

# Deep Drilling, Deep Pockets

Expenditures of the Natural Gas Industry in New York  
to Influence Public Policy

## Part II - Lobbying Expenditures

A Report by Common Cause/New York  
April 2011



74 Trinity Place, Suite 901  
New York, NY 10006  
[www.commoncause.org/ny](http://www.commoncause.org/ny)

*This report was prepared by Susan Lerner, Executive Director and Deanna Bitetti, Associate Director of Common Cause/NY with the assistance of Common Cause/NY intern Alex Turek.*

*We gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the Park Foundation, which made this series of reports possible.*

*Contact Susan Lerner or Deanna Bitetti with questions or for more information at 212-691-6421 or via email at*

***[SLerner@commoncause.org](mailto:SLerner@commoncause.org) or [DBitetti@commoncause.org](mailto:DBitetti@commoncause.org)***

*Layout and design done by: Danielle Mastrion*

## Executive Summary

The proposed use of hydro-fracturing to drill for natural gas in New York State remains highly controversial. To assist the public in monitoring the decision making process on hotly contested public policy, Common Cause/NY has continued and expanded its examination and evaluation of lobbying expenditures by entities who seek to influence this critical decision.

Recently, the new head of the Department of Environmental Conservation indicated that the department's review of the thousands of comments received to the proposed Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement regarding natural gas drilling is on track to permit the release of the Statement this coming summer. As in the last legislative session, numerous bills have already been introduced into the Legislature this year dealing with natural gas exploitation.

Industry and upstate landowners continue to press to be permitted to use the hydro-fracturing technology in New York State, particularly to unlock the natural gas found in the Marcellus Shale, citing job creation and the need for new energy sources. Environmental groups and others meanwhile urge caution, pointing to potential risks to New York's water, air and natural resources. All of this activity underscores the need for the public to monitor the state's decision-making process, to insure that the process is balanced and not driven by any particular special interest. The goal of the monitoring and of the process as a whole should be a policy that is adopted based on good science and an impartial weighing of the competing factors.

For this analysis, Common Cause/NY looked at the companies and entities whose lobbying reports identified activities relating to the two bills introduced into the 2009-2010 Legislature session that proposed imposing a moratorium on natural gas drilling in New York State, as a reasonable way to identify the companies and entities seeking to influence public policy relating to natural gas exploitation.

Analysis showed that the companies and entities which opposed a moratorium on natural gas drilling outspent those entities which supported the moratorium by a margin of 4 to 1. The trend we noted in our July 2010 report on lobbying expenditures in the first half of 2010, reflecting the precipitous rise of industry lobbying, slowed somewhat in the second half of 2010. Nevertheless, lobbying totals for 2010 reached historic highs for the natural gas industry. Because of the substantial amounts it spent for advertising, Chesapeake Appalachia, the nation's second largest producer of natural gas, was the biggest spender among industry advocates of hydro-fracturing, disclosing a total of \$1,090,051 spent lobbying in 2010. In contrast, the biggest spender among the groups that supported the moratorium, Citizens Campaign for the Environment, an entity which lobbies on numerous environmental issues, not only natural gas exploitation, spent \$159,232 lobbying in 2010.

Common Cause/NY also wants to emphasize that while natural gas industry groups such as Fortuna, IOGA and Chesapeake Appalachia have focused their lobbying efforts specifically at issues pertaining to natural gas extraction, environmental groups have been involved in lobbying on a plurality of issues. The significantly larger amount the organizations associated with natural gas interests spent lobbying reflects the great imbalance in resources at the disposal of the natural gas industry as compared to multi issue environmental lobby groups.

## Current Political Climate

Across the nation the natural gas “gold rush” has brought with it promises of a domestic clean energy source and an economic engine for growth, but cases of water contamination prompted Congress this year to revisit drilling using hydro-fracturing by requiring the Environmental Protection Agency to fund a new study of the technique.

