2AX7kIDYBA&usg=AFQjCNEHMIT8mkErfQG8QcaZGJ-_WMGt7g&sig2=6-zkgfnAD-O8mOAJ49JUqQ&bvm=bv.42080656,d.b2l

Fracking General

Wilber, Tom. Under the Surface: Fracking, Fortunes, and the Fate of the Marcellus Shale.

commonsensecanadian.ca/clean-lng-powered-massive-increase-dirty-fracking/

theindependent.ca/2014/12/06/should-we-frack-emotions-need-not-apply/

theindependent.ca/2014/12/20/fracking-moratoria-could-cause-domino-effect-in-north-america-including-nl/

www.mun.ca/gazette/2000-2001/feb22/newspage5.html

theindependent.ca/2015/03/14/interview-with-earle-mccurdy/

www.mun.ca/memorial_history/committee/rotary.html

you.leadnow.ca/petitions/ban-hydraulic-fracking-in-newfoundland

rt.com/tags/fracking/

www.cbc.ca/natureofthings/episodes/shattered-ground

engage.gov.bc.ca/Inginbc/

www.gov.bc.ca/mngd/doc/2_LngCard_HydraulicFracturing.pdf

Fracking Information Databases

www.psehealthyenergy.org/site/view/1180

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Supplemental-Reference-Material-on-Impacts-from-Hydraulic-Fracturing.pdf

Approvals/Decisions

Bureau d'audiences publiques sur l'environnement), *Les enjeux liés à l'exploration et l'exploitation du gaz de schiste dans le shale d'Utica des basses-terres du Saint-Laurent* (www.bape.gouv.qc.ca/sections/mandats/gaz_de_schiste-enjeux/).

European Academies Science Advisory Council (press release) www.easac.eu/home/press-releases/detail-view/article/no-scientifi.html

Hydraulic Fracturing Ban, The Economic Impact of a Statewide Fracking Ban in Colorado,
www.oilandgasbmps.org/docs/CO90-Economic-Impact-Of-Fracking-Moratorium.pdf

Report of the Nova Scotia Independent Panel on Hydraulic Fracturing (2015). Submitted to the Province of Nova Scotia Department of Energy, by Cape Breton University and the Verschuren Centre for Sustainability in Energy and the Environment. Cape Breton University, Sydney, NS.

The Adverse Impact of Banning Hydraulic Fracturing in the City of Denton on Business Activity and Tax Receipts in the City and State, [d3n8a8pro7vnmx.cloudfront.net/themes/540dbeeaebad643b5a000001/attachments/original/1410398621/Perryman_Denton_Fracking_Ban_Impact_6_20_2014_\(1\).pdf?1410398621](https://d3n8a8pro7vnmx.cloudfront.net/themes/540dbeeaebad643b5a000001/attachments/original/1410398621/Perryman_Denton_Fracking_Ban_Impact_6_20_2014_(1).pdf?1410398621)

www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/go-slow-on-fracking-scientists-warn/article18355999/

www.huffingtonpost.ca/2014/10/08/fracking-ban-canada_n_5952796.html

theindependent.ca/2014/02/12/throwing-caution-to-the-wind/

www.cbc.ca/news/canada/new-brunswick/shale-gas-moratorium-details-unveiled-by-brian-gallant-1.2877440

www.huffingtonpost.ca/2014/09/03/nova-scotia-fracking-ban_n_5760926.html

www.legassembly.gov.yk.ca/pdf/rbhf_final_report.pdf

www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2014/12/the-alarming-research-behind-new-yorks-fracking-ban/383868/

www.dec.ny.gov/energy/75370.html

rt.com/usa/259841-texas-prohibits-fracking-bans/

www.theguardian.com/environment/2013/aug/05/children-ban-talking-about-fracking

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Quebec-Public-Inquiry-English-Translation.pdf

www.bape.gouv.qc.ca/sections/rapports/publications/bape273_excerpts.pdf

royalsociety.org/policy/projects/shale-gas-extraction/report/

www.easac.eu/home/press-releases/detail-view/article/no-scientifi.html

canadians.org/blog/win-ontario-bill-banning-fracking-passes-second-reading

Panel/Panel Review Documents

theyee.ca/News/2014/07/17/Fracking-Public-Advisor-Patent/

theindependent.ca/2014/11/28/qa-with-fracking-review-panel-member-maurice-dusseault/

www.nr.gov.nl.ca/nr/energy/pdf/hydraulic_fracturing_panel_terms_of_reference.pdf

Industry Documents

www.shoalpointenergy.com/pdfs/shp-exec-summary-April.pdf

www.wnloilandgas.com/media/uploads/Antoine_Forcinal.pdf

Western Newfoundland

www.thewesternstar.com/Business/2015-05-27/article-4161121/Proposed-drill-for-oil-in-western-N.L.-registered-with-CNLOPB/1

savewestcoastnl.wordpress.com/bibliography/

Other

Economic Council of Canada, 1980. *From Dependency to Self-Reliance*. Ottawa. Minister of Supply and Services. p. 109.

Church, J. & Ware, R. (2000). *Industrial Organization: A Strategic Approach*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, pp. 769-772.

Nova Scotia Commission on Building Our New Economy (2014). *Now or Never: An Urgent Call to Action for Nova Scotians*. onens.ca/report/

Saskatchewan Oil and Gas Facts www.ir.gov.sk.ca/ and www.economy.gov.sk.ca/oilandgas

Statistics Canada Census and National Household Survey data, 2011

Statistics Canada, CANSIM, table 282-0087

Statistics Canada, CANSIM, table 282-0122

www.tcr.gov.nl.ca/tcr/publications/2009/vision_2020.pdf

www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/13-604-m/13-604-m2014075-eng.pdf

