

From: [Sunset Advisory Commission](#)
To: [Janet Wood](#)
Subject: FW: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)
Date: Monday, August 22, 2016 3:47:28 PM

-----Original Message-----

From: sundrupal@capitol.local [<mailto:sundrupal@capitol.local>]
Sent: Monday, August 22, 2016 2:39 PM
To: Sunset Advisory Commission
Subject: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)

Agency: RAILROAD COMMISSION TEXAS RRC

First Name: adam

Last Name: baker

Title:

Organization you are affiliated with:

Email:

City: houston

State: Texas

Your Comments About the Staff Report, Including Recommendations Supported or Opposed:

I support that commissioners must have no direct or indirect interest in any regulated entity as well as limits on campaign contributions, with a prohibition on corporate contributions.

I support changing the totally misleading name to something that reflects its true function.

I support higher bonding requirements, especially for horizontal wells, and additional bonding requirements such as surface bonds to protect surface owners from damage. Permitting fees are significantly higher in some states and, as with bonding requirements, are designed to place the financial burdens on industry rather than the public, and take into account economic gain from noncompliance. The stated policy regarding penalties in many states is to set them high enough to ensure compliance in the first place and deter future violations. All of these issues should be treated as the cost of doing business, and borne by industry.

I support implementing real performance measures that give us a true picture of what is really going on and establishing minimum inspector-to-well ratio.

The RRC lacks sufficient inspectors to inspect each well even once a year; they need to impose an annual inspection fee to help cover the additional costs necessary to carry out their mandated duty to protect public health and the environment.

I'm opposed to allowing another 12 years without review of an agency wholly unable to demonstrate that it is carrying out its mandated responsibilities.

There is an astounding lack of transparency, performance measures are nearly non-existent and their website is full of misleading statistics.

The lack of acknowledgment or studies of problems associated with oil and gas development by the RRC is unconscionable and the limited opportunities for public participation as well as not having an environmental advocate at the RRC only exacerbate this heated issue.

Any Alternative or New Recommendations on This Agency: Place an environmental advocate at the RRC

My Comment Will Be Made Public: I agree