In June 2009, Democratic members of Congress introduced a controversial piece of legislation that would amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to give the EPA authority over natural gas drilling. The Fracturing Responsibility and Awareness of Chemicals Act (FRAC Act) would require companies involved in drilling to divulge the chemicals used in the process making it easier for water contamination to be identified. The House bill was introduced by Maurice Hinchey (D, NY) and Jared Polis (D-Colorado) and the Senate companion bill was introduced by Senator Schumer (D-NY) and Sen. Bob Casey (D-Pa). The energy industry has vehemently fought to quash the bill, claiming that the FRAC Act would add more regulation to an industry that is already regulated by the states and increase costs to companies exorbitantly, having a detrimental effect on production and job creation.<sup>1</sup> But the rush in localities to drill for gas before the EPA study is completed creates confusion among ordinary taxpayers who wonder why the different levels of government and regulators are not coordinating and learning from each other’s evaluations. This is not to suggest that the EPA’s recommendations should substitute for analysis and evaluation by the other governmental bodies, but does raise serious questions about the various levels of government ability to actively engage with one another and share relevant information that has the potential to affect millions of individuals.

In New York State over thirty (30) bills were proposed in the past legislative session, including bills which looked to create various panels, commissions and task forces to investigate everything from environmental impact to economic benefit and 2 separate moratorium bills. Numerous bills on regulating hydrofracking have also been introduced in the current session so far. Industry has spent large amounts of money lobbying against the moratorium bills and waged a public relations campaign to convince the public of the benefits and safety of natural gas drilling. This has included rallies coordinated by local landowner associations, messaging geared at residents in upstate communities about the positive impacts of natural gas exploration and hosting conferences aimed at influencing policy makers. The amount of money spent on advertising skyrocketed in the latter half of 2009 and continued throughout 2010.

On August 3, 2010, amid growing public outcry over potential drilling, the New York State Senate overwhelmingly passed S8129B, by a vote of 48-9 which prohibits permits from being issued by the DEC before the SGEIS has been finalized. The bill passed the Assembly by a vote of 93-43 on November 30, 2010. On December 13, 2010, Governor Paterson vetoed S8129B while issuing an Executive Order prohibiting hydraulic fracturing of horizontally drilled wells until about July 1, 2011. With the Executive Order in place until July, 2011, Governor Andrew Cuomo is now at the forefront of the debate this year. As the highest ranking official to have decision making power over the DEC and who has the final say on whether to approve or veto a moratorium bill on hydro-fracturing in the state, the large influx of lobbying dollars spent by industry challenge any official’s ability to remain independent and impartial.

While the moratorium bill was pending in the Assembly, DEC Commissioner Pete Grannis, New York’s top environmental official, was dismissed by Governor Paterson because of a memo reflecting the growing frustration of DEC officials with the understaffing and underfunding of their agency that was leaked to the press.

The memo, a response to a request from the Governor's budget division to cut 209 staffers from the DEC by the end of the year, described the agency as weak and in many ways ineffective. "The risks to human health...have already increased with respect to enforcement activities related to pollution sources," wrote Grannis.<sup>ii</sup> According to an interview conducted by ProPublica shortly after his termination, Grannis stated that there would be a "direct link between the volume of drilling activity and the number of inspectors we [DEC] have to monitor that activity."<sup>iii</sup>

This year Governor Cuomo appointed Joseph Martens as the new Commissioner of the Department of Environmental Conservation. On February 8, 2011 during his testimony before State lawmakers on his budget recommendations for DEC, when asked about his position on hydro-fracturing, Martens responded that the State should wait for DEC to release its revised SGEIS draft for public comment<sup>iv</sup>. In a previous interview Martens told The Post-Standard that he believes the State should wait until the EPA study was completed before making any decisions regarding hydrofracturing.<sup>v</sup> Recently, in a March 31st interview with the Associated Press, Martens said "DEC staff will meet twice each week starting in early April and through the summer to complete a new environmental impact statement."<sup>vi</sup> That same day Norse Energy Corp, a natural gas entity with stake in the Marcellus Shale, issued a press release touting their meeting with Commissioner Martens shortly before he appeared on NPR's the Capitol Pressroom to discuss the issue and stating their confidence in gas drilling starting soon.<sup>vii</sup>

