

The RDSGEIS states that onsite disposal of water-based muds is permissible, despite the fact that these muds may contain mercury, metals and other contaminants. These contaminated muds would be put in direct contact with soils and groundwater, resulting in the potential for significant adverse environmental impacts not addressed in the RDSGEIS. Some portions of the RDSGEIS and proposed regulations vaguely reference a requirement for consultation with the NYSDEC Division of Materials Management prior to disposal of cuttings from water-based mud drilling, but this “consultation” improperly circumvents the proper public review that would be provided by reaching a decision on the disposal requirements for water-based mud and associated cuttings through the environmental review process.

3.12.4 Hydraulic Fracture Additive Limitations

The RDSGEIS and proposed regulations continue to rely solely on the drilling operators to (1) regulate themselves, and (2) select the lowest toxicity chemicals for use in fracture treatment additives.

The proposed regulations require documentation that the additives exhibit “reduced aquatic toxicity” and “lower risk to water resources” compared to alternate additives or documentation that alternatives are not equally effective or feasible. There are no specific criteria for determining what is an acceptable reduction in toxicity or an acceptable reduction in risk. Operators would still be allowed to use harmful chemicals merely by stating to NYSDEC that these are the only chemicals that would be “effective” or by showing that the chemicals they propose are slightly less toxic than the most toxic alternatives.

To address this problem, the RDSGEIS and proposed regulations should identify the type, volume and concentrations of fracture treatment additives that are protective of human health and the environment; include a list of prohibited additives; and require the use of non-toxic materials to the greatest extent possible.

NYSDEC should develop the list of prohibited fracture treatment additives based on the known list of chemicals currently used in hydraulic fracturing. The list of prohibited fracture treatment additives should apply to all hydraulic fracture treatments, not just HVHF treatments. NYSDEC should also develop a process to evaluate newly proposed hydraulic fracturing chemical additives to determine whether they should be added to the prohibited list. No chemical should be used until NYSDEC and/or the New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) has assessed whether it is protective of human health and the environment, and has determined whether or not it warrants inclusion on the list of prohibited hydraulic fracturing chemical additives for NYS. The burden of proof should be on industry to demonstrate, via scientific and technical data and analysis, and risk assessment work, that the chemical is safe. Fracture treatment additive prohibitions should be included in the RDSGEIS as a mitigation measure and codified in the proposed regulations.

3.12.5 Centralized Surface Impoundments for HVHF Flowback Off-Drillsite

The 2009 DSGEIS disclosed significant adverse air quality impacts associated with centralized surface impoundments for HVHF flowback, which were found to emit over 32.5 tons of air toxics per year. However, this important impact information was removed from the RDSGEIS. Instead, NYSDEC improperly declined to analyze centralized surface impoundments based on statements by the industry that they would not “routinely propose” to use centralized flowback impoundments. The proposed regulations do not prohibit centralized surface impoundments, which would be appropriate

mitigation for the significant adverse impact identified in the 2009 DSGEIS, and instead a separate site-specific SEQRA review would be required for them.

3.12.6 Chemical and Waste Tank Secondary Containment

NYSDEC appropriately codified a requirement for secondary containment for chemical and waste handling tanks in the proposed regulations. However, the proposed regulations do not specifically address secondary containment for chemical and waste transport, mixing and pumping equipment. The regulations should be revised to address secondary containment for transport, mixing and pumping equipment in order to minimize potential soil and water resource impacts from chemical spills. There are several other minor modifications to the proposed regulations for secondary containment detailed in Chapter 21 of the Harvey Consulting, LLC report (Attachment 1) to eliminate inconsistencies between various regulatory requirements.

