

To:
European Parliament
The President of European Parliament
Rue Wiertz, B-1047 Bruxelles

Petition from Barlad citizens, on Romanian Govern granting the exploration and exploitation permits for shale gas on Barlad area

Addressed by: Citizens in Barlad
Name: Georgeta Elisabeta Ionescu
Nationality: Romanian
Adress: Calea Serban Voda 256, bl.13, sc B, ap 47, sector 4, Bucuresti, ROMANIA

Citizens in Barlad, Romania considering our right to a healthy and secure environment as granted by the Constitution of Romania¹ and our rights as European Citizens to public health and civil rights protection aiming the participatory democratic process are addressing to the European Parliament, to safeguard our rights, with the present petition.

On our way to clear out the future of our community in regard with the decisions taken by Romanian Government to promote the exploitation of shale gas in our region, without having inform us or local authorities, without public consultation or even answering our entitled questions on this issue, we express our opinion, supported by more than 21.700 people in Barlad, and ask the Committee on Petitions and the European Parliament, to clarify our concerns and take all further necessary actions in preserving our region as safe and health secured for human life and environment. The Directive providing for public participation in respect of the drawing up of certain plans and programs relating to the environment (2003/35/EC) needs to be enforced. This is an emergency for Romania, where the Governmental decisions in the field of natural resources management strongly conflict with the Aarhus Convention and the Lisbon Treaty requirements for public participation in decision making.

When discussions started on the possible shale gas exploitation in Romania, spirits were highly inflamed and still continue to burn, as the battle between environmentalists, citizens, NGOs on the one hand and corporations, lobbyists and even government on the other hand, is continuously underway. In Bârlad this issue has caught people's attention a bit more than in other parts of the country, partly due to the fact that local authorities initially supported the debates (being politically in the opposition when debate started). Media coverage was provided mainly by the Civil Society Initiative Group of Bârlad (abbreviated CSIGB), by VIRA Association, by the local media. Bârlad residents and nearby villages inhabitants were more receptive to this issue which is likely to have a stronger direct impact on their lives.

The central issue in our debate over the environmental aspect of shale drilling is whether its risks are known and assumed. Long-term underground chemical injections are extremely harmful and poisonous; infesting deep aquifers and groundwater, and potentially polluting water supplies,

1 ARTICOLUL 35, CONSTITUȚIA ROMÂNIEI

(1) Statul recunoaște dreptul oricărei persoane la un mediu înconjurător sănătos și echilibrat ecologic.

(2) Statul asigură cadrul legislativ pentru exercitarea acestui drept.

(3) Persoanele fizice și juridice au îndatorirea de a proteja și a ameliora mediul înconjurător.

while the operations at ground level affect the soil too. In addition, the process needs enormous quantities of water that is currently used for agriculture and social needs, and became a scarce resource in our area during last decades. But the real danger is a possible irreversible ecological catastrophe. The practice of injecting water into deep rock formations may also cause earthquakes, and our area is one with frequent minor tremors, in connection with the seismic active Vrancea region, where the most earthquakes in Romania were registered during last decades, some of them with high intensity.

The expected shale gas exploitation in Romania **was kept secret to public, since the responsible Romanian authorities decided that concession for generic “exploration and exploitation” works to be entirely classified, although information on environmental protection is of public interest** and any license on land and underground use issued by the National Authority on Mineral Resources (NARM) should be accompanied by a compulsory detailed study on environmental protection.

The first public information on any shale gas further development was acknowledged by Romanian media based declarations of the representatives of oil Companies, directly involved in this business, in mid-2011². As for Barlad, it was firstly Chevron representative George Kirkland, Vice Chairman and Executive Vice President of the company, that in December 2011, declared the company has interest in exploiting four blocks in Romania, covering 2.1 million acres. He identified **Barlad Block** and Blocks 17, 18 and 19 in South Romania - Dobrogea area, as future growth opportunities³. Even when public information was requested, Romanian Authorities remained ambiguous or did not even answer (see Annex 2 with our requests, and Annex 3 with the received answers).