www.heritage.nf.ca/index.php

www.heritage.nf.ca/articles/environment/geology.php

www.risk-assessment.org

APPENDIX B – SOURCES CITED BY COMMUNITY GROUPS/ORGANIZATIONS

Groundwater

- AECOM (2013). "Groundwater Under Direct Influence of Surface Water (GUDI) –an Evaluation for Public Water Supplies in Newfoundland and Labrador." Report for the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, Department of Environment and Conservation, Water Resources Management Division. www.env.gov.nl.ca/env/waterres/cycle/groundwater/NL_GUDI_AECOM.pdf
- Al, T., Butler, K., Cunjak, R., & MacQuarrie, K. (2012). *Opinion: Potential Impact of Shale Gas Exploitation on Water Resources*. Fredericton (NB): University of New Brunswick.
- Banerjee, N. (2015). The acknowledgment of instances of fracking-related water contamination marks a notable reversal for the Obama administration. InsideClimate News, June 5.
- BCTWA Media Release. (2013) 'Contamination of North America's Groundwater from Fracking (Hydraulic Fracturing) Revealed in New Case History Catalogue.' nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/FrkBC-PrRel-June16-2013-NewCatalogue.pdf
- BCTWA Media Release (2013). "The Big Squeeze: North American Regulator and Protective Agency Close Controversial Groundwater Contamination Cases." nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/FrkBC-PrRel-July12-2013.pdf
- de Albuquerque, C. *Report of the Special Rapporteur on the human right to safe drinking water and sanitation*. Mission to the United States of America, U.N. Doc. A/HRCII 8/33/Add.4 (Aug. 2,
- de Albuquerque, C. (2013) Report of the Special Rapporteur on the human right to safe drinking water and sanitation. U. N. Doc. A/HRC/24/44 (July 11,2013)
- Hydraulic Fracturing and Water Stress: Growing Competitive Pressures for Water, May 2013. www.ceres.org/press/press-clips/fracking-can-strain-u.s.-water-supplies
- Ernst Environmental Services (2013). *Brief Review of Threats to Canada's Groundwater from the Oil and Gas Industry's Methane Migration and Hydraulic Fracturing*. 93 pages. nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Brief-review-of-threats-to-Canadas-groundwater-from-oil-gas-industrys-methane-migration-and-hydraulic-fracturing.pdf
- Llewellyn, G. T., F. Dorman, J. L. Westland, D. Yoxtheimer, P. Grieve, T. Sowers, E. Humston-Fulmer, and S. L. Brantley "Evaluating a groundwater supply contamination incident attributed to Marcellus Shale gas development". *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*, vol. 112 no. 20 >Garth T. Llewellyn, 6325–6330, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1420279112 www.pnas.org/content/early/2015/05/01/1420279112
- Osborn, S.G., A. Vengosh, N.R. Warner, R.B. Jackson. "Methane contamination of drinking water accompanying gas-well drilling and hydraulic fracturing." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, U.S.A. 2011; DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1100682108
- Pennsylvania State College of Agricultural Sciences Cooperative Extension. *Water Facts 28: Gas Well Drilling and Your Private Water Supply*. March 2010.
- Rivard, C., Molson, J., Soeder, D. J., Johnson, E. G., Grasby, S., Wang, B., & Rivera, A. (2012). *A Review of the November 24-25, 2011 Shale Gas Workshop, Calgary, Alberta – 2. Groundwater Resources, Open File 7096*. Natural Resources Canada.

Van Stempvoort, D., Maathuis, H., Aworski, E., Mayer, B., & Rich, K. (2005). Oxidation of fugitive methane in ground water linked to bacterial sulfate reduction. *Groundwater*, 43(2), pp. 187-199.

Van Stempvoort, D. & Roy, J. W. (2011). *Potential Impacts of Natural Gas Production on Groundwater Quality in Canada and Related Research Needs*. Ottawa (ON): Environment Canada.

Vidic, R., Brantley, S. L., Vandenbossche, J. M., Yoxtheimer, D., & Abad, J. D. (2013). "Impact of shale gas development on regional water quality." *Science*, 340(6134).

Wilson, J. M. & VanBriesen, J. (2012). "Oil and gas produced water management and surface drinking water sources in Pennsylvania." *Environmental Practice*, 14(4), pp. 288-300.

Surface Water

"Regulation Lax as Gas Wells' Tainted Water Hits Rivers." *New York Times*, 27 February 2011. p A1; www.nytimes.com/2011/02/27/us/27gas.html

Waste Management

Adams, M.B., "Land application of hydrofracturing fluids damages a deciduous forest stand in West Virginia." *J. Environ Qual.* 2011 Jul-Aug;40(4):1340-4. doi: 10.2134/jeq2010.0504 www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21712604

Arnaud, C. A. "Figuring Out Fracking Wastewater", Celia Henry, *Chemical and Engineering News*, 2015, March 16, page 8ff.

Brown VJ. 2014. "Radionuclides in fracking wastewater: managing a toxic blend." *Environ Health Perspect* 122:A50–A55. [dx.doi.org/10.1289/ehp.122-A50](https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.122-A50)

"California's fracking industry found to be dumping toxic chemicals." www.shaleenergyinsider.com/2015/03/11/californias-fracking-industry-found-to-be-dumping-toxic-chemicals/?utm_source=Shale+Energy+Insider&utm_campaign=8f5a0bce3b-11_03_2015_NL&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_346cca65c0-8f5a0bce3b-15973809

"Fracking Failures – Oil and Gas Industry Environmental Violations in Pennsylvania and what they mean for the U.S." environmentamerica.org/reports/amc/fracking-failures-oil-and-gas-industry-environmental-violations-pennsylvania-and-what

Georgescu, C. (2012). Report of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights obligations related to environmentally sound management and disposal of hazardous substances and waste, Human Rights and Extractive Industries, U.N. Doc. A/HRC/21/48 (July 2, 2012), paras. 8, 14

Harkness, J. S., G. S. Dwyer, N. R. Warner, K. M. Parker, W. A. Mitch, and A. Vengosh. "Iodide, Bromide, and Ammonium in Hydraulic Fracturing and Oil and Gas Wastewaters: Environmental Implications". *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 2015, 49 (3), pp. 1955-1963. pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/

"Nearly 3 Million Gallons of Drilling Wastewater Spewed From ND Pipeline." www.commondreams.org/news/2015/01/22/nearly-3-million-gallons-drilling-wastewater-spewed-nd-pipeline

Parker, K. M., T. Zeng, J. Harkness, A. Vengosh, and W. A. Mitch "Enhanced Formation of Disinfection Byproducts in Shale Gas Wastewater – Impacted Drinking Water Supplies. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 2014, 48 (19), pp. 11161-11169 pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/es5028184

Papoulias D. M. and A.y L. Velasco "Histopathological Analysis of Fish from Acorn Fork Creek, Kentucky, Exposed to Hydraulic Fracturing Fluid Releases" *Southeastern Naturalist*, Volume 12, Special Issue 4 (2013): 92-111.

"Wasting Away: Four states' failure to manage oil and gas waste in the Marcellus and Utica Shale."
www.earthworksaction.org/library/detail/wasting_away_full_report#.VVtgBmZ0Hr4

Management of Additives

AER (Alberta Energy Regulator). (2012c). *Directive 059: Well Drilling and Completion Data Filing Requirements*. Calgary (AB): AER.

AER (Alberta Energy Regulator). (2012f). *Bulletin 2012-25. Amendments to Directive 059: Well Drilling and Completion Data Filing Requirements in Support of Disclosure of Hydraulic Fracturing Fluid Information*. Calgary (AB): AER. April 2011. p. 1.

B.C. Oil and Gas Commission. (2012b). *Fracture Fluid Report Upload Manual*. Victoria (BC): B.C. Oil and Gas Commission.

Edwards, P. M, Steven S. Brown, James M. Roberts, Ravan Ahmadov, Robert M. Banta, Joost A. deGouw, William P. Dubé, Robert A. Field, James H. Flynn, Jessica B. Gilman, Martin Graus, Meng Li, Stuart A. McKeen, Shane M. Murphy, David D. Parrish, Christoph J. Senff, Jeffrey Soltis, Jochen Stutz, Colm Sweeney, Chelsea R. Thompson, Michael K. Trainer, Catalina Tsai, Patrick R. Veres, Rebecca A. Washenfelder, Carsten Warneke, Robert J. Wild, Cora J. Young, Bin Yuan & Robert Zamora. "High winter ozone pollution from carbonyl photolysis in an oil and gas basin." *Nature* (2014).

