

Shale Gas Production via Hydraulic Fracturing

AOSC/CHEM 433 & AOSC/CHEM 633

Ross Salawitch

Class Web Sites:

<http://www2.atmos.umd.edu/~rjs/class/spr2022>

<https://myelms.umd.edu/courses/137772>


- Overview of shale gas production via horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing (aka fracking)
- Concerns about shale gas production:
 - Earthquakes
 - Contamination of ground water
 - Air quality (surface O₃ precursors)
 - Climate (fugitive release of CH₄)

Lecture 21

28 April 2022

U.S. Petroleum

Tight oil is contained in petroleum-bearing formations of low permeability, such as shale or sandstone. Production requires hydraulic fracturing and often uses the same horizontal well technology used in the production of shale gas.




<https://www.accessscience.com/content/hydraulic-fracturing-fracking/326700>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tight_oil

U.S. Petroleum

U.S. became a net exporter of crude oil in August 2019 and, in Dec 2021 exported about a million (1000 x 1000) barrels per day, yielding about \$74 million in capital per day




Source: U.S. Energy Information Administration

https://www.eia.gov/dnav/pet/pet_move_net/a_EP00_IMN_mbbldpd_m.htm

Hydraulic Fracturing

- Pumping of chemical brine to loosen deposits of natural gas from shale
- Extraction of CH₄ from shale gas became commercially viable in 2002/2003 when two mature technologies were combined: horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing
- High-pressure fluid is injected into bore of the well at a pressure that fractures the rock



Shale gas fracturing of 2 mile long laterals has been done only in the past decade

Image: https://assets.propublica.org/legacy/images/articles/natural_gas/marcellus_hydraulic_graphic_090514.gif

Tapping the Gas

Horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing have made it feasible to extract huge amounts of natural gas trapped in shale formations. Here's how they work.






Image: <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303491304575187880596301668.html>



https://www.eia.gov/energyexplained/index.cfm?page=natural_gas_where

States with Active Natural Gas Production

as of 2009 (most states)



2020	No. of Wells
Texas	118,957
Penn.	68,929
W. Virginia	47,934
Oklahoma	40,369
New Mexico	32,529
Color	31,939
Maryland	

States	No. of Wells
Texas	121,534
Oklahoma	52,287
West Virginia	42,645
New Mexico	39,497
Colorado	38,278
Pennsylvania	35,928
Wyoming	32,617
Ohio	28,181
Kansas	26,025
Louisiana	18,519
Kentucky	13,330
Michigan	10,462
Virginia	7,078
New York	6,995
Utah	6,860
Arkansas	6,859
Montana	6,760
Alabama	6,157
California	4,142
Mississippi	1,734
Alaska	1,046
Indiana	620
North Dakota	509
Nebraska	354
South Dakota	137
Oregon	23
Arizona	6
Maryland	4
Florida	4
Missouri	2

Source: U.S. Energy Information Administration⁷²

States with Active Natural Gas Production

For most states these figures reflect the number of wells as of 2009. At the time this census was published, three states had not yet reported 2009 data. The number reported for Kentucky is for 2008, the number for Pennsylvania is for 2004, and the number for Tennessee is for 2006.

Capital Gazette

Governor Hogan signs fracking ban




Larry Hogan, Governor of Maryland, along with, on the left, President of Senate Mike Miller, and on the right, Speaker of the House of Delegate Michael Busch, sign the fracking ban during a bill signing ceremony. (Pamela Wood, Baltimore Sun video)


<https://www.capitalgazette.com/multimedia/videos/92970771-132.html>

See also https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/md-politics/maryland-senate-gives-final-approval-to-fracking-ban/2017/03/27/362649d8-1349-11e7-833c-503e1f6394c9_story.html

Pa Active Natural Gas Production



Pennsylvania Natural Gas Number of Gas and Gas Condensate Wells




Map: <http://www.marcellus.psu.edu/images/Spud%20Map%20All%2011.19.13.jpg>

Chart: http://www.eia.gov/dnav/ng/hist/nal170_spa_8a.htm

Monthly US natural gas production

Monthly dry shale gas production

billion cubic feet per day



**Marcellus accounted for
~ 34% of U.S. shale gas
production in Feb 2022**




Source: Graph by the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) based on state administrative data collected by Enverus. Data are through February 2022 and represent EIA's official tight gas estimates, but are not survey data. State abbreviations indicate primary state(s).

Note: Improvements to play identification methods have altered production volumes of between various plays.

https://www.eia.gov/energyexplained/index.php?page=natural_gas_where

U.S. Shale Gas Production

Figure MT-46. U.S. dry natural gas production by source in the Reference case, 1990–2040



https://www.eia.gov/energyexplained/index.php?page=natural_gas_where


Production numbers from https://www.eia.gov/dnav/ng/ng_prod_sum_dc_NUS_mmcf_a.htm

Year	% of US Total CH ₄ Production Via Fracking
2001	2
2006	6
2008	8
2011	30
2013	40
2014	44
2015	48
2016	55
2017	60
2018	64
2019	68
2020	70

Tight Gas and Shale Gas

Tight gas: CH_4 dispersed within low porosity silt or sand that create “tight fitting” environment; has been extracted for many years using hydraulic fracturing

Shale gas: CH_4 accumulated in small bubble like pockets within layers sedimentary rock such as shale, like tiny air pockets trapped in baked bread



Large, well
connected
pores

Conventional Gas
Reservoir rock



Small, poorly
connected
pores

Tight Gas
Reservoir rock




Very small,
hardly
connected pores

Shale Gas
Reservoir rock

Image:

<http://www.wintershall.com/en/different-types-of-reserves-tight-gas-and-shale-gas.html>

U.S. Natural Gas Imports and Exports



Center for Strategic and International Studies | Energy and National Security Program
Source: Adapted from U.S. Energy Information Administration data (October 2017).