3.12.7 Fuel Tank Containment

NYSDEC appropriately included a requirement for fuel tank secondary containment in the Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions. However, this requirement is confused by inconsistent statements in the RDSGEIS that secondary containment is not required for *temporary* fuel tanks (page 7-34). In addition to correcting this inconsistency, the proposed regulatory framework for fuel tank containment should be substantively improved to be more protective of the environment through adoption of the following changes:

- Define clear criteria for adequate containment (e.g., using coated or lined materials that are chemically compatible with the environment and the substances to be contained; providing adequate freeboard; protecting containment from heavy vehicle or equipment traffic; and having a volume of at least 110 percent of the largest storage tank within the containment area).
- Include mandatory minimum setbacks from surface water features, homes and public buildings. The proposed regulations contain a setback for surface water resources, but only “to the extent practical.”
- Explain how NYSDEC’s requirements for fuel tank containment interface with federal requirements (40 CFR Part 112).
- Require tank inspections, spill prevention and spill alarm systems.
- Clarify whether vaulted, self-diking, and double-walled portable tanks will be allowed in cases where secondary containment is impractical, and codify the requirements for the use of those tanks, including inspections and spill prevention alarm systems.

3.13 Toxicology

This section addresses the toxicology-related issues associated with Naturally Occurring Radioactive Materials (NORM), hydraulic fracturing additives and waste disposal. For supporting technical information for these comments, refer to the technical reports of Dr. Glenn Miller (Attachment 3) and Dr. Ralph Seiler (Attachment 4).

3.13.1 Naturally Occurring Radioactive Materials

The Marcellus Shale is known to contain NORM concentrations at higher levels than surrounding rock formations. The primary environmental contamination risk associated with NORM is in production brines. Appendix 13 of the RDSGEIS presented some information on radioactivity

characteristics of vertical wells in the Marcellus Shale in New York. However, the data in Appendix 13 identifies only 14-24% of the gross alpha radiation sources in the water samples. The sources of the other 75%+ of alpha radiation are not identified. The RDSGEIS explicitly acknowledges that the scientific understanding of NORM in production brine is incomplete.⁶ NYSDEC should have obtained more information on the radiation sources in production brine as part of the SGEIS process because it is essential to NYSDEC's decision-making process and for NYSDEC to ensure that adequate regulations are in place before widespread HVHF occurs in New York. Even if the information could not have been reasonably obtained (which is not the case here), the proper approach for SEQRA compliance would have been to disclose the unavailable information in accordance with NYCRR §617.9 (b) (6)⁷:

One possible source of the unspecified alpha levels in production brines is polonium. Polonium-210 is 5,000 times more radioactive than radium and is highly toxic.⁸ Polonium-210 is difficult and expensive to remove from drinking water and bioaccumulates in the environment. Before completing the SEQRA process, NYSDEC should determine if polonium is a significant component of alpha emission in formation waters and identify appropriate regulations that address polonium-contaminated wastewater to prevent water resource impacts. Specific technical recommendations regarding the analyses that should be conducted to determine the presence of polonium are provided in Attachment 4. Attachment 4 also addresses the potential for Polonium-210 exposure via build-up in natural gas delivery pipes.

3.13.2 Radon Exposure via Natural Gas Combustion

Radon is a cancer-causing, radioactive gas. Radon is known to be present in natural gas and will be delivered with the natural gas to consumers. The quantity of radon in natural gas is highly variable and has not been studied by NYSDEC in the Marcellus Shale. While normal natural gas use in properly ventilated burners are unlikely to contribute to radon concentrations in a closed space, poorly vented areas may well be a problem, and certain scenarios (e.g., high use of natural gas for industrial applications, restaurants that use gas burners) need to be subjected to risk assessment. At the very least, substantially more radon measurements need to be made. The risk is likely to be greatest in those areas that already have elevated radon in air, and that risk may be enhanced by the natural gas contribution. Any increase in radon exposure in the Southern Tier is of particular concern in terms of cumulative impacts given that the NYSDOH estimates the majority of homes in

⁶ 2011 RDSGEIS Page 5-142: "The data indicate the need to collect additional samples of production brine to assess the need for mitigation and to require appropriate handling and treatment options...."