"EPA FracFocus Analysis Report" www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/201503/documents/fracfocus_analysis_report_and_appendices_final_032015_508_0.pdf

"Environmental Impacts of Shale Gas Extraction in Canada – Council of Canadian Academies" U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Energy and Commerce, Minority Staff Report.

Gilman, J. B., Lerner, B. M., Kuster, W. C., & de Gouw, J. A. (2013). "Source signature of volatile organic compounds from oil and natural gas operations in north-eastern Colorado." *Environmental Science and Technology*, 47(3), pp. 1297-1305.

Linley, Dayna. "Fracking Under Pressure: The Environmental and Social Impacts and Risks of Shale Gas Development." *Sustainalytics*; August 2011. p 10.

Minister of Justice. (2013). *Hazardous Materials Information Review Act*. Ottawa (ON): Government of Canada.

Morrison, J "The Disclosure Debate", *Chemical and Engineering News*, 2015, March 16, page 13ff.

U.S.Fish and Wildlife Service(2013).:"Hydraulic Fracturing Fluids Likely Harmed Threatened Kentucky Fish Species." August 28. www.fws.gov/southeast/news/2013/053.html

The Breakthrough Institute. Interview with Dan Steward, former Mitchell Energy Vice President. December 2011.

"The Endocrine Disruption Exchange – Summary of Chemicals" endocrinedisruption.org/assets/media/images/Multistate%20summary%201-27-11%20Final%20with%20letterhead.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Appendix-E-Toxic-Substances-List-Schedule-1.pdf

canadians.org/sites/default/files/ATI-fracking-chemicals-1013.pdf.

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Appendix-G-2nd-Priority-Substances-List.pdf

www.scienceadvice.ca/uploads/eng/assessments%20and%20publications%20and%20news%20releases/shale%20gas/shalegas_fullreporten.pdf

Wellbore Integrity

Dusseault, M., M. N. Gray, P. A. Nawrocki. "Why Oilwells Leak: Cement Behavior and Long-Term Consequences." [dx.doi.org/10.2118/64733-MS](https://doi.org/10.2118/64733-MS)

Haluszczak, L. O., A. W. Rose; and L. R. Kump "Analysis of Marcellus Flowback Finds High Levels of Ancient Brines. Forthcoming, *Applied Geochemistry*. www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2012/12/121218203537.htm

Nikiforuk, A. (2011). theyee.ca/News/2011/12/19/Fracking-Contamination/

Stark, A. J., A. Settari, J. R. Jones. "Analysis of Hydraulic Fracturing of High Permeability Gas Wells to Reduce Non-darcy Skin Effects." Petroleum Society of Canada, Annual Technical Meeting, Jun 8-10, 1998, Calgary, Alberta.

Robbins K. (2013). "Awakening the Slumbering Giant: How Horizontal Drilling Technology Brought the Endangered Species Act to Bear on Hydraulic Fracturing." *Case Western Reserve Law Review*.

www.democracynow.org/2014/12/19/new_york_says_no_to_fracking

Seismic/Geological Risks

"Did Alberta Just Break a Fracking Earthquake World Record?" www.resilience.org/stories/2015-01-29/did-alberta-just-break-a-fracking-earthquake-world-record

"Fracking Confirmed as Cause of Ohio Earthquake" ecowatch.com/2015/01/06/fracking-cause-ohio-earthquake/?utm_source=EcoWatch+List&utm_campaign=2b12cfb273-Top_News_1_6_2015&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_49c7d43dc9-2b12cfb273-85328537

"Fracking linked to 4.4 magnitude quake in Fox Creek" www.cbc.ca/news/canada/edmonton/fracking-linked-to-4-4-magnitude-quake-in-fox-creek-1.2938900

"Fracking Quakes Pose Added Risks and Require Study, Expert Warns" www.resilience.org/stories/2015-02-10/fracking-quakes-pose-added-risks-and-require-study-expert-warns

Hinchey, A.M. et al. The Green Point Shale of Western Newfoundland. Geological Survey, Mines Branch, Department of Natural Resources, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. www.nr.gov.nl.ca/nr/energy/pdf/green_point_shale_west_nl.pdf

Nicholson, C. & Wesson, R. L. (1990). *Earthquake Hazard Associated with Deep Well Injection. A Report to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency*. Denver (CO): U.S. Geological Survey and U.S. Department of the Interior.

Nikiforuk, A. "Fracking Industry Shakes Up Northern BC with 231 Tremors." Quakes also triggered by wastewater disposal, finds oil and gas commission. theyee.ca/News/2015/01/10/Fracking_Industry_Shakes_Up_Northern_BC/?utm_source=daily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=100115

"Staggering Rise in Fracking Earthquakes Triggers Kansas to Take Action" ecowatch.com/2015/04/02/kansas-fracking-earthquakes/?utm_source=EcoWatch+List&utm_campaign=d579f220f0-Top_News_4_4_2015&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_49c7d43dc9-d579f220f0-85328537

Zoback, M. (2012). Managing the seismic risk posed by wastewater disposal. *Earth Magazine*, 57(4), pp. 38-44.

www.bcogc.ca/node/8046/download

www.usgs.gov/blogs/features/usgs_top_story/man-made-earthquakes/

www.seismosoc.org/society/press_releases/BSSA_1051_Skoumal_et_al_Press_Release.pdf

Regulatory Oversight/Responsibility

Branley, Matthew. "Is Natural Gas a Climate Change Solution for Canada?" Pembina Institute and David Suzuki Foundation, July 2011. www.pembina.org/pub/2240

Bureau d'audiences publiques sur l'environnement. (2014). "Issues relating to shale gas exploration and exploitation in the St. Lawrence Lowlands: The Inquiry Commission's Guidelines and Conclusions from Report 307". Chapter 13. www.bape.gouv.qc.ca/sections/rapports/publications/bape307_Chap13_ENG.pdf

New York State Environmental Review of High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing (2015): www.dec.ny.gov/energy/75370.html

Sumi, L., (2013). "The Regulation of Shale Gas Development: State of Play." Council of Canadians www.canadians.org/sites/default/files/publications/OEB%20Sumi.pdf

Air Emissions

Brown D, Weinberger B, Lewis C, Bonaparte H. "Understanding exposure from natural gas drilling puts current air standards to the test." *Rev. Environ. Health*. 2014;29(4):277-92. www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24690938

Casey, J.A., E. L. Ogburn, S. G. Rasmussen, J. K. Irving, J. Pollak, P A. Locke, and Brian S. Schwartz. "Predictors of Indoor Radon Concentrations in Pennsylvania, 1989-2013", *Environ Health Perspect*; ehp.niehs.nih.gov/1409014/

"Gassed! Citizen Investigation of Toxic Air Pollution from Natural Gas Development." www.gcmmonitor.org/downloads/gassedreport.pdf

Jackson, R., B. R. Pearson, S. Osborn, N. Warner, A.Vengosh. (2011). *Research and Policy Recommendations for Hydraulic Fracturing and Shale Gas Extraction*. Duke University, Durham, NC.