<https://www.csis.org/features/us-natural-gas-global-economy>

Cove Point Terminal



Millions in tax revenue, continued community partnership and environmental sustainability. For 40 years, the Cove Point Terminal has taken great pride in being a valued member of the Maryland community and a responsible environmental steward.



Dominion Energy Cove Point Terminal is located on the Chesapeake Bay in Lusby, Maryland, south of Baltimore. Historically, the facility has received transport vessels, stored liquefied natural gas (LNG) onshore, then transformed it back to gas when needed to meet demand. The [Cove Point Liquefaction Project](https://www.dominionenergy.com/company/moving-energy/dominion-energy-transmission-inc/facilities-projects-and-programs/cove-point) allows Dominion Energy to liquefy natural gas onsite and transport it to tanker ships for export.

<https://www.dominionenergy.com/company/moving-energy/dominion-energy-transmission-inc/facilities-projects-and-programs/cove-point>

From tiny Cove Point on the Chesapeake, tankers take natural gas around the world. At what cost?



By KEVIN RECTOR

THE BALTIMORE SUN | MAR 20, 2019 | 8:00 AM



To better understand Dominion Energy's LNG terminal in Cove Point and its role in the global LNG trade, Baltimore Sun reporter Kevin Rector spent months reporting in and around Cove Point, in the fracking fields of Pennsylvania and in Japan, the largest foreign consumer of Cove Point gas. (Jerry Jackson, Ulysses Muñoz, Kevin Rector / Baltimore Sun video)

<https://www.baltimoresun.com/news/investigations/bs-md-japan-lng-20180606-story.html>

Shale Gas Production & Public Policy

- U.S. imports very little CH₄ (some imports from Canada)
- Price of CH₄ has fallen by a factor of 2 since 2008
- Concerns about shale gas production fall into four categories:
 - **Earthquakes**
 - **Contamination of ground water**
 - **Air quality (surface O₃ precursors)**
 - **Climate (fugitive release of CH₄)**
- Former U.S. Dept of Energy Secretary Steven Chu (served 21 Jan 2009 to 22 April 2013) commissioned two reports from the Shale Gas Subcommittee of the Secretary of Energy Advisory Board (SEAB) to “identify measures that can be taken to reduce the environmental impact and to help assure the safety of shale gas production”
- First report (11 Aug 2011) identified 20 action items (see table, next slide)
- Second report (18 Nov 2011) outlined recommendations for implementation of action items
- EPA issued new standards for the oil and natural gas industry on 14 Jan 2015
- Notably absent is extended discussion of earthquake issue

<https://www.epa.gov/controlling-air-pollution-oil-and-natural-gas-industry>

Shale Gas Production & Public Policy

- First report (11 Aug 2011) identified 20 action items

1. Improve public information about shale gas operations

2. Improve communication among state and federal regulators

3. Improve air quality:

- 4. Industry to measure CH₄ & other air pollutants
- 5. Launch federal interagency effort to establish GHG footprint over shale gas extraction life cycle
- 6. Encourage companies & regulators to reduce emissions using proven technologies & best practices

7. Protect water quality:

- 8. Measure and report composition of water stock
- 9. Manifest all transfers of water among different locations
- 10. Adopt best practices for well casing, cementing, etc & conduct micro-seismic surveys to “assure that hydraulic growth is limited to gas producing formations”
- 11. Field studies of possible CH₄ leakage from shale gas wells to water reservoirs
- 12. Obtain background water quality measurements (i.e., CH₄ levels in nearby waters prior to drilling)

Protect water quality (cont.):

13. Measure and report composition of water stock

14. Disclosure of fracking fluid composition

15. Reduce use of diesel fuel for surface power

16. Manage short-term & cumulative impacts on communities & wild life: sensitive areas can be deemed off-limit to drilling and support infrastructure through an appropriate science based process

17. Create shale gas industry organiz. to promote best practice, giving priority attention to:

- 18. Air: emission measurement & reporting at various points in production chain
- 19. Water: Pressure testing of cement casing & state-of-the-art technology to confirm formation isolation

20. Increase R & D support from Administration & Congress to promote technical advances such as the move from single well to multiple-well pad drilling

https://www.edf.org/sites/default/files/11903_Embargoed_Final_90_day_Report%20.pdf

Shale Gas Production & Public Policy

- First report (11 Aug 2011) identified 20 action items

- | |
|--|
| 1. Improve public information about shale gas operations |
| 2. Improve communication among state and federal regulators |
| 3. Improve air quality: <ul style="list-style-type: none">4. Industry to measure CH₄ & other air pollutants5. Launch federal interagency effort to establish GHG footprint over shale gas extraction life cycle6. Encourage companies & regulators to reduce emissions using proven technologies & best practices |
| 7. Protect water quality: <ul style="list-style-type: none">8. Measure and report composition of water stock9. Manifest all transfers of water among different locations10. Adopt best practices for well casing, cementing, etc & conduct micro-seismic surveys to “assure that hydraulic growth is limited to gas producing formations”11. Field studies of possible CH₄ leakage from shale gas wells to water reservoirs12. Obtain background water quality measurements (i.e., CH₄ levels in nearby waters prior to drilling) |

Footnote 25:

Extremely small microearthquakes are triggered as an integral part of shale gas development. While essentially all of these earthquakes are so small as to pose no hazard to the public or facilities (they release energy roughly equivalent to a gallon of milk falling off a kitchen counter), earthquakes of larger (but still small) magnitude have been triggered during hydraulic fracturing operations and by the injection of flow-back water after hydraulic fracturing. It is important to develop a hazard assessment and remediation protocol for triggered earthquakes to allow operators and regulators to know what steps need to be taken to assess risk and modify, as required, planned field operations.

https://www.edf.org/sites/default/files/11903_Embargoed_Final_90_day_Report%20.pdf

Shale Gas Production & Public Policy

- First report (11 Aug 2011) identified 20 action items

The Subcommittee shares the prevailing view that the risk of fracturing fluid leakage into drinking water sources through fractures made in deep shale reservoirs is remote. Nevertheless the Subcommittee believes there is no economic or technical reason to prevent public disclosure of all chemicals in fracturing fluids, with an exception for genuinely proprietary information. While companies and regulators are moving in this direction, progress needs to be accelerated in light of public concern.