We, the citizens of Bârlad, strongly consider that Romania, as member state must strictly comply with EU regulations, and should not allow itself engage into such a partnership with oil companies without any prior public debates and maximum transparency.

It is publicly, that Romania currently has no specific legislation in place on shale gas (industry is still at an early stage), and instead uses the same laws that apply to its conventional oil & gas sector - Oil Law no. 238/2004. Currently oil accords and exploration licenses in Romania were **fully classified by the Govern under Oil Law no. 238/2004.** Even though, **entirely classification of the licensed agreements is not justified**, considering art. 203 lit. b) GD. 585/2002 on national standards for the protection of classified information expressly prohibits corpus classification of contracts / agreements. In this sense, Art. 203 lit. b) of G.D. 585/2002 demands: "*b) classification applies only to those parts of the contract to be protected*".

²<http://www.zf.ro/business-international/viitorul-energiei-e-in-gazul-din-pietre-asa-numitul-gaz-de-sist-americanii-de-la-exxon-mobile-si-chevron-foreaza-in-europa-de-est-polonia-are-rezerve-pentru-300-de-ani-de-consum-8325265/>

³ <http://www.balkans.com/open-news.php?uniquenumber=128606>

Besides Chevron, Hungary's MOL and Canada's East West Petroleum also have struck drilling agreements with NAMR and are awaiting government approval. Canadian company Sterling Resources which has licenses to explore conventional gas reserves in Romania, has said it will use the same blocks to look for shale gas.

For our region Barlad, the Romanian Govern issued a “*Concession Agreement for exploration, development and exploitation of perimeter oil in EV-2 Barlad concluded between the National Agency for Mineral Resources, as grantor, and Regal Petroleum, as concessionaire*” (Annex 1 with publicly available Govern Decisions on licenses for shale gas). The agreement was approved by Govern Decision no. 2283 of 09.12.2004, published in Official Gazette on 04.01.2005, which is strictly confidential although in regard with public interest, as human health and environment protection.

Further on, this license was then taken in 2009 by Chevron Company that in late 2011 had publicly announced, they intend to develop works for shale gas here.

When examining the contents of the Fundamenting Notes of Government Decisions on more recent licensing permits in: Vama Veche or Adamclisi, issued on March 22 2012 and attached in Annex1 (see the procedure below⁴), the conclusion is that the law initiator did not want to consider its obligations as well, and therefore the latter were ignored. It is noteworthy that the vising institutions have also taken the same attitude, including the Ministry of Environment.

According to environment laws⁵, the environmental information must be made public, at the request of those concerned, and that did not actually happen.

In order to adopt such Government Decisions, it should be mandatory to:

- discuss with the civil society: interested citizens, NGOs, academics, professional associations;
- inform and discuss with the local authorities from the areas where land was conceded;

4 According to NAMR webpage, the licensing Regime in Romania consists of:

The Ministry of Industry and Resources has responsibility for petroleum policy and strategy. The National Agency for Mineral Resources (NAMR) was set up in 1993 to administer and regulate petroleum operations. When licenses are made available, NAMR publishes a list of available blocks for concession in the Official Gazette. Foreign and Romanian companies must register their interest by a specified date and must submit applications by an application deadline. Applicants are required to prove their financial capacity, technical expertise, and other stipulated requirements. The licensing rounds are competitive and the winning bid is based on a scoring system. NAMR negotiates the terms of agreements granting the licenses with the winning licensee and the license agreement is then submitted to the government for its approval. The date of government approval is the effective date of the license. Blocks which fail to attract a prescribed level of bids are re-offered in a subsequent licensing round. NAMR may issue a prospecting permit or a **petroleum concession**. A prospecting permit is for the conduct of geological mapping, magnetometry, gravimetry, seismology, geochemistry, remote sensing, and drilling of wildcat wells in order to determine the general geological conditions favoring petroleum accumulations. **A petroleum concession provides exclusive rights to conduct petroleum exploration and production under a petroleum agreement.**