As a consequence, the natural gas debate has gained increased media and public attention, with front page investigative reporting pieces appearing in the New York Times as well as a recent editorial in the Times calling for a more deliberative approach and calling the rushed process for DEC to come up with a new SGEIS a "ridiculously short timeframe."<sup>viii</sup>

## Methodology:


Common Cause/NY accessed and obtained copies of the bi-monthly lobbying reports filed by the companies we had previously identified in our July, 2010 lobbying report. In that report, we analyzed the lobbyist expenditures of three natural gas companies from the year 2005 through the first half of 2010, as well as expenditures by five environmental groups. This report brings earlier data up to date with full year 2010 figures and expands our analysis to look more fully at lobbying expenditures spent lobbying in favor or opposition to two moratorium bills introduced last year. We examined the bi-monthly lobbying reports available for 2010 on the NY Commission for Public Integrity website in detail to compile the lobbying data for each company and entity identified as having lobbied on the moratorium bills introduced in the previous legislative session, S7592/ A10490 and S8129B/A1143B.

Introduced by Senator Addabbo and Assemblyman Englebright, S7592/A10490 sought to establish a state-wide moratorium on conducting hydraulic fracturing for the extraction of natural gas or oil until 120 days after United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issues its report on the safety and environmental impact of that technology. S8129B/A1143B, introduced by Senator Thompson, the then-chair of the Senate's Environmental Conservation Committee, and Assemblyman Sweeney, the chair of the parallel Assembly Environmental Conservation Committee, sought to place a one year moratorium on the awarding of new drilling permits and would prevent issuance of any permits for horizontal drilling which utilizes hydraulic fracturing in this state until May 15, 2011.

In this report we compare industry and organizational dollars spent on lobbying in favor or opposition to the passage of a moratorium bill on hydro-fracturing. We generated a list of the companies and organizations that lobbied against the moratorium from lobbying reports available on the NY Commission for Public Integrity. Anti-moratorium groups include industry entities such as Fortuna, Chesapeake, BP America, Sunoco, The Williams Companies and Shell Energy as well as trade associations such as the Independent Oil and Gas Association (IOGA), The American Association of Professional Landmen, The Business Council of NYS and the American Petroleum Institute, among others. On the pro moratorium side the list includes traditional environmental organizations such as Environmental Advocates of New York, the Sierra Club and The Natural Resources Defense Council, as well as other groups such as the Academy of Pediatrics, District II and Common Cause/NY. A complete list of the companies, organizations and associations whose disclosures list lobbying on the moratorium bills is found in the Appendix, along with short descriptions of the nature of the reporting entity. It is interesting to note that two groups included in Common Cause/NY's analysis on lobbying expenditures by the natural gas industry – Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC and the Business Council of NYS - were listed within the New York Public Integrity Research Group Top 25 Lobbyists in New York State.<sup>ix</sup>


### Natural Gas Industry Spending Hit New High in 2010

Three natural gas companies, Chesapeake Appalachia, Fortuna Energy and The Williams Companies, and the trade association which represents natural gas producers, Independent Oil and Gas Association of New York (IOGA) lobbied on the moratorium bills. Examination of their lobbying expenditures for the past five years, 2005 through 2010 shows a dramatic increase in lobbying expenditures in 2009 and 2010. In 2009, industry spent \$1,231,673 in lobbying, while lobbying expenditures in 2010 totaled \$1,564,428.




A more detailed analysis shows that while expenditures by IOGA remained relatively constant over the 5 year period, the precipitous jump in lobbying expenditures was caused by a dramatic increase in the amounts spent by Chesapeake Appalachia and Fortuna Energy in 2009 and 2010. Compared with spending in 2005, for example, Chesapeake spent \$1,158,961 more dollars lobbying in 2010.

Fortuna's expenditures increased \$54,070 from an average of \$30,000 during the years 2005-2007, with expenditures of \$84,070 for lobbying in 2008. Fortuna's spending on lobbying jumped by \$112,495 from 2008 to 2009, an increase dwarfed by the dramatic increase to \$211,316 in 2010 lobbying expenditures, an almost 100% increase.