Protect water quality (cont.):

13. Measure and report composition of water stock

14. Disclosure of fracking fluid composition

15. Reduce use of diesel fuel for surface power

16. Manage short-term & cumulative impacts on communities & wild life: sensitive areas can be deemed off-limit to drilling and support infrastructure through an appropriate science based process

17. Create shale gas industry organiz. to promote best practice, giving priority attention to:

18. Air: emission measurement & reporting at various points in production chain

19. **Water:** Pressure testing of cement casing & state-of-the-art technology to confirm formation isolation

20. Increase R & D support from Administration & Congress to promote technical advances such as the move from single well to multiple-well pad drilling

Concern #1: Earthquakes

2012 Seismological Society of America meeting

ARE SEISMICITY RATE CHANGES IN THE MIDCONTINENT NATURAL OR MANMADE?


ELLSWORTH, W. L., US Geological Survey, Menlo Park, CA; HICKMAN, S. H., US Geological Survey, Menlo Park, CA; LLEONS, A. L., US Geological Survey, Menlo Park, CA; MCGARR, A., US Geological Survey, Menlo Park, CA; MICHAEL, A. J., US Geological Survey, Menlo Park, CA; RUBINSTEIN, J. L., US Geological Survey, Menlo Park, CA

A remarkable increase in the rate of M 3 and greater earthquakes is currently in progress in the US midcontinent. The average number of $M \geq 3$ earthquakes/year increased starting in 2001, culminating in a six-fold increase over 20th century levels in 2011. Is this increase natural or manmade? To address this question, we take a regional approach to explore changes in the rate of earthquake occurrence in the midcontinent (defined here as 85° to 108° West, 25° to 50° North) using the USGS Preliminary Determination of Epicenters and National Seismic Hazard Map catalogs. These catalogs appear to be complete for $M \geq 3$ since 1970. From 1970 through 2000, the rate of $M \geq 3$ events averaged 21 ± 7.6 /year in the entire region. This rate increased to 29 ± 3.5 from 2001 through 2008. In 2009, 2010 and 2011, 50, 87 and 134 events occurred, respectively. The modest increase that began in 2001 is due to increased seismicity in the coal bed methane field of the Raton Basin along the Colorado-New Mexico border west of Trinidad, CO. The acceleration in activity that began in 2009 appears to involve a combination of source regions of oil and gas production, including the Guy, Arkansas region, and in central and southern Oklahoma. Horton, et al. (2012) provided strong evidence linking the Guy, AR activity to deep waste water injection wells. In Oklahoma, the rate of $M \geq 3$ events abruptly increased in 2009 from 1.2/year in the previous half-century to over 25/year. This rate increase is exclusive of the November 2011 M 5.6 earthquake and its aftershocks. A naturally-occurring rate change of this magnitude is unprecedented outside of volcanic settings or in the absence of a main shock, of which there were neither in this region. While the seismicity rate changes described here are almost certainly manmade, it remains to be determined how they are related to either changes in extraction methodologies or the rate of oil and gas production.

Wednesday, April 18th / 3:45 PM Oral / Pacific Salon 4 & 5

Concern #1: Earthquakes

Ellsworth's study area:



<http://www.esa.org/esablog/ecology-in-the-news/increase-in-magnitude-3-earthquakes-likely-caused-by-oil-and-gas-production-but-not-fracking>

Concern #1: Earthquakes

Ellsworth's study suggests:

- Deep waste water injection wells are the culprit, especially if in the vicinity of a fault
- Increased fluid pressure in pores of the rock can reduce the slippage strain between rock layers
- Speed of pumping is important (slow better than fast)

USGS testimony:

- On 19 June 2012, Dr. William Leath of the U.S. Geological Survey testified before the U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, stating:

The injection and production practices employed in these technologies have, to varying degrees, the potential to introduce earthquake hazards

Since the beginning of 2011 the central and eastern portions of the United States have experienced a number of moderately strong earthquakes in areas of historically low earthquake hazard. These include M4.7 in central Arkansas on Feb27, 2011; M5.3 near Trinidad, Colorado on Aug 23, 2011; M5.8 in central Virginia also on Aug 23, 2011; ... M5.6 in central Oklahoma on Nov 6, 2011 ... and M4.8 in east Texas on May 17, 2012. Of these only the central Virginia earthquake is unequivocally a natural tectonic earthquake.

In all other cases, there is scientific evidence to at least raise the possibility that the earthquakes were induced by wastewater disposal or other oil- and gas-related activities.

USGS scientists documented a seven-fold increase since 2008 in the seismicity of the central U.S., an increase largely associated with areas of wastewater disposal from oil, gas & coalbed methane production

First three bullets:

<http://www.esa.org/esablog/ecology-in-the-news/increase-in-magnitude-3-earthquakes-likely-caused-by-oil-and-gas-production-but-not-fracking>

USGS testimony:

http://www.usgs.gov/congressional/hearings/docs/leith_19june2012.DOCX

Concern #1: Earthquakes

28 Jan 2015 Washington Post

The Washington Post

Economy

Search

Oklahoma worries over swarm of earthquakes and connection to oil industry

GUTHRIE, Okla. — The earthquakes come nearly every day now, cracking drywall, popping floor tiles and rattling kitchen cabinets. On Monday, three quakes hit this historic land-rush town in 24 hours, booming and rumbling like the end of the world.