5 Specifications in compliance with:

1. Provisions of article 6 of Law 52/2003 on decisional transparency in public administration: the Government Decision project was to be published on the website of the competent authority, MECMA-ANRM, for public debate, except for information strictly on geological reserves and fund data, which are classified (acc. Article 4 of the Oil Law no. 238/2004, taken from the Law 23/1971 of the communist regime).
2. Provisions of the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, signed in Aarhus on 25th June 1998, ratified by Law no. 86/2000. As follows: Article 20 (1) The competent authority for environmental protection, together with other central public administration authorities and local authorities, as appropriate, are to provide public information and participation in decisions on specific activities and access to justice ...
3. Emergency Ordinance no. 195 of 22nd December 2005 on environmental protection: (3) Public consultation is mandatory in the case of procedures for issuing regulatory acts. Procedure for public participation in decision-making is established by specific legislation.
4. Law no. 265 of 29th June 2006 approving Government Emergency Ordinance no.195/2005 on environmental protection.

- undertake an assessment of the environmental impact;
- obtain a prior consent of the competent authority in water management.

In accordance with article 19, paragraph 5 of the Mining Law nr.85/2003, republished, when approving the Government Decision for land concession, it was necessary to previously obtain "the approval from the water management authority".

Given the impact of the categories of specific works deal out, according to the provisions of the Government Emergency Ordinance no.195/2005, the environmental impact assessment and the discussion with the residents are required both in the exploration and in the exploitation stage.

Our group, as well as many other citizens from Barlad, has made numerous requests to the authorities in order to obtain information on these permits and works (Annex 2), but their answers were vague, while the Government Decision for land concession around Barlad is still kept secret by the authorities.

By comparing to the **legal status of Barlad concession**, the other three licenses granted to the same company: EX - 18 VAMA VECHE, concluded between the National Agency for Mineral Resources (NAMR) as grantor, and Chevron Romania Holding BV, as a concessionaire agreement approved by G.D. no. 188 of 20.03.2012 (published in Official Gazette of 03/28/2012), EX - 19 ADAMCLISI between the NAMR, and Chevron Romania Holding BV, approved by GD no. 189 of 20.03.2012 (published in Official Gazette of 03/28/2012) and EX - 17 COSTINEȘTI concluded between the NAMR, and Chevron Romania Holding BV, approved by GD no. 190 of 20.03.2012 (published in Official Gazette of 03/28/2012) **were also confidential initially when they were granted** on March 3th, 2012.

We should add that all four publicly recognized shale gas permits granted under same procedure, and the previous granted other permits, have **identical and extremely sketchy and vague provisions** (See the Govern decisions attached to the petition as *Annex 1*).

It was under the pressure of public protests in Barlad on 26th April that gathered about 7.000 people, when NAMR published some parts of the petroleum agreements signed up with Chevron Company on the three blocks from Dobrogea: Adamclisi, Vama Veche and Costinesti (Annex 3). Even though, **ANRM did not make public the Barlad concession agreement (which is the most controversial and the largest in extent).**

For all these reasons mentioned above, the civil society representatives from Barlad, by gathering informing documents on this subject and after discussing with independent experts (Prof. Dr. Vlad Codrea, Mrs. Georgeta Elisabeta Ionescu- geologist and legal expert, author of a recent paper on shale gas potential in Romania⁶), tried to obtain relevant information and to organize local informing and awareness campaign, as follows:

- In January 2012, when finding out about the intention to implement shale gas exploitation, several NGOs and citizens concerned with the environment and its problems took militant attitude. At first their actions were weak, chaotic, and specific to a civil society without previous comparable experiences. An initiative group took shape in Bârlad, consisting of 15 people who started informing the other people in the area.
- On March 2nd, in the City Hall boardroom, around 80 people gathered and wrote a letter to the Prime Minister at that time: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YTLuC6AH9Ts>

6 Georgeta Ionescu: Shale Gas - A New Challenge, August 2012, edit. Alma-ro
http://issuu.com/alma-ro/docs/brosura_gaze_de_sist

- Then the initiative group was restructured and took the name of Civil Society Initiative Group of Bârlad, (CSIGB), and an online⁷ petition was set up in order to gather signatures to stop shale gas exploitation in Romania. Now the online petition has the support of over 8,000 citizens of who most are people living or originate from areas subject to exploitation.