Ruth, J. H. (1986). "Odour thresholds and irritation levels of several chemical substances: A review." *American Industrial Hygiene Association Journal*, 47(3), A142-A151.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of Surface Mining. *Technical Measures for the Investigation and Mitigation of Fugitive Methane Hazards in Areas of Coal Mining*. September 2001.

Socio-Economic Impacts

- AMEC Environment and Infrastructure. (2013). *Western Newfoundland and Labrador Offshore Area Strategic Environmental Assessment Update*. www.cnlopb.ca/pdfs/wnlsea/wnlseaupdateen.pdf
- Barth, J. M. (2013). "The economic impact of shale gas development on state and local economies: Benefits, costs and uncertainties." *New Solutions*, 23(1), pp. 85-101.
- Blue Green Canada. "More Bang for Our Buck." bluegreencanada.ca/more-bang-for-our-buck
- Deloitte. (2013, May 17). *Future NB: Shale gas supply chain opportunities in New Brunswick*. www.futurenb.com/docs/resources/FNB%20Shale%20Gas%20Supply%20Chain%20Opportunities%20in%20NB%20Final%20Report.pdf
- Ecosystem Research Group. (2008). *Sublette County: Socioeconomic impact study*. www.sublettewyo.com/DocumentCenter/Home/View/355
- Food & Water Watch (FWW). *Exposing the Oil and Gas Industry's False Jobs Promise for Shale Gas Development: How Methodological Flaws Grossly Exaggerate Jobs Projections* www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0143622815000776
- Holland, B. (2011). "Prices, profits, and Ponzi schemes: US shale gas." *Energy Economist*, 359, pp. 1-2.
- IEA Oil Market Report for May 2015: www.iea.org/newsroomandevents/news/2015/may/iea-releases-oil-market-report-for-may.html
- Krugel, L. (2012) "Is Newfoundland home to Canada's next big oil find?" *Financial Post*, Sept. 11, 2012.
- Lipscomb, C.A., Wang, Y., and Kilpatrick, S. (2012). Unconventional shale gas development and real estate valuation issues. *The Review of Regional Studies*, 42, pp. 161-175.
- Marcellus Shale Education and Training Center. (2011). *Natural gas drilling effects on municipal governments throughout Pennsylvania's Marcellus Shale region (part 1)*. Penn State College of Agricultural Sciences: extension.psu.edu/natural-resources/natural-gas/news/2011/09/natural-gas-drilling-effects-on-municipal-governments-throughout-pennsylvania2019s-marcellus-shale-region-part-i
- Neate, R. "Fears for US economy as shale industry goes into hibernation." *The Guardian*, 7 February, 2015. www.theguardian.com/business/2015/feb/07/shale-industry-hibernation-us-economy-fears
- New Brunswick Chief Medical Officer, New Brunswick Department of Health. 2012. Chief Medical Officer of Health's Recommendations Concerning Shale Gas Development in New Brunswick: www2.gnb.ca/content/dam/gnb/Departments/h-s/pdf/en/HealthyEnvironments/Recommendations_ShaleGasDevelopment.pdf
- Nieves, E. "Fracking town's laid-off workers." *The Tyee*, 10 April, 2015. thetyee.ca/News/2015/04/10/Fracking-Town-Laid-off-Workers/
- Pennsylvania Budget and Policy Center. (2013, April 17). "Pa. should not spend taxpayer dollars to subsidize new markets for natural gas producers." Keystone Research Centre: pennbpc.org/pa-should-not-spend-taxpayer-dollars-subsidize-new-markets-natural-gas-producers

Perry, S. A. (2012). "Development, land use, and collective trauma: The Marcellus shale gas boom in rural Pennsylvania." *Culture & Agriculture*, 34(1), pp. 81-92.

Richter, W (2012). "Dirt Cheap Natural Gas Is Tearing Up The Very Industry That's Producing It," *Business Insider*: mobile.businessinsider.com/capital-destruction-in-natural-gas-2012-6

Spencer, T., O. Sartor and M. Mathieu (2014). *Unconventional wisdom: an economic analysis of US shale gas and implications for the EU*, Studies N°02/14, Institute for Sustainable Development and International Relations (IDDRI), Paris, France.

"The Great Oil Swindle," *Le Monde Diplomatique*, 2013. mondediplo.com/2013/03/09gaz-nb5

Yukon Legislative Assembly, Final Report of the Select Committee Regarding the Risks and Benefits of Hydraulic Fracturing, January 2015, pp. 18-19. www.legassembly.gov.yk.ca/pdf/rbhf_final_report.pdf

Tourism

Bezzina, E. Discussion of the Impact of Hydraulic Fracturing on Tourism, February 2013, pp. 1-15. savewestcoastnl.files.wordpress.com/2013/04/frackingimpacttourism.pdf.

Harris-Decima. 2014. *Non-Resident Travel Motivations Study*. www.tcr.gov.nl.ca/tcr/publications/2014/Newfoundland_Labrador_Non-Resident_Travel_Motivations_Survey_Canadian_Travellers.pdf

www.tcr.gov.nl.ca/tcr/publications/2009/Vision_2020_Print_Text.pdf

Agriculture

Bamberger, M. and R.E. Oswald. Unconventional Oil and Gas Extraction and Animal Health. *Environ. Sci. Processes Impacts*, Vol. 16, 1860-1865 (2014).

Intervale Associates (2010). "Dairy Farmers of Newfoundland." In *Social, Economic and Cultural Overview of Western Newfoundland and Southern Labrador*. Report for Oceans, Habitat and Species at Risk Branch of Fisheries and Oceans Canada Newfoundland and Labrador Region.

Resolution by the National Farmers Union. www.nfu.ca/node/187 19

Sustainability

One Earth Community – Ethical Principles for Environment and Development, and *The Earth Charter* www.unitedchurch.ca/files/ecology/energy/nuclear_commentary.pdf

United Nations (1992). *Rio Declaration on Environment and Development*, The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

UNESCO (2013). State of conservation of World Heritage properties inscribed on the World Heritage List, Decision 37 COM 78.18, U.N. Doc. WHC-13137.COM/78.Add whc.unesco.org/arch jve/20\3 /whcl3-37com-7B-Add-en.pdf.

en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ecosystem-based_management

Public Health

Bolden, A.L., C. F. Kwiatkowski, and T. Colborne. "New Look at BTEX: Are Ambient Levels a Problem?" *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 2015, 49 (9), pp 5261-5276 DOI: 10.1021/es505316f
pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/es505316f

Colborne, T. *Health Implications of Fracking for Natural Gas in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin* www.dentonrc.com/local-news/special-projects/gas-well-drilling-headlines/20110831-breast-cancer-rate-climbs-up.ece

"Compendium Of Scientific, Medical, And Media Findings Demonstrating Risks And Harms Of Fracking (Unconventional Gas And Oil Extraction)" Concernedhealthny.Org/Compendium/Ecology, Environment & Conservation (2015). "Lung cancer; Increased levels of radon in Pennsylvania homes correspond to onset of fracking." *ECECON*, 477. aglobal.factiva.com/hp/printsaveews.aspx?pp=Print&hc=Publication

EPA (Environmental Protection Agency). (2012b). Health Effects. www.epa.gov/glo/health.html.