“After a while, you can’t even tell what’s a pre-shock or an after-shock. The ground just keeps moving,” said Jason Murphey, 37, a Web developer who represents Guthrie in the state legislature. “People are so frustrated and scared. They want to know the state is doing something.”

What to do about the [plague of earthquakes](#) is, however, very much an open question in Oklahoma. Last year, 567 quakes of at least 3.0 magnitude rocked a swath of counties from the state capital to the Kansas line, alarming a populace long accustomed to fewer than two quakes a year.

Scientists [implicated](#) the oil and gas industry — in particular, the deep wastewater disposal wells that have been linked to a dramatic increase in seismic activity across the central United States. But in a state founded on oil wealth, officials have been reluctant to crack down on an industry that accounts for a third of the economy and one in five jobs.

Concern #1: Earthquakes

28 Jan 2015 Washington Post


The Washington Post

Economy

Search

Oklahoma worries over swarm of earthquakes and connection to oil industry

2012



<http://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/national/oklahoma-earthquakes/>

Concern #1: Earthquakes

28 Jan 2015 Washington Post


The Washington Post

Economy

Search

Oklahoma worries over swarm of earthquakes and connection to oil industry

2014



<http://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/national/oklahoma-earthquakes/>

Concern #1: Earthquakes

23 April 2015, Daily Show



<http://www.businessinsider.com/jon-stewart-fracking-causes-earthquakes-2015-4>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ma-gX-t4tuw>

Concern #1: Earthquakes

7 Nov 2016 USA Today



Search

NEWSSPORTSLIFEMONEYTECHTRAVELOPINION80°CROSSWORDSWASHINGTONVIDEOSTOCKSAPPSMORE



1253





10







Oklahoma earthquake reignites concerns that fracking wells may be the cause

[Rick Jervis](#), USA TODAY 5:34 p.m. ET Nov. 7, 2016



(Photo: Jim Beckel, AP)



1253

CONNECT



TWEET



10

LINKEDIN



COMMENT



EMAIL



MORE


A 5.0 magnitude earthquake that rattled north-central Oklahoma Sunday was only the sixth of that strength in state history and has reawakened concerns that oil and gas activity could be causing the tremors.

The temblor, which occurred around 7:44 p.m. Sunday about a mile west of Cushing, Okla., sheared bricks off buildings, caused structural damage to homes and forced local schools to close Monday. Around 40 residents were evacuated from a retirement home and sheltered at a local gymnasium.

It was only the sixth 5.0 magnitude or higher to strike Oklahoma since 1882, said George Choy, a geophysicist with the U.S. Geological Survey in Boulder, Colo. Three of those larger quakes occurred this year. The strongest ever recorded in Oklahoma

Concern #1: Earthquakes

7 Nov 2016 USA Today



Oklahoma earthquake reignites concerns that fracking wells may be the cause

Rick Jervis, USA TODAY 5:3




(Photo: Jim Beckel, AP)

Sunday about a mile west of C structural damage to homes and residents were evacuated from gymnasium.

It was only the sixth 5.0 magnitude earthquake in Oklahoma since 1992. George Choy, a geophysicist with the U.S. Geological Survey, said that of those larger quakes occurred


Oklahoma Natural Gas Number of Gas and Gas Condensate Wells



Source: U.S. Energy Information Administration

http://www.eia.gov/dnav/ng/hist/nal170_spa_8a.htm

Concern #2: Water Quality



<http://savethewater.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/Stock-Save-the-water-New-Study-Predicts-Fracking-Fluids-Will-Seep-Into-Aquifers-Within-Years.jpg>


Concern #2: Water Quality

Spread of contaminants in ground water determined by

Dispersion – differential flow of water through small openings (pores) in soil

Diffusion – random molecular (Brownian) motion of molecules in water

Sorption – some chemicals may be *absorbed by soil* while others are *adsorbed* (adhere to surfaces)



Highly diffusive chemicals (such as MTBE) can spread quickly even though ground water is relatively motionless.

MTBE: Methyl tert-butyl ether; $(\text{CH}_3)_3\text{COCH}_3$

<https://www.cancer.org/cancer/cancer-causes/mtbe.html>

http://toxics.usgs.gov/topics/gwcontam_transport.html


Concern #2: Water Quality

Typical Chemical Additives Used in Frac Water

Compound	Purpose	Common application
Acids	Helps dissolve minerals and initiate fissure in rock (pre-fracture)	Swimming pool cleaner
Sodium Chloride	Allows a delayed breakdown of the gel polymer chains	Table salt
Polyacrylamide	Minimizes the friction between fluid and pipe	Water treatment, soil conditioner
Ethylene Glycol	Prevents scale deposits in the pipe	Automotive anti-freeze, deicing agent, household cleaners
Borate Salts	Maintains fluid viscosity as temperature increases	Laundry detergent, hand soap, cosmetics
Sodium/Potassium Carbonate	Maintains effectiveness of other components, such as crosslinkers	Washing soda, detergent, soap, water softener, glass, ceramics
Glutaraldehyde	Eliminates bacteria in the water	Disinfectant, sterilization of medical and dental equipment
Guar Gum	Thickens the water to suspend the sand	Thickener in cosmetics, baked goods, ice cream, toothpaste, sauces
Citric Acid	Prevents precipitation of metal oxides	Food additive; food and beverages; lemon juice
Isopropanol	Used to increase the viscosity of the fracture fluid	Glass cleaner, antiperspirant, hair coloring

Source: DOE, GWPC: Modern Gas Shale Development in the United States: A Primer (2009).