In contrast when analyzing the total annual lobbying expenditures of five key environmental groups- Riverkeeper, The Sierra Club, Environmental Advocates of New York, Citizens Campaign for the Environment and Natural Resources Defense Council – the total amount spent was \$485,222. The three natural gas groups outspent these five environmental groups by \$1,079,206.




## Advertising by Chesapeake Fuels Dramatic Increase in Industry Lobbying Expenditures

The dramatic jump in total lobbying figures was fueled, in major part, by the high cost of grassroots advertising conducted by Chesapeake Appalachia. In the first half of 2010, Chesapeake spent an astounding \$836,386 on advertising to the public, an amount which fell to \$34,500 in the second half, while the amounts spent on hiring paid lobbyists to communicate directly with officials remained almost unchanged. Advertising expenditures included paying for billboard signs, TV Ads on the benefits of natural gas, and even a short film production.

**Expenditures of Chesapeake  
(January - June 2010)**




**Expenditures of Chesapeake  
(July - December 2010)**




As a result, Chesapeake catapulted into the top 25 highest lobbying spenders in New York State, as reported by the New York Public Interest Research group in 2010, placing it 18th on the NYPIRG list.<sup>x</sup>

The picture was similar in 2009, when Chesapeake was the 46th largest lobbying spender, according to NYPIRG.<sup>xi</sup> The big increase in Chesapeake's lobbying expenditures was fueled by \$262,652 spent on advertising in the 2nd half of the year out of total yearly lobbying expenditures of \$383,708: In December of 2009 for example they spent \$222,326 to run television ads on the benefits of natural gas.

**Expenditures of Chesapeake  
(January - June 2009)**



**Expenditures of Chesapeake  
(July - December 2009)**




## Powerful Interests Arrayed to Push Hydro-fracturing In New York State


Analysis of lobbying disclosures shows that it is not only the natural gas industry that is seeking to influence the state's policies regarding natural gas exploration. A powerful consortium of business groups allied with the natural gas industry to oppose the moratorium on hydro-fracturing. That consortium, made up of energy companies, business and professional associations in addition to natural gas companies spent a total of \$2,869,907 in lobbying expenditures last year.

The first two graphs reflect all associations and natural gas interests that lobbied in opposition to any of the moratorium bills S7592/ A10490 and S8129B/A1143B- introduced in the 2009-2010 legislative calendar. The involvement of The Business Council of New York State, which is the 20th largest lobbying spender in the aforementioned NYPIRG report, attests to the importance of this issue.

The involvement of powerful companies traditionally thought of as energy and oil interests such as BP America, Sunoco and Shell reflect a growing trend of large companies becoming more involved in the natural gas debate over regulation in New York State. The Williams Companies is a Texas based company and a major player in the Barnett Shale in northeast Texas that also has interests in the Marcellus Shale




Total Amount Spent 2010 = \$1,204,567




Total Amount Spent 2010 = \$1,665,340

## Environmental Groups Spent More Modestly

Analysis of the lobbying patterns of the five key environmental groups show a consistently more modest spending pattern. However, these groups also increased spending in 2009 and 2010 as the natural gas issue began to heat up and groups directed attention at pushing forward a moratorium. A look at the lobbying expenditures of environmental companies reflects a very different trend than those costs incurred by natural gas entities. While natural gas entities focus on advertising and direct lobbying, environmental groups, such as Citizens Campaign for the Environment, spent most of its increase in spending on staff compensation costs. Environmental Advocates of New York spent money on grassroots lobbying expenditures such as e-advocacy messages and their sister organization EPL spent money releasing Voter Guides.





The next graph represents all of the groups that have lobbied in support of any of the moratorium bills and represent a mix of environmental organizations, such as the Sierra Club and NRDC, political groups, such as the Working Families Party, good government groups, such as Common Cause/NY and a labor union. The two groups with the highest lobbying expenditures are Citizens Campaign for the Environment with a total of \$159,232 and Environmental Advocates of New York, with a total of \$145,748. The highest spender on the anti-moratorium side of the debate, Chesapeake Appalachia, spent \$1,085,333 on lobbying expenditures. This reflects the massive resources at the disposal of natural gas interests and the highly uneven balance that exists in regards to financial resources of the opposing sides in this debate.