Finkel, M.L., and Hays, J. (2013). The implications of unconventional drilling for natural gas: a global public health concern. *Public Health*, 127, 889-893. dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2013.07.005

Glauser, W. (2014). New legitimacy to concerns about fracking and health. *Canadian Medical Association*, 186(8), E245-E246.

Health Canada. (1996). *Health-Based Tolerable Daily Intakes/Concentrations and Tumorigenic Doses/Concentrations for Priority Substances*. Ottawa (ON): Health Canada.

Koop, W (ed). A Chronological & Single Document Reference Tool: For PSE's (Physicians, Scientists & Engineers's) Health Energy Citation Database on Shale Gas & Tight Oil Developments. B.C. Tap Water Alliance, Version 2.0., 478 pages. nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/A-Chronological-Single-Document-Reference-Tool-For-PSEs-Health-Energy-Citation-Databse-on-Shale-Gas-Tight-Oil-Developments.pdf

Lustgarten, A., N. Kusnetz and ProPublica (2011). "Science lags as health problems emerge near natural gas wells." *Scientific American*, 19 September 2011. www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=science-lags-as-health-problems

Mash, R., Minnaar, J., & Mash, B. (2014). "Health and fracking: Should the medical profession be concerned?" *South African Medical Journal*, 104(5), pp. 332-335.

McKenzie, L. M., Witter, R. Z., Newman, L. S., and Adgate, J. L. (2012). "Human health risk assessment of air emissions from development of unconventional natural gas resources." *Science of the Total Environment*, 424(1), pp. 79-87.

"New York Final SGEIS on the Oil, Gas and Solution Mining Regulatory Program." (May 2015)" www.dec.ny.gov/energy/75370.html

New York State Department of Health. *A Public Health Review of High Volume Hydraulic Fracturing for Shale Gas Development*, December 2014, p. 12 www.health.ny.gov/press/reports/docs/high_volume_hydraulic_fracturing.pdf

New York State Department of Health www.health.ny.gov/press/releases/2014/2014-12-17_fracking_report.htm

New York State Health Professionals and Scientists (2014). "Towards an understanding of the environmental and public health impacts of shale gas development: an analysis of the peer-reviewed scientific literature, 2009-2014." psehealthyenergy.org/data/Database_Analysis_2015.1_.27_1.pdf

Office of the Chief Medical Officer of Health, New Brunswick (2012). *Chief Medical Officer of Health's Recommendations Concerning Shale Gas Development in New Brunswick*, Office of the Chief Medical Officer of Health (OCMOH), Department of Health, Fredericton, New Brunswick.

"Potential Public Health Impacts of Natural Gas Development and Production in the Marcellus Shale in Western Maryland" phpa.dhmfh.maryland.gov/OEHFP/EH/Shared%20Documents/Reports/MDMarcellusShalePublicHealthFinalReport08.15.2014.pdf

"Toward an understanding of the environmental and public health impacts of shale gas development: an analysis of the peer reviewed scientific literature, 2009-2014" psehealthyenergy.org/site/view/1233

Webb, E., S. Bushkin-Bedient, A. Cheng, Christopher D. Kassotis, V. Balise, S. C. Nagel (2014). "Developmental and reproductive effects of chemicals associated with unconventional oil and natural gas operations", *Reviews on Environmental Health*. Volume 29, Issue 4:307–318, ISSN (Online) 2191-0308, ISSN (Print) 0048-7554, DOI: 10.1515/reveh-2014- 0057, www.degruyter.com/view/j/reveh.2014.29.issue-4/reveh-2014-0057/reveh-2014-0057.xml?format=INT

www.cbc.ca/news/canada/new-brunswick/potential-health-risks-cited-in-report-on-shale-gas-industry-1.1204651
concernedhealthny.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/CHPNY-Fracking-Compendium.pdf

Greenhouse Gases/Climate Change

Jenkins, Creties D. and Charles M. Boyer II (2008). "Coalbed and Shale-Gas Reservoirs." *Society of Petroleum Engineers*. Distinguished Author Series.

Howarth, R.W., R. Santoro and A. Ingraffea. "Methane and the greenhouse-gas footprint of natural gas from shale formations." *Climate Change*, March 2011.

Johnson, J. "Methane's Role in Climate Change", *Chemical and Engineering News*, 2014, July 7, page 10ff.

Pontifical Academy of Sciences and the Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences (2015). *Climate Change and the Common Good: A Statement of the Problem and the Demand for Transformative Solutions*, Vatican City State, 29 April.

Ritter, S. (2014). "Greenhouse Emissions, Methane by the Numbers", *Chemical and Engineering News*, July 7, page 14-15. www.env.gov.nl.ca/env/climate_change/coastal_zone_erosion/index.html

Spills

Corridor Resources Inc. "RE: August 23, 2006, Accidental Release from J-67 Well on Well Pad C-67/J-67/G-67." Letter to Residents and Landowners. 8 September 2006. www.penobsquis.ca/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/fracspillfirst101.pdf

Water Usage

B.C. Oil and Gas Commission. (2012c). *Water Use in Oil and Gas Activities*. Victoria (BC): B.C. Oil and Gas Commission.

Chapman, A. and Venables, S. (2012). *Projections of Surface Water Use for Hydraulic Fracturing in the Montney Trend*. Paper presented at Unconventional Gas Technical Forum, Victoria (BC).

Fracking Technology

BAPE (Bureau d'audiences publiques sur l'environnement). (2011a). *Sustainable Development of the Shale Gas Industry in Québec*. Excerpts from Report 273. Québec (QC): BAPE.

Ritter, S. and Stephen K. (2014) "A New Way of Fracking." *Chemical and Engineering News*, May 12.