% of the 632 disclosed chemicals that are either water soluble (206) or volatize (126)



<http://www.exxonmobilperspectives.com/2011/08/25/fracking-fluid-disclosure-why-its-important/>

<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/10807039.2011.605662>

Many chemicals used in fracking have “everyday” uses ...

We control how chemicals are used in homes, not the case for fracking

Fluid composition: Concern #2: Water Quality

April 2011: www.fracfocus.org created as central disclosure registry for industry use

Currently, 26 states require drillers to report to FracFocus

Searchable database & Google map interface allow user to obtain info for individual wells

FracFocus Reporting States



<http://fracfocus.org/welcome>

Fluid composition: Concern #2: Water Quality

April 2011: www.fracfocus.org created as central disclosure registry for industry use

As of January 2016, 28 states require the disclosure of some, but not all, chemicals used during fracking & 23 use Frac Focus


Searchable database & Google map interface allow user to obtain info for individual wells

Harvard Law School study highlights flaws in this system:

- 1) Timing of Disclosures: Site does not notify States if company submits late**
- 2) Substance of Disclosure: Site does not provide state specific forms, no minimum reporting standards**
- 3) Nondisclosures: Companies not required to disclose chemicals if they are considered a “trade secret”**
~20% of all chemicals not reported.

http://www.eenews.net/assets/2013/04/23/document_ew_01.pdf

See also <http://www.factcheck.org/2017/04/facts-fracking-chemical-disclosure>



Find a Well

Narrow Results:

Options

N COUNTY:

DATE:

Chemical 2 Ingredient 11 -- Proprietary

Chemical Entity Nitrogen -- 7727-37-9

Chemical Tracer -- Proprietary

Chemplex -- Proprietary

CHEMPLEX-Polymer_00019 -- Trade Secret

Chholine Chloride -- 67-48-1

Chloine Dioxide -- 10049-04-4

Chloline Bicarbonate -- 78-73-9

Chlorid Acid, Sodium Salt -- 7775-09-9

Chloride -- *3rd Party Additive

Chloride -- 16887-00-6

Chloride Dioxide -- 10049-04-4

Chloride Glutaraldehyde -- 111-30-8

Chloridne dioxide -- 10049-04-4

Chlorin Dioxide -- 10049-04-4

Chlorine Chloride -- 67-48-1

CHLORINE CHLORIDE -- Proprietary

Chlorine compound -- Confidential

Chlorine compound -- Proprietary

Chlorine Dioxide -- 10049-04-04

Chlorine Dioxide -- 7631-90-5

Press and hold "ctrl" to select more than one ingredient.

Narrow Results: Proprietary

Acryimide Polymer -- Proprietary

Acylamide polymer -- proprietary

Acrylic amide (impurity) -- Proprietary

Additive 1 -- Proprietary

Additive 2 -- Proprietary

Additive 3 -- Proprietary

AG-2 Blend -- Proprietary

AI-3 -- Proprietary

Aiphatic Hydrocarbon -- Proprietary

Akylene oxide block polymer -- proprietary

Akylene Oxide Block Polymer -- Proprietary

Akylene oxide block polymer -- proprietary

Akylbenzene sulfonate -- Proprietary

Akylbenzene sulfonate #2 -- Proprietary

AKYLBENZENE SULFONATE, COMPD. WITH 2-PROP

Alcohol -- Proprietary

ALCOHOL ETHOXYLATE -- Proprietary

Alcohol Ethoxylates -- Proprietary

Alchol Alkoxy Sulfate -- Proprietary


Alchol Ethoxylates -- Proprietary

Alcohol -- Proprietary

Alcohol (Alkoxv) -- Proprietary

Press and hold "ctrl" to select more than one ingredient.

Fluid composition: Concern #2: Water Quality



ECONOMY

March 15, 2017 9:55 PM
Associated Press

Trump Administration Halts Obama-Era Rule on Fracking on Public Land

WASHINGTON — The Trump administration is rolling back an Obama administration rule requiring companies that drill for oil and natural gas on federal lands to disclose chemicals used in hydraulic fracturing, better known as fracking.

The administration said in court papers Wednesday that it is withdrawing from a lawsuit challenging the Obama-era rule and will begin a new rule-making process later this year.

The Interior Department issued the rule in March 2015, the first major federal regulation of fracking, the controversial drilling technique that has sparked an ongoing boom in natural gas production but raised widespread concerns about possible groundwater contamination and even earthquakes.

The rule has been on hold since last year after a judge in Wyoming ruled that federal regulators lack congressional authority to set rules for fracking.

FracFocus.org started in 2011

The rule relies on an online database used by at least 16 states to track the chemicals used in fracking operations. The website, FracFocus.org, was formed by industry and intergovernmental groups in 2011 and allows users to gather well-specific data on tens of thousands of drilling sites across the country.

Companies would have had to disclose the chemicals they use within 30 days of the fracking operation.

Fracking involves pumping huge volumes of water, sand and chemicals underground to split open rocks to allow oil and gas to flow.

<http://www.voanews.com/a/trump-administration-halts-obama-era-rule-on-racking-on-public-land/3768474.html>

The Show Must Go On

The New York Times



By Eric Lipton and Hiroko Tabuchi


Oct. 27, 2018

Driven by Trump Policy Changes, Fracking Booms on Public Lands

The administration is auctioning off millions of acres of drilling rights and rolling back regulations, raising environmental concerns in states like Wyoming.