- We began collecting signatures directly in the information and awareness campaigns, currently over 21.700 citizens of Bârlad and residents of neighboring villages signed the petition and the lists of signatures are attached to this file.

- On March 22nd the first public march was organized in Bârlad; the number of participants exceeded any other event in the country and was a major milestone in the series of civic actions against shale gas exploitation (see here all the march and what the people ask):

<http://www.b-o.ro/Evenimente-798->

[INTEGRAL Revolutia de la Bârlad MITING anti gaze de sist prin metoda fractionarii hidraulice PROCLAMATIA de la Bârlad.html](http://www.b-o.ro/Evenimente-798-)

- CSIGB continued to visit towns and villages in Vaslui County, where we conducted informing activities in churches and community centers;

- On April 26th the second large march was organized, with as many participants as previously, this time with the participation of citizens from villages all over Vaslui County and also from other regions of the country, see here the entire meeting protest:

http://www.b-o.ro/Evenimente-877-Mii_de_oameni_in_strada_la_Bârlad_la_cel_de-al_doilea_miting_impotriva_exploatarii_gazelor_de_sist.html

Despite the fact that 4.000 than 7.000 people were protesting, no representative of the central Govern did responded to our request for dialog.

CSIGB's work focused primarily on public information and participation to meetings, collecting signatures against shale gas exploitation, filling in petitions and drawing letters to state institutions, signed by thousands of people. We aimed to inform the public about the risks involved. We have sent public information requests and open letters to the Prime Minister of Romania, Parliament and the President of the National Agency for Mineral Resources, and other Ministries asking them to inform us with their decisions and to cancel the plans for shale gas through hydraulic fracturing, as there is no proper legislation in place (Annex 2).

We were also present, through our representatives, on TV and radio debates, both regionally and nationally, on the subject of shale gas, and organized press conferences, interviews and articles in local and national media. We are present on social media as well. Then on September 7th, 2012 have organize a third protest as the *Silent March*, see coverage on: <http://forum.b-o.ro/photo/thumbnails.php?album=732>

Although we were not invited (we wonder why?) we attended, the **public informing roundtable on the "Impact of the extraction of natural gas from gas-bearing clays on the area of Vaslui county" –which aimed to achieve an unnoticed "public consultation"** in the attempt to fulfill the necessary requirements for passing on to the exploration stage. Moreover, CSIGB together with "Romania Dreapta" NGO, sued the Romanian government on this issue of land concession contracts and requesting cancellation of the exclusive exploration licenses that use this method. Thousands of citizens of Bârlad have thus become part of a collective trial, a trial that is ongoing.

⁷ http://www.petitiononline.com/nu_vrem_exploatarea_gazelor_de_sist_in_romania_prin_fractionare_h

Through focus groups on social media, we also keep in touch with other organizations and individuals fighting against shale gas exploitation. Last but not least, we would like to help create initiative groups in other cities as well, to inform people about the impact of shale gas exploitation on ecosystems and to organize actions on this issue.

This should be a brief presentation of CSIGB activity on awareness and mobilization.

We know that on 9th October the Committee on Petitions of the European Parliament organized a workshop and discussed about the future of Europe in the context of shale gas extraction and use on the old continent. We also know that University Prof. Dr. Nicolae Anastasiu from the University of Bucharest represented at that meeting for the interests of the extractive industry, specified in his writings, as it is well-known by the general public in Romania as a great partisan and in favor of shale gas extraction.