Marine/Coastal Ecosystems

Canada's Oceans Strategy (2002) www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/oceans/publications/cos-soc/pdf/cos-soc-eng.pdf

DFO. State of the Oceans Report for the Gulf of St. Lawrence 2012, Fisheries and Oceans Canada
www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/Library/345310.pdf

DFO. Large Ocean Management Areas (including Gulf of St. Lawrence)
www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/oceans/marineareas-zonesmarines/loma-zego/index-eng.htm

DFO. Management of Marine Activities, Fisheries and Oceans Canada
www.qc.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/gestion-management/index-eng.html

Gulf of St. Lawrence Integrated Management Plan 2013, Fisheries and Oceans Canada
www.icomnl.ca/files/GOSLIM%20Plan.PDF

Policy and Operational Framework for Integrated Management of Estuarine, Coastal and Marine Environments in Canada (2002) www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/oceans/publications/cosframework-cadresoc/index-eng.asp

www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/oceans/publications/oap-pao/pdf/oap-eng.pdf

Fishery

www.cnlopbc.ca/pdfs/wnlsea/wnlseaen.pdf

Aboriginal Rights

Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada. (2010). Treaty or articles of peace and friendship renewed 1752.
www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100028593/1100100028594

Allain, J. & Frechette, J-D. (1993). The Aboriginal fisheries and the Sparrow decision.
www.parl.gc.ca/content/lop/researchpublications/bp341-e.htm

Crow, K. (2011, June 6). Land claims. Rev. by Pedersen, A-M. The Canadian Encyclopedia.
www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/land-claims/

Judgments of the Supreme Court of Canada. (1999). R.v. Marshall.
scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/1740/index.do

Justice Canada. (1982). Constitution Act, part II: Rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada.
laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/CONST/page-16.html#h-52

Salomons, T. and Hanson, E. (2009). Sparrow Case. indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/home/land-rights/sparrow-case.html

United Nations. (2008). United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf

United Nations (2012). Report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples on the situation of indigenous peoples in Argentina, UN Doc. A/HRC/21/47/Add. 2 (July 4, 2012), para. 43 (in reference to the Kaxipayii'l community in Argentina).

Energy Strategies

Associated Press. 2013. Renewables to make 1/4 of world's energy by 2018. www.cbc.ca/m/news/business/canada-missing-out-on-green-energy-revolution-report-says-1.2774192

Weis, T. S., Stensil, S-P, & Stewart, K. (2010). *Ontario's green energy plan 2.0: Choosing 21st century energy options*. Retrieved from Pembina Institute: www.pembina.org/pub/2059

Flaring

globalnews.ca/news/1623963/charges-laid-after-7500-birds-killed-in-flare-at-saint-john-gas-plant/

General

BCTWA Media Release, March 10, 2015: "Did the Council of Canadian Academies' Frack Panel 'Cherry-Pick the Scientific Evidence on Harms from Fracking?" nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/PrRel-Mar10-2015-CherryPicked.pdf

APPENDIX C – SOURCES CITED BY INDUSTRY AND INDUSTRY GROUPS

Groundwater/Surface Water/Drinking Water

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Fracking-and-Drinking-Water-Submission.pdf

www.energy.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/files/serve?File_id=4f086706-79aa-43df-a6e9-1ce1169f6312

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/7-CAPP-Hydraulic-Fracturing-Operating-Practice_-Anomalous-Induced-Seismicity_-Assessment-Monitoring-Mitigation-and-Response.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Big-Issues-with-Food-and-Water-Watch-Seismic-study.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/CNN-Earthquake-Error-Highlights-Media.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/HF-and-Seismic-Activity-Report-v2.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Key-Points-on-B.C.-Oil-and-Gas-Seismicity-Study- Shale-Resource-Centre.pdf

www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=L4RLzIcoX5c

energyindepth.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/EID_State-Regulators.pdf

www.api.org/%7E/media/files/policy/hydraulic_fracturing/hf-comments-by-us-officials.pdf

energyindepth.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/Experts-Tout-Safety-HF.pdf

www.capp.ca/publications-and-statistics/publications/218135

s5-bsc-faisan.cits.rncan.gc.ca/pub/geott/ess_pubs/292/292762/of_7449.pdf

nbenergyinstitute.ca/sites/default/files/files/Tom%20AI%20RT%20Nov%2021%202013.pdf

nbenergyinstitute.ca/energy-science/ongoing

<https://www.aer.ca/documents/bulletins/Bulletin-2007-10.pdf>

Land Disturbance

www.blm.gov/style/medialib/blm/wy/information/NEPA/pfodocs/npl.Par.40081.File.dat/POD.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Modern-Well-Development-Technology-Produces-Big-Time-Environmental-Benefits-for-Michigan.pdf

Waste Management

www.capp.ca/publications-and-statistics/publications/218146

www.bcogc.ca/node/12440/download

Management of Additives

www.fracfocus.org/

www.halliburton.com/public/projects/pubsdata/Hydraulic_Fracturing/fluids_disclosure.html

www.capp.ca/publications-and-statistics/publications/218130

www.google.ca/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CCIFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.capp.ca%2F~%2Fmedia%2Fcapp%2Fcustomer-portal%2Fpublications%2F218146.pdf&ei=hjGEVaGNNMizAHxpoDwCQ&usg=AFQjCNEcpUEHLviYdBSZh0ZHw28AnOTSg&bvm=bv.96042044,d.cWw

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Developing-Effective-and-Environmentally-Suitable-Fracturing-Fluids-Using-Hydraulic-Fracturing-Flowback-Waters-1.pdf

www.halliburton.com/public/common/Case_Histories/H09138.pdf

www.capp.ca/publications-and-statistics/publications/218130

www.capp.ca/publications-and-statistics/publications/218132

<https://www.aer.ca/documents/directives/Directive059.pdf>

Wellbore Integrity

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Well-Bore-Integrity-Submission.pdf

ptrc.ca/+pub/document/King%20%20Barrier%20Failure%20and%20Wel%20Integrity.pdf

www.capp.ca/publications-and-statistics/publications/218137

www.enform.ca/resources/detail/29/dacc-irp-volume-24-interim-fracture-stimulation-interwellbore-communications

www.aer.ca/rules-and-regulations/directives

www.enform.ca/resources/detail/61/dacc-irp-volume-25-primary-and-remedial-cementing-guidelines

Seismicity/Geological Risks

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Induced-Seismicity-Letter.pdf

www.energy.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/files/serve?File_id=4f086706-79aa-43df-a6e9-1ce1169f6312