Federal Land For Sale

The amount of federal land offered at oil and gas lease sales has greatly increased under the Trump administration.



<https://www.nytimes.com/2018/10/27/climate/trump-fracking-drilling-oil-gas.html>

The Show Must Go On

ENERGY

Biden Promised To End New Drilling On Federal Land, But Approvals Are Up

July 13, 2021 - 9:19 AM ET

THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

BILLINGS, Mont. — Approvals for companies to drill for oil and gas on U.S. public lands are on pace this year to reach their highest level since George W. Bush was president, underscoring President Joe Biden's reluctance to more forcefully curb petroleum production in the face of industry and Republican resistance.

The Interior Department approved about 2,500 permits to drill on public and tribal lands in the first six months of the year, according to an Associated Press analysis of government data. That includes more than 2,100 drilling approvals since Biden took office January 20.

New Mexico and Wyoming had the largest number of approvals. Montana, Colorado and Utah had hundreds each.

Biden campaigned last year on pledges to end new drilling on federal lands to rein in climate-changing emissions. His pick to oversee those lands, Interior Secretary Deb Haaland, adamantly opposed drilling on federal lands while in Congress and co-sponsored the liberal Green New Deal.



Pumpjacks work in April 2015 in a field near Lovington, N.M. The Biden administration has approved thousands of drilling permits since taking office despite a campaign pledge to end fracking on federal land.

Charlie Riedel/AP

<https://www.npr.org/2021/07/13/1015581092/biden-promised-to-end-new-drilling-on-federal-land-but-approvals-are-up>


See also <https://grist.org/politics/biden-promised-no-new-drilling-on-public-lands-heres-why-he-broke-that-promise/>

Concern #3: Air Quality

- Fracking releases a lovely mixture of air pollutants

Air Emissions from Oil and Gas Development in the Eagle Ford

There are more than 7,000 oil and gas wells in the Eagle Ford Shale, and Texas regulators have approved another 5,500. Most of them, like the one shown here, are oil wells that also produce condensate and natural gas. Developing these resources releases various air pollutants, some of which are shown in this simplified diagram.



Emission Sources

The pollutants come from a number of sources, including the diesel- or natural gas-fueled equipment, the oil and gas itself, and leaks from storage devices. The emissions' actual and relative amounts vary widely based on operator practices and local geology. The emissions occur regularly in some cases, but are intermittent in others.


CHEMICAL	WHAT IT IS	WHAT IT DOES
A VOCs	Volatile organic compounds including benzene, formaldehyde	There are dozens of VOCs that make people sick. Some can cause cancer. VOCs react with NO _x to form ozone, a respiratory irritant and greenhouse gas.
B PM	Particulate matter	Affects the heart and lungs.
C CH₄	Methane	Main component of natural gas. Much more powerful than CO ₂ as a greenhouse gas.
D CO₂	Carbon dioxide	Major greenhouse gas.
E NO_x	Nitrogen oxides	Reacts with VOCs to create ozone.
F H₂S	Hydrogen sulfide	Toxic gas found in some gas fields. Causes illness and death at certain concentrations.

Fugitive emissions: pipelines, valves, pneumatic devices etc. leak methane, VOCs, H₂S and CO₂ throughout the entire process.

<https://insideclimatenews.org/infographics?topic=All&project=&keywords=&page=16>

Concern #3: Air Quality

- Fracking is a major contributor to anthropogenic VOCs



<https://ehp.niehs.nih.gov/120-a272/>

Concern #3: Air Quality













- Fracking is a major contributor to anthropogenic VOCs

VOC Emissions by Sector, 2008	
Sector	Emissions (in tons)
Vegetation and Soil	31,743,795.67
Solvent Utilization	3,299,117.52
On-Road Vehicles	3,055,361.80
Wildfires	2,847,133.50
Off-Road Vehicles	2,492,752.86
Prescribed Fires	1,696,594.50
Oil and Gas Production	1,688,454.83
Gas Stations	643,277.44
Residential Fuel Combustion	367,023.10
Storage and Transport	237,737.78
Miscellaneous Nonindustrial Sources	226,996.24
Miscellaneous Industrial Sources	216,635.89
Waste Disposal	179,769.43
Pulp and Paper Processing	129,903.19
Chemical Manufacturing	99,470.59
Bulk Gasoline Terminals	92,808.65
Agriculture/Livestock Waste	92,448.42
Industrial Fuel Combustion	80,142.47
Petroleum Refineries	68,004.53
Agricultural Field Burning	53,269.51
Locomotives	44,198.42
Electric Utility Fuel Combustion	43,246.70
Ferrous and Nonferrous Metals Processing	35,721.12
Aircraft	35,445.09
Commercial Marine Vessels	20,645.64
Commercial/Institutional Fuel Combustion	13,454.01
Commercial Cooking	13,366.75
Cement Manufacturing	9,189.33
Mining	1,886.09
Construction Dust	16.63

Source: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency⁸

<https://ehp.niehs.nih.gov/120-a272/>


Tropospheric Ozone Production



VOC: Volatile Organic Compounds

Produced by trees and fossil fuel vapor

Strong source of HO_x (OH & HO_2) & O_3 (depending on NO_x levels)



Ozone Production “limited” by $k[\text{HO}_2][\text{NO}] + \sum k_i [\text{RO}_2]_i [\text{NO}]$

Concern #3: Air Quality (Case Study: Wyoming)


Sublette County Ozone & Weather History (2005 – 2011)




