To: Montgomery, Michael[Montgomery.Michael@epa.gov]; Albright, David[Albright.David@epa.gov]; Torres, Tomas[Torres.Tomas@epa.gov]
Cc: Strauss, Alexis[Strauss.Alexis@epa.gov]; Keener, Bill[Keener.Bill@epa.gov]; Zito, Kelly[ZITO.KELLY@EPA.GOV]
From: Maier, Brent
Sent: Thur 5/5/2016 6:51:51 PM
Subject: FW: response - Technical assistance request -- exempt aquifers
ta_aquifer_exempt_5-5-16.pdf

Please see attached response with regard to technical assistance on exempt aquifers.

Brent Maier

Congressional Liaison

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX

75 Hawthorne St. (OPA-3)

San Francisco, CA 94105

Ph: 415.947.4256

From: Spraul, Greg
Sent: Thursday, May 05, 2016 11:44 AM
To: Walsh, Ed <Walsh.Ed@epa.gov>
Cc: Strauss, Alexis <Strauss.Alexis@epa.gov>; Maier, Brent <Maier.Brent@epa.gov>; Osborne, Howard <Osborne.Howard@epa.gov>; Bloom, David <Bloom.David@epa.gov>; Fontaine, Tim <Fontaine.Tim@epa.gov>; Blizzard, James <Blizzard.James@epa.gov>
Subject: response - Technical assistance request -- exempt aquifers

Ed,

We worked with our HQ and regional offices on the attached response to the request from HAC.

Greg Spraul

Acting Associate Director
Resource Management Staff

Office of Water

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Email: spraul.greg@epa.gov
Direct:(202) 564-0255

From: Walsh, Ed
Sent: Wednesday, April 27, 2016 3:22 PM
To: Strauss, Alexis <Strauss.Alexis@epa.gov>; Maier, Brent <Maier.Brent@epa.gov>; Blizzard, James <Blizzard.James@epa.gov>; Fontaine, Tim <Fontaine.Tim@epa.gov>
Cc: Bloom, David <Bloom.David@epa.gov>; Osborne, Howard <Osborne.Howard@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Technical assistance request -- exempt aquifers

Alexis, Brent

Just got this request from Jason on the CA exempt aquifer issue. Looks like he is floating some language he was asked to consider

Also circling in Tim in OW and Jim in OCIR. I think the best way to answer this type of question is to do a one pager like the senate has asked for in their "capabilities drill". Happy to send you format etc….

Thanks

Ed

From: Gray, Jason [mailto:Jason.Gray@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, April 27, 2016 2:33 PM
To: Walsh, Ed <Walsh.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: Technical assistance request -- exempt aquifers

Hi Ed – We have been asked to consider some language regarding the ongoing exempt aquifer issue in California. The language, as I understand it, seeks to reaffirm the process and criteria EPA has outlined in its guidance documents as I gather there may be some outside pressure to deviate from that. Could you share with the experts and provide feedback? Thank you

Jason

Bill Language:

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall work within the existing criteria and procedures for aquifer exemptions in the Underground Injection Control regulatory framework, in a collaborative manner with the States and regulated industries, to promptly review and make decisions on all aquifer exemption applications using the criteria for exempted aquifers set forth in 40 CFR 146.4 (as in effect on April 1, 2016). Consistent with EPA's Guidance for Review and Approval of State UIC Programs and Revisions to Approved State Programs, GWPB Guidance #34, the Administrator shall not use substantial program revisions for purposes of reviewing and making decisions on aquifer exemption applications involving underground injection authorized by permit, provided the injection is occurring into aquifers that meet the criteria for an exemption set forth in 40 CFR 146.4 and the recommendations of key State resource agencies are taken in account.

Report Language:

Exempt Aquifers.- Existing criteria and procedures for aquifer exemptions under EPA Underground Injection Control (UIC) regulations for all classes of injection wells are sufficiently flexible to address new and changed circumstances, including the

development of significant new information regarding what can or cannot reasonably be expected to serve as a source of drinking water. The Committee believes amendment to these criteria is not necessary or warranted. EPA is directed to work within the existing UIC regulatory framework, in a collaborative manner with the States, and the energy producing industry, and all other stakeholders that rely on UIC operations, to promptly review and process all aquifer exemption applications submitted to the Agency, including applications for Class II injection by permit, to ensure robust oil and natural gas production in the States as well as robust economic development. Consistent with EPA's Guidance for Review and Approval of State UIC Programs and Revisions to Approved State Programs, GWPB Guidance #34, substantial program revisions are not to be used for purposes of processing aquifer exemption applications involving Class II injection authorized by permit, provided the injection is occurring into aquifers that meet the criteria for an exemption set forth in 40 CFR 146.4 (as in effect on April 1, 2016), and the recommendations of key State resource agencies are taken in account.