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/7-CAPP-Hydraulic-Fracturing-Operating-Practice_-Anomalous-Induced-Seismicity_-Assessment-Monitoring-Mitigation-and-Response.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Big-Issues-with-Food-and-Water-Watch-Seismic-study.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/CNN-Earthquake-Error-Highlights-Media.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/HF-and-Seismic-Activity-Report-v2.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Key-Points-on-B.C.-Oil-and-Gas-Seismicity-Study-Shale-Resource-Centre.pdf

www.sciencemag.org/content/161/3848/1301.short

video.cnbc.com/gallery/?video=3000082962

energyindepth.org/national/on-shaky-ground-2/

energyindepth.org/ohio/ohio-regulators-update-rules-to-further-reduce-seismic-risk/

www.capp.ca/publications-and-statistics/publications/217532

www.bcogc.ca/node/8046/download

www.bcogc.ca/node/12291/download

www.aer.ca/about-aer/spotlight-on/seismicity-in-alberta

www.aer.ca/documents/orders/subsurface-orders/SO2.pdf

www.aer.ca/rules-and-regulations/bulletins/bulletin-2015-03

Regulatory Oversight and Responsibility (Government and Corporate)

theintelligencer.net/page/content.detail/id/549886/-Halliburton-Loophole--False--Lawyer-Claims.html?nav=515

energyindepth.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/03/Federal-Hydraulic-Fracturing-Process.pdf

www.oilandgasinfo.ca/fracopedia/hydraulic-fracturing-code-of-conduct/

www.assembly.nl.ca/legislation/sr/regulations/rc961150.htm#3

www.qp.alberta.ca/documents/Acts/O06.pdf

www.aer.ca/documents/actregs/2013_090.pdf

www.oilandgasinfo.ca/wp-content/uploads/WEC-Code-of-Conduct-Oct2013.pdf

www.aer.ca/rules-and-regulations/directives/

www.aer.ca/rules-and-regulations/informational-letters/il-98-01

Federal/Provincial/Territorial Regulations

Federal – National Energy Board:

www.neb-one.gc.ca/bts/ctrgr/gnthr/flrqnsdrllprtn/index-eng.html

British Columbia – BC Oil & Gas Commission:

www.bcogc.ca/Legislation

www.bclaws.ca/EPLibraries/bclaws_new/document/ID/freeside/00_08036_01

www.bclaws.ca/EPLibraries/bclaws_new/document/ID/freeside/282_2010

www.bcogc.ca/node/6068/download?documentID=1208&type=.pdf

Alberta – Alberta Energy Regulator:

www.aer.ca/rules-and-regulations/acts-and-rules

www.aer.ca/about-aer/spotlight-on/unconventional-regulatory-framework

Saskatchewan – Ministry of Energy and Resources:

www.er.gov.sk.ca/Default.aspx?DN=dacef797-97a9-4b04-9045-1568b89cb131

Manitoba – Manitoba Innovation, Energy, and Mines

www.manitoba.ca/iem/petroleum/actsregs/dap.html

Ontario – Ministry of Natural Resources:

www.ontario.ca/laws/regulation/970245

www.ogsrlibrary.com/documents/Provincial_Operating_Standards_v2_Jan_24_2002.pdf

Quebec: Ministry of Natural Resources and Wildlife

www.mern.gouv.qc.ca/lois/lois-energie.jsp

www2.publicationsduquebec.gouv.qc.ca/dynamicSearch/telecharge.php?type=3&file=/M_13_1/M13_1R1_A.HTM

New Brunswick: Department of Energy and Mines

www2.gnb.ca/content/dam/gnb/Corporate/pdf/ShaleGas/en/RulesforIndustry.pdf

Nova Scotia – Department of Energy:

www.novascotia.ca/just/regulations/regs/prondril.htm

energy.novascotia.ca/oil-and-gas/onshore/regulating-activities-and-forms

energy.novascotia.ca/oil-and-gas/onshore/hydraulic-fracturing-review

Prince Edward Island – Department of Finance, Energy, and Municipal Affairs:

www.gov.pe.ca/energy/index.php3?number=18082&lang=E

Newfoundland and Labrador – Department of Natural Resources

www.assembly.nl.ca/Legislation/sr/statutes/p10.htm

www.assembly.nl.ca/Legislation/sr/Regulations/rc961150.htm

www.nr.gov.nl.ca/nr/energy/pdf/nl_hydraulic%20fracturing_pt1.pdf

www.nr.gov.nl.ca/nr/energy/pdf/nl_hydraulic_fracturing_pt2.pdf

Nunavut – Department of Economic Development & Transportation:

www.neb-one.gc.ca/bts/ctrq/index-eng.html

laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/PDF/SOR-2009-315.pdf

laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/PDF/C-8.5.pdf

Northwest Territories – Department of Industry, Tourism, and Investment:

laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/PDF/SOR-2009-315.pdf

www.neb-one.gc.ca/bts/ctrq/index-eng.html

laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/PDF/O-7.pdf

Yukon – Department of Energy, Mines, and Resources:

www.gov.yk.ca/legislation/regs/oic2004_158.pdf

Site Restoration

www.bcogc.ca/node/12445/download

Financial Security and Insurance

www.bcogc.ca/industry-zone/liability-management-rating-program

www.aer.ca/rules-and-regulations/directives/directive-006

www.economy.gov.sk.ca/LLR-guideline

Air Emissions

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Papers-Addressing-Emission-Issues.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Data-Show-Texas-Ozone-Levels-Are-Not-Driven-by-Fracking.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/New-Study-Finds-Low-Emissions-at-Marcellus-Well-Sites.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/research-gaps-in-Utica-air-quality-study.pdf

www.ghgenius.ca/

iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/7/4/044030;jsessionid=A8053CA0FAB4EDFA644953EBA653CCE0.ip-10-40-2-121

Federal/Provincial/Territorial Air Quality/Emissions Information

ec.gc.ca/Air/default.asp?lang=En&n=14F71451-1

esrd.alberta.ca/air/clearing-the-air/integrated-air-quality-management.aspx

esrd.alberta.ca/air/education-guidelines/emission-standards-and-guidelines.aspx

www.bcairquality.ca/

environment.gov.sk.ca/air

www.gov.mb.ca/conservation/envprograms/airquality/

www.ontario.ca/page/rules-air-quality-and-pollution

www2.publicationsduquebec.gouv.qc.ca/dynamicSearch/telecharge.php?type=2&file=%2F%2FQ_2%2FQ2R4_1_A.htm

www.env.gov.yk.ca/air-water-waste/air_emissions_regs.php

www2.gnb.ca/content/gnb/en/departments/elg/environment/content/air_quality/air_quality_monitoring/types_of_air_qualitymonitoringinnewbrunswick.html

www.novascotia.ca/just/regulations/regs/envairqt.htm

Climate Change

energyindepth.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/Five-Things-to-Know-Factsheet-FINAL.pdf

www2.cce.cornell.edu/naturalgasdev/documents/pdfs/skone_ng_lc_ghg_profile_cornell_12may11_final.pdf

www.politicopro.com/energy/story/2011/08/dueling-gas-studies-contradict-each-other-005438

cce.cornell.edu/EnergyClimateChange/NaturalGasDev/Documents/PDFs/Policy_Brief_Sept11-draft02.pdf

Methane

energyindepth.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/Gasland-Fact-Sheet-FINAL-062110.pdf

energyindepth.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Problems-Associated-with-Natural-Gas-in-Michigan-1965.pdf

www.dep.state.pa.us/dep/deputate/minres/districts/homepage/california/SSA/5600-FS-DEP2690.pdf

news.google.com/

[newspapers?id=18daAAAIBAJ&sjid=qG0DAAAIBAJ&pg=4586,4617703&dq=methane+in+well+water&hl=en](http://news.google.com/newspapers?id=18daAAAIBAJ&sjid=qG0DAAAIBAJ&pg=4586,4617703&dq=methane+in+well+water&hl=en)

www.fightgaslandcensorship.com/

Public Safety and Emergency Planning

www.google.ca/search?client=safari&rls=en&q=CAPP+Process+Safety+Management+2014&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&gfe_rd=cr&ei=jnMuVrSyFaaD8Qff05T4CA

www.aer.ca/documents/directives/Directive071-with-2009-errata.pdf

www.health.gov.bc.ca/library/publications/year/2014/detailed-health-risk-assessment.pdf