- ♦ Mid-January – March 2005
 - 8 Elevated 8-Hour O₃ Days > 75 ppb
- ♦ Mid-January – March 2006
 - 2 Elevated 8-Hour O₃ Days > 75 ppb
- ♦ Mid-January – March 2007
 - 0 Elevated 8-Hour O₃ Days > 75 ppb
 - Meteorological conditions not conducive to formation of elevated ozone levels.
- ♦ Mid-January – March 2008
 - 14 Elevated 8-Hour O₃ Days > 75 ppb
 - Higher magnitude than previous years
 - Met. conditions conducive to formation of elevated ozone levels.
- ♦ Mid-January – March 2009
 - 0 Elevated 8-Hour O₃ Days > 75 ppb
 - Limited met. conditions conducive to formation of elevated ozone levels.
- ♦ Mid-January – March 2010
 - 0 Elevated 8-Hour O₃ Days > 75 ppb
 - Met. conditions not conducive to formation of elevated ozone levels.
- ♦ Mid-January – March 2011
 - 13 Elevated 8-Hour O₃ Days > 75 ppb
 - Higher magnitude than previous years
 - Met. conditions conducive to formation of elevated ozone levels.

http://deq.state.wy.us/out/downloads/March22PublicMtg_2011Ozone_WDEQ.pdf


Concern #3: Air Quality (Case Study: Wyoming)



Concern #3: Air Quality (Case Study: Wyoming)



Concern #3: Air Quality (Case Study: Wyoming)



Dramatic ozone spikes puzzle regulators, locals in Wyoming gas field

Heather Richards 307-266-0592, Heather.Richards@trib.com Mar 22, 2019

Joel Bousman wasn't sure if ozone would be a problem Friday, despite a warning from the state. The snow covered the sage brush and the wind was less than 10 miles per hour — both bad signs. On the other hand, it had been overcast most of the day at the Sublette County commissioner's ranch near Boulder — a small community about 12 miles southeast of Pinedale, within view of the Wind River Mountains.

You need the right mix of factors to create ground-level ozone: sunlight, snow cover, little to no wind and, of course, emissions from the oil and gas industry — which arrived in force more than a decade ago in the Jonah and Pinedale gas field.

And this year the factors have been right more often than usual.

Friday was the 12th ozone action day of the season — a warning system from the Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality that forces industry to pull back when conditions for ozone are expected. It's a record number for recent years, and another action day was forecast for Saturday.

But there's something more troubling in the case of the Boulder area: ground-level ozone is regularly forming despite precautions. Breathing it in can cause a variety of health problems, from chest pain to reduced lung function.

For reasons still unclear to state regulators, in one corner of the Upper Green, the rules and regulations that reversed an air quality crisis more than a decade ago haven't been enough. "We don't have all the answers, yet," said Keith Guille, spokesman for the state Department of Environmental Quality. "It's definitely not being ignored. We understand that the public is concerned, as we are."

https://trib.com/business/energy/dramatic-ozone-spikes-puzzle-regulators-locals-in-wyoming-gas-field/article_82837053-a70d-5591-b4a4-e83c24e8565b.html

Concern #3: Air Quality (Colorado)

NEWS > ENVIRONMENT

Colorado lets oil and gas companies pollute for 90 days without federally required permits that limit emissions

State health officials say they'll review whether exemption for fossil fuels industry violates Clean Air Act

By **BRUCE FINLEY** | bfinley@denverpost.com | The Denver Post

April 7, 2019 at 6:00 am



Michael Ciaglo, Special to the Denver Post

Stephanie Nilsen, left, and her partner Janis Butterfield walk down the road next to their small ranch — and in front of Extraction Oil and Gas' Trott pad — on Thursday, March 28, 2019, in Berthoud. Butterfield and Nilsen live about 1,000 feet south of the oil and gas site, which they say emitted harmful pollution last year. The site is one of nearly 200 in Colorado that was allowed to pollute without a federally required permit limiting emissions for its first 90 days.

Colorado public health officials have let oil and gas companies begin drilling and fracking for fossil fuels at nearly 200 industrial sites across the state without first obtaining federally required permits that limit how much toxic pollution they can spew into the air.

Air pollution control officials at the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment allow the industry to emit hundreds of tons of volatile organic chemicals, cancer-causing benzene and other pollutants using an exemption tucked into the state's voluminous rules for the industry — rules that former Gov. John Hickenlooper, state leaders and industry officials long have hailed as the toughest in the nation.

They rely on this 27-year-old state exemption to give oil and gas companies 90 days to pollute, then assess what they need from Colorado regulators before applying for the air permits that set limits on emissions from industrial sites.

"It is a loophole that allows pollution at some of the times when the pollution is the most extreme," said U.S. Rep. Diana DeGette, D-Denver, who chairs a congressional panel that oversees the Environmental Protection Agency.

<https://www.denverpost.com/2019/04/07/colorado-oil-gas-air-pollution>

AT 18

Combustion of 1 gram of CH_4 results of 50.1 kJ of energy
Combustion of 1 gram of C results in 32.8 kJ of energy

Alas, coal is not pure carbon in the real world. Rather, notational formula for coal is $\text{C}_{135}\text{H}_{96}\text{O}_9\text{NS}$ (page 162 of *Chemistry in Context*): i.e., coal has a carbon content of 85% by mass.

Therefore, an even better estimate where the ratio of C to H in coal and natural gas is treated in the same manner, we would write:

Natural gas is $(1.33 \times 1.53) / 0.85 = 1.73$; i.e., natural gas is about 70% more efficient than coal, in terms of energy yield per mole of CO_2 .




Fig 4.16. Energy differences (in kJ/g) for the combustion of methane (CH_4), n-octane (C_8H_{18}), coal (assumed to be pure carbon), ethanol ($\text{C}_2\text{H}_5\text{OH}$), and wood (assumed to be glucose).