Given the important impact that this industry may have on our region as well as our continent with a high population density, considering the regional geotectonic with seismic actively potential and not least our need for a clean environment, on a country already prejudiced by heavy pollution, nothing recommends hydraulic fracturing use in our region. What it aims is a feeble potential and lack long-term results. The positive aspects of shale gas extraction cannot in the least cover the damage that these exploitations have already caused worldwide.

Is it of no importance that the negative effects of such extraction led to the largest environmental fines ever? Not to mention the Europeans' opposing attitude.

Is it that human life is no longer important in this confrontation generated by the energy rush, but mainly by the rush for profit?

We are all quite aware of the financial power of the oil companies and their lobby including at EU⁸ institutions to open as many exploitations as possible – after all it's all about profit, not charity or concern for humans or the environment - but we, as volunteers, represent people who value life and now feel vulnerable, because no one defends them in a world enslaved by money and economic interests, in such an unbalanced struggle as that between citizens and big oil companies.

Even if University Prof. Dr. Anastasiu comes from Romania and officially supports shale gas exploitation unconditionally, we would not like you to understand that in Romania there aren't also enough organizations and individuals who oppose this openly and explicitly. The presentation of CSIGB and their actions show that in Bârlad **thousands of people fear for their future and for their children's future**, and they do not want to reach even the exploration stage, as it uses same technology at a certain stage. We all put our whole trust and hope in the competence and good faith of the members of the European Commission on Petitions, but please listen to our voice, too.

Aware of all the risks for human health and the environment, we watched with great concern the debates organized by your Commission⁹, and we wish to inform you that we do not agree with starting unconventional gas exploitation in Romania with the proposed technology yet; we want to keep the environment clean, an environment in which we the people, who live in the areas targeted by shale gas exploitation, can keep enjoying healthy and sustainable living, our nature, clean water and air.

8 Foot on the gas, lobbyists push for unregulated shale gas, Corporate Europe Observatory, November 2012. See: http://corporateeurope.org/sites/default/files/publications/Article_Shale%20Gas%20Lobby_final.pdf

9 <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/committees/en/peti/events.html?id=workshops#menuzone>

For all those mentioned above, and due to the facts that:

1. At present, Romania has only laws for land concession applicable to exploration and exploitation of oil and gas in conventional reservoirs. "Shale gas" is in the unconventional category for which the National Agency for Mineral Resources has no applicable law¹⁰, a fact acknowledged by officials from this authority¹¹ when abroad, visiting USA. According to the current law on oil and its rules of application, the land lease for exploration and exploitation is for 30 years. Considering that Romania does not currently have adequate consolidated legislation regarding shale gas, neither can it be determined without further studies and objectives, we believe that the risks are too high and that no amount of money or any other material compensation can possibly repair the wasted lives and destroyed environment. **Therefore we ask the European Parliament to immediately secure measures appropriate to the risks to which EU citizens and environment are subject when granting permits to, and using, hydraulic fracturing.**

2. Under the provisions of the Implementing Rules of the Oil Law (Government Decision no.2075/ 2004) in Romania, an offer is declared a winner based on the following: analysis of the environmental impact and its recovery program, while, on the other hand, all normative acts aimed at changing environmental conditions must be subject to public informing. **We actually see that this information was and still is classified**, violating the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, signed in Aarhus on 25th June 1998, ratified in Romania by Law no. 86/2000, as well as other national regulations. **We request that Romanian government to declassify the Barlad concession license and to make it public as it has a direct impact on the environment and possibly human health and public participation requirements should apply to all shale gas project permitting procedures.**

3. According to the present Romanian laws - Government Decision no.1213/ 2006 regarding the setup of a framework procedure for environmental impact assessment for certain public and private projects, Annex 1, paragraph 2.2., an evaluation on environment impact is required when only a well's production overcomes 500.000 cm per day that may not cover all shale gas projects as the amount extracted per day might be lower. Even Directive 97/11/EC amending the EIA Directive in Annex I, defines a threshold of 500,000 m³ daily extraction rate for natural gas wells above which an Environmental Impact Assessment is compulsory. **This current limit is too high, unrealistic compared to the risks and ignores the reality of the wells, their production being initially of few tens of thousands of cubic meters per day.**