Community Engagement

rmmanitou.ca/pdf/An_Introduction_to_Oil_and_Gas_Leasing_in_British_Columbia__Alberta_and_Saskatchewan.pdf

www.capp.ca/publications-and-statistics/publications/255363

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/CAPP-Western-NL-Polling-Results-Q2-2015.pdf

www.pfac.ca/working-energy-commitment/

www.communitypartners.ca/

www.oilandgasinfo.ca

Socio Economic Impacts

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Socio-Economic-Impacts.pdf

www.encana.com/pdf/operations/usa/npl-fact-sheet.pdf

www.atlanticaenergy.org/pdfs/natural_gas/Economy/CERI_Study_132_Quebec_Shale_2013-03-08_.pdf

marcelluscoalition.org/wpcontent/uploads/2010/05/EconomicImpactsofDevelopingMarcellus.pdf

anga.us/media/blog/CC3DAD7050569F69D486E62E37BC2D70/files/ICERES_-_Marcellusjobsstudy_FINAL.pdf

www.business.pitt.edu/faculty/papers/PittMarcellusShaleEconomics2011.pdf

www.mde.state.md.us/programs/Land/mining/marcellus/Documents/RESI_Marcellus_Shale_Report_Final.pdf

anga.us/media/content/F7D1750E-9C1E-E786-674372E5D5E98A40/files/shale-gas-economic-impact-dec-2011.pdf

www.api.org/~media/files/policy/exploration/api-economic-impacts-marcellus-shale.pdf

therivardreport.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/CCBR_EagleFordShaleStudyMarch2013.pdf

www.atlanticaenergy.org/pdfs/natural_gas/Economy/NB%20Shale%20Gas%20Supply%20Chain%20Report.pdf

www.pfac.ca/wp-content/uploads/hor_drill_wf_study.pdf

www.energy.alberta.ca/About_Us/2564.asp

Public Health

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Public-Health-Reports.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Colorado-Head-doctor-disavows-study.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Colorado-Health-Officials-Rebuke.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Public-Health-critique.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Questionable-Sources-Underpin-UT-Report-Linking-Shale-to-Cancer.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Scariest-Chemicals-in-Household-products.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Studies-Show-Shale-Development-is-Protective-of-Public-Health.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Study-no-health-concerns-associated-with-the-Barnett-Shale-development.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Study-Shows-Childhood-Cancer-Rates-Not-Impacted-by-Oil-and-Gas-Operations.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Who-Says-There-Are-No-Natural-Gas-Health-Studies.pdf

Worker Safety

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Worker-Safety.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Oil-and-Gas-Worker-safety.pdf

Compensation Plan

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Compensation-Plan1.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Public-Sector-Employees-as-percent-of-all-Employees.pdf

Environmental Impacts

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Environmental-Impacts1.pdf

Spill Reporting and Environmental Protection

laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/PDF/C-15.31.pdf

www.qp.alberta.ca/documents/Acts/E12.pdf

www.qp.alberta.ca/documents/Regs/1993_117.pdf

www.nrc-cnrc.gc.ca/eng/publications/codes_centre/2006_alberta_fire_code.html

laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/PDF/T-19.01.pdf

www.bclaws.ca/Recon/document/ID/freeside/03053_00

www.bclaws.ca/Recon/document/ID/freeside/46_263_90

www.saskspills.ca/PDF/d14r1-env_spill_control_regs.pdf

www.environment.gov.sk.ca/adx/asp/adxGetMedia.

Water Usage

www.capp.ca/publications-and-statistics/publications/218142

www.bcogc.ca/public-zone/water-information

www.ptac.org/projects/42

Fracking Technology

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Just-the-Facts.pdf

water.epa.gov/type/groundwater/uic/class2/hydraulicfracturing/wells_hydrowhat.cfm

energyindepth.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/Real-facts-behind-fracture-stimulation-technology.pdf

energyindepth.org/docs/pdf/Hydraulic-Fracturing-3-E's.pdf

geothermal.inel.gov/publications/future_of_geothermal_energy.pdf

www.ucalgary.ca/utoday/issue/2014-05-07/researchers-bring-unique-canada-perspective-hydraulic-fracturing

www.capp.ca/publications-and-statistics/publications/218125

www.oilandgasinfo.ca/fracopedia/hydraulic-fracturing-explained/

www.scek.ca/sites/default/files/documents/ra2011-03modern-practices-fracturingfinal-28verion-2-nov-201229.pdf

Shale Gas/Natural Gas

www.api.org/Policy-and-Issues/Policy-Items/Exploration/Facts_About_Shale_Gas

www.eia.gov/dnav/ng/ng_prod_wells_s1_a.htm

www.capp.ca/publications-and-statistics/publications/217568

www.capp.ca/publications-and-statistics/statistics

www.iea.org/

www.capp.ca/canadian-oil-and-natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas-development

Biased Science

energyindepth.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/EID-New-York-Fracking-Ban.pdf

energyindepth.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/EID_Howarth_fact_sheet5.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/AP-news-story-about-bad-science-by-K.-Begos.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/EID-letter-to-Josh-Fox-Aug.-2012.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Errors-from-Start-to-Finish-in-Center-for-Public-Integrity.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Five-Facts-about-Ingraffea-and-Howarth.pdf <http://nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Fracking-Activists-letter-debunked.pdf>

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Major-Research-Gaps-in-New-Groundwater-Study1.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/New-Air-Quality-Report-Uses-Scientifically-Dubious-Methods.pdf <http://nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/New-Report-Sets-the-Record-Straight-on-Safe-Fracking-in-North-Carolina.pdf>

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Science-and-Ingraffeas-Natural-Gas-Emission-Study.pdf

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Just-the-Facts.pdf

Newfoundland West Coast

NI 51-101 Resource Evaluation West Coast NL Exploration Licenses 1070 & 1120

nlhfrp.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/NI-51-101-Resource-Evaluation-West-Coast-NL-Exploration-Licenses-1070-1120.pdf

Additional Websites

Fracfocus: www.fracfocus.ca

Energy from Shale: www.energyfromshale.org

Ground water protection: council www.gwpc.org

Canadian Society for Unconventional Resources: www.csur.com

Shale Resource Centre: www.shaleresourcecenter.ca

Energy in Depth: www.energyindepth.org

Study Fracking: www.studyfracking.com

Environmental Protection Agency: www.epa.gov

Independent Petroleum Producers of America: www.ipaa.org

Canadian Energy Research Institute CERI: www.ceri.ca