Concern #4: Climate

Combustion of 1 gram of CH₄ results of 50.1 kJ of energy

Combustion of 1 gram of C results in 32.8 kJ of energy

Alas, coal is not pure carbon in the real world. Rather, notational formula for coal is C₁₃₅H₉₆O₉NS (page 162 of Chemistry in Context): i.e., coal has a carbon content of 85% by mass.

Therefore, we'd state:

natural gas is actually $1.33 \times 50.1 / (32.8/0.85) = 1.73$; i.e., 73% more efficient than coal.

Break even point, for leakage of CH₄

First, would like GWP on a per molecule basis, rather than a per mass basis

GHG	IPCC (2021) per mass	IPCC (2021) per molecule
<i>100 Year Time Horizon</i>		
CH ₄	29.8	10.8
<i>20 Year Time Horizon</i>		
CH ₄	82.5	30

Next, must balance energy gain from combustion of CH₄ relative to coal versus climate penalty.

If CH₄ is inadvertently released, then for the per molecule GWP on **100-year time horizon, break even point is:**

$$\text{CO}_2 + \text{Leak Fraction} \times 10.2 \times \text{CO}_2 = 1.73 \times \text{CO}_2$$

$$\text{Leak Fraction} = \mathbf{0.072}$$

⇒ leakage of **7.2 % of CH₄ causes**

climate penalty to balance climate benefit

Concern #4: Climate

Combustion of 1 gram of CH₄ results of 50.1 kJ of energy
Combustion of 1 gram of C results in 32.8 kJ of energy

Alas, coal is not pure carbon in the real world. Rather, notational formula for coal is C₁₃₅H₉₆O₉NS (page 162 of Chemistry in Context): i.e., coal has a carbon content of 85% by mass.

Therefore, we'd state:

natural gas is actually $1.33 \times 50.1 / (32.8/0.85) = 1.73$; i.e., 73% more efficient than coal.

Break even point, for leakage of CH₄

First, would like GWP on a per molecule basis, rather than a per mass basis

GHG	IPCC (2021) per mass	IPCC (2021) per molecule
<i>100 Year Time Horizon</i>		
CH ₄	29.8	10.8
<i>20 Year Time Horizon</i>		
CH ₄	82.5	30

Next, must balance energy gain from combustion of CH₄ relative to coal versus climate penalty.

If CH₄ is inadvertently released, then for the per molecule GWP on **20-year time horizon, break even point is:**

$$\text{CO}_2 + \text{Leak Fraction} \times 30 \times \text{CO}_2 = 1.73 \times \text{CO}_2$$

$$\text{Leak Fraction} = \mathbf{0.024}$$

⇒ leakage of **2.4 % of CH₄ causes**

climate penalty to balance climate benefit

Concern #4: Climate

Break Even Points: **7.2%** (100-yr time horizon) and **2.4%** (20-yr time horizon)

Leakage (%)	Region	Method	Citation
4.2 – 8.4	Bakken Shale, North Dakota	Aircraft Sampling	Peischel et al. (2016)
1.0 – 2.1	Haynesville Shale, Louisiana and Texas	Aircraft Sampling	Peischel et al. (2015)
1.0 – 2.8	Fayetteville Shale, Arkansas		
0.18 – 0.41	Marcellus Shale, Pennsylvania		
9.1 ± 6.2	Eagle Ford, Texas	Satellite Sampling	Schneising et al. (2014)
10.1 ± 7.3	Bakken Shale, North Dakota		
0.42	190 production sites including Gulf Coast, Rocky Mountain, and Appalachia	In situ within facility grounds	Allen et al. (2013)
6.2 – 11.7	Unitah County, Utah	Aircraft sampling	Karion et al. (2013)
2.3 – 7.7	Julesburg Basin, Denver, Colorado	Tall tower and ground level mobile sampling	Pétron et al. (2012)

Table 4.4 Estimates of % of CH₄ leakage relative to production in the US, selected studies

Paris Climate Agreement, Beacon of Hope

Global Methane Pledge

COP26: US and EU announce global pledge to slash methane

🕒 2 November 2021



| Joe Biden says COP26 methane reduction pledge will make 'huge difference'

The US and the EU have announced a global partnership to cut emissions of the greenhouse gas methane by 2030.

EU Commission chief Ursula von der Leyen and US President Joe Biden made the announcement at the COP26 summit on Tuesday.

The Global Methane Pledge aims to limit methane emissions by 30% compared with 2020 levels.

It is one of the most potent greenhouse gases and responsible for a third of current warming from human activities.

More than 100 countries have signed up to the initiative, first proposed by the US and the EU in September.

<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-59137828>

Poland spent decades trying to quit Russian gas. Now it has no choice.

The country's energy guru, Piotr Naimski, has spent years building infrastructure to free Poland from Russian gas. As Moscow cuts imports, his plan faces a dramatic test.



By Jeanne Whalen

Yesterday at 12:59 p.m. EDT

The nation of 38 million has generally imported about half of its natural gas from Russia, using it to heat and power countless homes and factories.

Officially, Russia said it was cutting off Poland because Warsaw refused to start paying for gas in rubles instead of euros, though some analysts said Russia is probably punishing Poland for its strong support of Ukraine.

In an interview at his Warsaw office late last week, Naimski sketched out his grand plan — more than 20 years in the making — to switch to gas from Norway, the United States and other allied nations.

Gesturing toward a wall of maps, the 71-year-old secretary of state for energy infrastructure showed off a nearly completed network that Poland has spent years building: a multibillion-dollar terminal to import liquefied natural gas via ship, a spiderweb of pipelines crisscrossing Poland and connecting it to friendly neighbors, and an undersea pipeline from Norway scheduled to be opened Oct. 1.

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2022/04/27/poland-russian-gas-diversify-strategy/>