Total Amount Spent 2010 = \$726.382

## Groups Supporting Moratorium Grossly Outspent by Those in Opposition

Groups lobbying in opposition to the moratorium bills grossly outspent those that lobbied in support. A total of \$2,869,907 was spent in 2010 by groups that opposed the moratorium, as compared to \$726,382 spent by groups supporting the moratorium, grossly outspending the opposing side by \$2,143,525 or four to one.



### Conclusion:

Care must be exercised by the officials who are responsible for New York State's policies covering this contentious issue. In reporting on lobbyist expenditures by groups lobbying the legislature and the Governor on decisions affecting natural gas drilling in NYS, we seek to shine a light on the large amounts of special interest money flooding our legislature. All of the organizations and associations included in this report – including Common Cause/NY -lobby on multiple issues, and most of the expenditures cannot be matched dollar for dollar to money spent on lobbying on these specific bills, the significantly larger amount the organizations associated with natural gas interests spent lobbying reflects the resources and income at their disposal to influence public policy decision making. It further reflects the growing need for special interest money to be countered by the grassroots involvement of an informed public.

## Appendix A: Please find descriptions of each of the entities mentioned in this report and their connection to natural gas.

### Natural Gas and Energy Companies

*Shell Energy North America* Shell Energy North America is the primary marketer of Shell's natural gas production in North America. Shell produces approximately 1.5 billion cubic feet (Bcf) of natural gas per day and is also a prominent player in the supply of liquefied natural gas (LNG). Through joint ventures, Shell is involved in nearly 40 percent of the world's LNG production.

*BP America:* BP America Inc. and two other oil and gas companies are lobbying for the new Senate climate and energy bill to recommend against federal regulation of hydraulic fracturing. BP America is a leading producer and supplier of natural gas in the United States.

*The Williams Companies:* Williams is a natural gas producer specializing in developing shale resources. They hold an interest in more than 12,000 natural gas wells nationwide. The company is actively drilling in the Barnett Shale in northeast Texas and their lobbying here reflects an interest in expanding operations to the North East.

*Chesapeake Operating Inc.* is the second-largest producer of natural gas in the United States and the most active driller of new wells in the U.S. It has also been listed in a recent report put out by NYPIRG as number 18 in the top 25 lobbyists in New York State that also gave campaign donations in 2010.

*Fortuna* Fortuna Energy is not acting on contract extensions for Marcellus Shale drilling properties in Tioga County, New York. In an Ithaca Journal article a company representative cites an uncertain regulatory climate and low gas prices for the decision. The company has dozens of successful TBR wells in New York State and is now the State's largest natural gas producer.

<http://www.theithacajournal.com/article/20090402/NEWS01/904020443/1124>

### Associations and Professional Organizations:

*The Business Council of NYS:* an association that represents over 3,000 businesses across the state. As part of their Action Agenda of 2010 they list "Support drilling for natural gas in the Marcellus Shale" and have submitted opposition memos on the various moratorium bills. The Business Council of NYS has made donations to IPPNY-PAC- a trade association representing more than 100 companies involved in the development of natural gas in New York State. Their Chairman Kevin Burke, is President & CEO of Consolidated Edison, Inc.

*Joint Landowners of New York (JLNY):* JLNY describes itself as "a 501c 6 a non-for-profit corporation," that "represent[s] 17 counties and 37+ coalitions. Estimated numbers of households are currently over 20,000, representing approximately 70,000 people and over 800,000 acres throughout New York's Southern Tier." JLNY has organized many rallies and protests in Albany and other localities in support of natural gas. Elected officials such as state Sen. Thomas Libous, R-Binghamton, and Broome County Executive Barbara Fiala, D-Broome County have spoken at their rallies. They have hosted public forums with members of IOGA as well.

*American Petroleum Institute* The American Petroleum Institute (API) is a national trade association that declares they represent "all aspects of America's oil and natural gas industry," boasting that their "more than 400 corporate members, from the largest major oil company to the smallest of independents, come from all seg-

ments of the industry. They are producers, refiners, suppliers, pipeline operators and marine transporters, as well as service and supply companies that support all segments of the industry.” API lobbies on behalf of natural gas interests on the state and federal level.