¹⁰http://newsandinsight.thomsonreuters.com/Legal/News/2012/01_-_January/Factbox__Legal_status_of_shale_gas_in_key_countries/

¹¹ <http://www.balkans.com/open-news.php?uniquenumber=128606>

and

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/12/02/energy-shale-romania-idUSL5E7N21Z320111202>

Exploitation of shale gas does not reach this threshold by far, and therefore EIAs are not to be carried out.

An evaluation on environment together with the citizens should be mandatory for each well. The regional authorities should have the right to forbid hydraulic fracturing activities in sensitive areas (areas of protection of drinking water, villages, organic agriculture land, protected areas, etc.).

More, the regional authorities should have a greater autonomy in deciding the forbidding or authorization of hydraulic fracture on their territory.

Therefore, we ask the European Parliament to consider uniform measures, consistent with the real risks and to the prevention principle, than integrated pollution prevention and control¹². We consider that an Environmental Impact Assessment should become mandatory for any work that is further based on hydraulic fracturing that has significant effect on the environment and residents, and public consultation as integrated stage into authorization procedure.

4. We know that in the U.S.A., these exploitations were encouraged when hydrocarbon industry activities with hydraulic fracturing was exempt from the provisions of the "Safe Drinking Water Act" as legalized with the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

Sustainability is essential for future generations, **so we believe that it should not be allowed to inject hazardous / toxic chemicals in the underground because such a practice may restrict or prevent any future use of the contaminated layer** (for example, for geothermal purposes) and its effects on the medium and long term have not been studied yet. The cumulative impact of exploration and exploitation works will **restrict other traditional economic activities in the area, such as agriculture, thus jeopardizing sustainable development** of our towns, and causing inhabitants to lose their jobs. Our ecosystems will be dramatically and irreparably damaged. We want Europe to remain the cradle of civilization and not become a desert, at the price of the Europeans' health and life, and of biodiversity as well.

We as European citizens would like to acknowledge the strategic vision of the European Parliament on fresh water management in European Union, given that some countries like Romania have been facing a steady tendency of decreasing freshwater resources in the past years.

5. The impact of this method as water footprint is well-known, as it is huge, given that significant quantities of fresh water (at average quantity as 15.000 cubic meters per well) that are **removed from the existing reserves, and of these an important part (which remains stored underground and can reach up to 60-70% of the injected fluid) is permanently removed from the natural water cycle**. Water is the resource without which life cannot exist. **We request a sustainable water usage, and express our concern that shale gas exploitation in our region will lead to depletion of water resources, already so limited. We address the Committee to ask the competent national State authorities to inform us which is actually the source of water to be used in hydraulic fracturing in our Barlad area, considering that for the other permits issued in Dobrogea and later partly de-classified, it was stipulated for oil companies full access to any available source of fresh water in the area, with no distinct reference to Article**

¹² As the EIA Directive is under consideration for revision, projects including hydraulic fracturing should be added to Annex I independently of a production threshold or the threshold value should be lowered (e.g. to 5,000 or 10,000 m³ per day of initial extraction volume) in order to close this gap.

11(3)(e) of the Water Framework Directive 2000/60/EC. We addressed similar direct requests to NAMR, Environment Agency and National Water Administration and Ministry of Environment, but they were not answered.