*National Federation of Independent Businesses:* The National Federation of Independent Business is an association representing small and independent businesses. It describes itself as a “nonprofit, nonpartisan organization.” NFIB has described its interests in energy policy as advocating for energy policies that benefit small business, in terms of finding cheaper gas and oil resources for independent and small business.

*American Association of Professional Landmen* The American Association of Professional Landmen is a professional organization with approximately 12,000 members. A landman is the field representative for a company that wants to buy the resources that are on or below a landowner’s property. Oil and gas landmen specialize in petroleum work. AAPL members work for major oil companies, large and small independent companies and as self-employed independent landmen. AAPL is headquartered in Fort Worth, Texas.

*Independent Oil and Gas Association (IOGA)* is one of the largest associations of natural gas interests in NYS. Brad Gill, IOGA of NY executive director has been a vocal opponent of a moratorium on natural gas drilling in NYS stating “It would be irresponsible to see lawmakers cave to the scare tactics of radical opponents, and it would be a slap in the face to landowners, New York taxpayers, all the people of the Southern Tier, as well as the DEC, to allow a moratorium bill to pass in the Legislature.” <http://www.marcellusfacts.com/blog/press-release-proposed-gas-drilling-moratorium-bill-unnecessary>

*Joint Council #16, International Brotherhood of Teamsters Joint Council 16* encompasses 33 Teamster locals in New York City and surrounding areas, including Westchester County and Newburg, New York and currently has about 120,000 members. The Teamsters represent a variety of industries, including Local 553 the heat and oil truck drivers.

## Environmental Groups:

*The Adirondack Mountain Club (ADK)* is a nonprofit membership organization that advocates to protect wild lands and waters. For more than two years, their Public Affairs Office has been deeply involved in issues surrounding gas drilling in the Marcellus Shale. ADK is particularly concerned about potential drilling in Allegany State Park, state forests, and in other natural areas  
[http://www.adk.org/press/SGEIS\\_Press\\_Release.aspx](http://www.adk.org/press/SGEIS_Press_Release.aspx)

*National Audubon Society, Inc.* Audubon New York, the state program of the National Audubon Society representing 27 local chapters and 50,000 members, is deeply concerned with the effect natural gas drilling will have on wildlife and the environment

*Sierra Club* is an environmental group that is involved with conservation efforts and connecting people with their built environment. They have chapters across NYS and have been heavily involved in advocating for stronger safeguards and protections for the environment in regards to natural gas drilling.

*Natural Resources Defense Council* is an environmental group comprised of members across the nation as well as lawyers, scientists and policy experts that work on a host of environmental issues on the State and federal

level.

*Citizens Campaign for the Environment* is a grassroots environmental and public health advocacy organization, supported by over 80,000 members, working to protect our shared environment and public health. CCE speaks extensively around the state on the inherent risks of hydrofracking and co-organized hydrofracking days of action to educate lawmakers on constituents' concerns with hydrofracking.

*Riverkeeper* defines itself as a “member-supported watchdog organization dedicated to defending the Hudson River and its tributaries and protecting the drinking water supply of nine million New York City and Hudson Valley residents” and is concerned specifically with the potential of natural gas drilling and extraction to pollute and harm New York’s drinking water supply. Their lobbying expenditures have mostly included money spent on supporting New York Citizen Suit Legislation campaign – a bill focused on enforcing New York’s environmental laws and investigating reports of water contamination.

*Environmental Advocates of New York* is an environmental government watchdog group that in addition to lobbying in favor of the moratorium on hydraulic fracturing, advocates for a statewide program to regulate all water withdrawals and ensure that the DEC and Governor have the staff and resources needed to regulate the natural gas industry

### Other groups lobbying on moratorium bills:

*American Academy of Pediatrics, District II*: is composed of the three New York Chapters, and get involved in issues regarding the welfare of children in New York State and the pediatricians who care for them. They are concerned about the potential negative impacts on children and families from natural gas drilling. A copy of their support memo on bills A10940/S7592 can be found here:

<http://www.tcgasmap.org/media/American%20Academy%20of%20Pediatrics%20Moratorium%20Support%20Letter.pdf>

*Working Families Party* is a political party that runs political candidates for office with a focus on issue affecting working families. The WFP was involved in a large grassroots push to mobilize people to support a moratorium on hydrofrack drilling.