6. Considering that in our region **there are no industrial facilities for cleaning the fluids used in the hydraulic fracturing process**, and the local water treatment plant in the town Barlad hardly meet the needs of the residents, while **in rural areas there are no such facilities**, these fluids would be pumped into special injection wells and stored as toxic waste (as it is done in many cases in the U.S. and it was deliberated as possible in the agreements licensed for Dobrogea mentioned above). **We consider that the deep injection of toxic residual fluids used in fracking is a crime against our environment, which will affect people and ecosystems on the medium and long term and should trigger seismic activity in this already active region. That is why we definitely express our position against such a procedure in our region. We ask the Committee to request further clarifications from the national competent authorities of Romania on the currently waste water management in Romania and the compliance to EU Directives i.e. on Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC), Ground Water Directive and Waste framework Directive.**

Moreover our concern is related to the management of the huge quantities of waste water from hydraulic fracturing (if it is to be allowed in our region): as there is no industrial treatment plant for waste water in our region, and even waste water from the householders is under 50% processed in water treatment plants in the country.

Examination of the capacity of waste water facilities in the country and region should be taken prior any hydraulic fracturing approval in place.

7. In regard with toxicological assessments of chemicals used in hydraulic fracturing, we are **asking the European Parliament to provide to the public a clear and exhaustive list of widely European accepted type¹³, quantity and concentration of chemicals used.**

We also demand regulations on the mechanism of monitoring, control and supervision of toxic chemical used in hydraulic fracturing operations. Cumulative effects of multiple installations, which are typical for unconventional gas activities should be considered, and also regulating the **abandoned wells monitoring with adequate guarantees for prompt and effective interventions in post operating phases.**

8. Last but not least, this technique will produce large amounts of methane to be released into the atmosphere, and the amount of pollution produced throughout the life cycle of the exploitation will accelerate climate change¹⁴, which is a worrying factor in the region, given the drought that we have experienced in recent years. **We would like to know what are the measures foreseen by the European Parliament to compensate for the greenhouse effect and to prevent climate change**, due to the expected impact of shale gas exploitation both in our country and in other member states. Even if the exploitations are local, their impact on climate is regional and global.

¹³ As far as the names provided by industry are not always unique, which introduces ambiguities that possibly lead to significant uncertainties in the toxicological assessment, clear and transparent procedure of identification should be considered.

¹⁴ http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/package/index_en.htm

We want a sustainable future development, to preserve our jobs in agriculture and local industry, and all these are put on danger by large scale use of hydraulic fracturing. Our community is interested in promoting future energy investments in the region directed exclusively towards renewable energy sources, in order to have a sustainable development which will not deplete local resources. **European Union can shift from fossil fuels to renewable energy by 2020 if EU regulators adopt the right public policies.**

We as European citizens, ask the European Parliament to take all necessary measures to safeguard our common future and adopt the necessary and emergency regulations in the wide interest of the citizens and public interest and for our sustainable common future.

Considering these justified reasons, and consequent with the *Proclamation issued by Barlad citizens*¹⁵ on March 22, **we request for a ban on hydraulic fracturing.** If this will not get consensus at EU level, than we need a **real**¹⁶ **moratorium on hydraulic fracturing activities in EU** until enough safety measure are provided regarding the safety of our health and environment.

This petition has attached:

Annex 1: Including the Govern Decisions on Agreements license

Annex 2: Petitions and public information requests addressed to national authorities

Annex 3: Answers received from public legal entities

Annex 4: The Barlad Proclamation, on 22 March 2012

Annex 5: Signatures of people in Barlad and neighboring communities, against hydraulic fracturing (*sent by mail direct to PETI Committee*)

Date: 18th November 2012

Civil Society Initiative Group of Bârlad - CSIGB

Contacts:

Mrs. Georgeta Elisabeta Ionescu

Telephone: +40 728 220 300

E-mail: igeorgeta@yahoo.com

Mr. Gabriel Mylan Sava

Telephone: +40 728 004 049

E-mail: milanexpert@yahoo.com

¹⁵ Annex 4, Public Proclamation made on the protest meeting on 22 March in Barlad city.

¹⁶ A moratorium is in place since May when at the vote of confidence in Parliament, the newly Prime Minister included Shale gas issue in his political declaration. In fact no Official Governmental or Parliamentary decision was not transposed into legislation. A clear decision was postponed after 9th December elections, 2012.