*Common Cause/NY* is a non partisan advocacy organization that advocates for good government reforms. Its connection to natural gas has been creating reports and analyzing campaign contribution and lobbying expenditures data to shine light on how special interests attempt to exert influence over the public policy decision making process. Common Cause/NY supported a moratorium bill on hydrofrack drilling and has provided testimony on this issue with the main message of “slow down and let’s get this right.”

## Endnotes:

- 
- <sup>i</sup> Abraham Lustgarten, “FRAC Act-Congress Introduces Twin Bills to Control Drilling and Protect Drinking Water,” *ProPublica*, June 9, 2009  
<http://www.propublica.org/article/frac-act-congress-introduces-bills-to-control-drilling-609>
- <sup>ii</sup> Maria Baca, “Leaked Memo Depicts Bare-Bones Regulatory Environment for NY Gas Drilling,” *ProPublica*, October 26, 2010  
<http://www.propublica.org/article/leaked-memo-depicts-bare-bones-regulatory-environment-for-ny-gas-drilling>
- <sup>iii</sup> Maria Baca, “Leaked Memo Depicts Bare-Bones Regulatory Environment for NY Gas Drilling,” *ProPublica*, October 26, 2010 [sic].
- <sup>iv</sup> Nick Resiman, “Cuomo’s Choice For DEC Sticks To Official Line On Gas Drilling,” *The Journal News*, February 8, 2010 <http://statepolitics.lohudblogs.com/2011/02/08/cuomos-choice-for-dec-sticks-to-official-line-on-gas-drilling/>
- <sup>v</sup> Paul Riede, “Cuomo taps ESF grad for DEC,” *Syracuse Post-Standard*, January 5, 2011  
[http://www.syracuse.com/news/index.ssf/2011/01/cuomo\\_taps\\_esf\\_grad\\_for\\_dec.html](http://www.syracuse.com/news/index.ssf/2011/01/cuomo_taps_esf_grad_for_dec.html)
- <sup>vi</sup> “AP Interview: NY drilling Regs may take all summer,” Associated Press, March 31, 2010,  
<http://online.wsj.com/article/AP9b42dc0c2ee34629a7e8d47a35e86a50.html>
- <sup>vii</sup> “Regulatory Update on New York State,” Norse Energy Corp, March 31, 2010 ,  
<http://www.cisionwire.com/norse-energy-corp-asa/regulatory-update-on-new-york-state102774>
- <sup>viii</sup> “Natural Gas and Clean Water,” *The New York Times*, Editorial, March 22, 2010  
[http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/23/opinion/23wed2.html?\\_r=1&adxnnl=1&ref=opinion&adxnlnlx=1300901609-5YBHW6GsrDinZYTxBMP38Q](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/23/opinion/23wed2.html?_r=1&adxnnl=1&ref=opinion&adxnlnlx=1300901609-5YBHW6GsrDinZYTxBMP38Q)
- <sup>ix</sup> “2010 A Sweet Year for Albany Lobbyists: Soda, Wine Advocates Contribute to a Record-Breaking \$210 Million Cocktail of Influence, Top Lobby Clients Spend Millions More in Campaign Donations,” New York Public Interest Research Group, March 4 2010
- <sup>x</sup> “2010 A Sweet Year for Albany Lobbyists: Soda, Wine Advocates Contribute to a Record-Breaking \$210 Million Cocktail of Influence, Top Lobby Clients Spend Millions More in Campaign Donations,” New York Public Interest Research Group, March 4 2010[sic].
- <sup>xi</sup> “Top 50 interest groups dominate 2009 lobbying spending; Over \$40 million spent; Top 50 kick in \$5 million more in campaign donations,” New York Public Interest Research Group, April 26, 2010.