⁷ *In addition to the analysis of significant adverse impacts required in subparagraph 617.9(b) (5) (iii) of this section, if information about reasonably foreseeable catastrophic impacts to the environment is unavailable because the cost to obtain it is exorbitant, or the means to obtain it are unknown, or there is uncertainty about its validity, and such information is essential to an agency's SEQRA findings, the EIS must:*

- (i) identify the nature and relevance of unavailable or uncertain information;*
- (ii) provide a summary of existing credible scientific evidence, if available; and*
- (iii) assess the likelihood of occurrence, even if the probability of occurrence is low, and the consequences of the potential impact, using theoretical approaches or research methods generally accepted in the scientific community.*

This analysis would likely occur in the review of such actions as an oil supertanker port, a liquid propane gas/liquid natural gas facility, or the siting of a hazardous waste treatment facility. It does not apply in the review of such actions as shopping malls, residential subdivisions or office facilities.

⁸ http://www.who.int/ionizing_radiation/pub_meet/polonium210/en/index.html

the region have existing basement radon levels above the EPA “action level” of 4 pCi/L. Between 20 and 40 percent of homes in the several Marcellus Shale counties have long-term exposure to radon levels above the EPA limit in their living areas.⁹ Before completing the SEQRA process, NYSDEC should analyze the cumulative health risk posed by additional radon exposure from Marcellus Shale natural gas combustion so that appropriate mitigation measures can be identified to address the issue.

3.13.3 Hydraulic Fracturing Additives

The RDSGEIS does not present sufficient information to analyze the toxicology risks posed by hydraulic fracturing additives. It does not address the toxicology risks generically or at the site level. The proposed regulations do not require permit applicants to provide sufficient information for the risks of these additives to be considered at the site level. The RDSGEIS provides a long list of potential additives (Tables 5.4 and 5.5), but does not analyze their potential environmental impacts. The list of additives is almost certainly incomplete, specific information on the chemicals is lacking, and the specific rate of usage is not offered. Thus, not knowing the composition of the specific additives nor the amounts in which they would be used during the HVHF process there is no basis for estimating the risk of these components with regard to their presence in the produced flowback or produced water.

The RDSGEIS misrepresents the presence of hydraulic fracturing additives in flowback. Table 6.1 of the RDSGEIS states that no non-naturally occurring additives were detected. However, most of these additives cannot be detected through standard methods. Table 6.1 should be revised to indicate which additives were actually capable of being detected by the analytical methods selected and the associated detection limits. This is a customary practice and standard. The proposed regulations should require testing of flowback water for acrylonitrile, a non-naturally occurring chemical that if detected provides a clear indication of off-site contamination by hydraulic fracturing.

3.13.4 Disposal of Contaminated Wastewater

The water that flows back immediately following hydraulic fracturing is heavily contaminated, primarily with the Marcellus formation contaminants, and represents the most problematic chemical contamination potential, due to the large volumes of contaminated water generated. The produced brines that are released during production generally have higher concentrations of naturally occurring contaminants than flowback water (although lower volumes) and similarly represent a serious chemical contamination potential. Four problematic components of the flowback water and produced brines are present: the radioactive component (NORM); the inorganic salts, metals and metalloids; the organic substances (from the hydrocarbon formation) and the hydraulic fracturing additives. While recognizing the problems with management of this water, the RDSGEIS fails to clearly state how this water will be either disposed in a manner that protects human health and the environment, or otherwise treated to remove the contaminants. While the RDSGEIS provides a range of alternatives, the RDSGEIS does not analyze the environmental or human health impacts associated with any of these disposal options. Further, effectively none of these options is likely to be accomplished in state, and the RDSGEIS implies that virtually all of the wastewater generated in New York will be managed out of state where regulations may be less stringent.

There are four possible treatment options for flowback and produced water discussed in the RDSGEIS: (1) reuse, (2) deep well injection, or (3) treatment in municipal or privately owned treatment facilities. None of these options is properly analyzed in the RDSGEIS. Reuse is not a

⁹ <http://www.wadsworth.org/radon/>

complete disposal option because residual salts and other contaminants must still be managed. Beyond reuse, the disposal options considered in the RDSGEIS only included injection wells, municipal sewage treatment facilities (of which there are currently none that are permitted to accept flowback and produced water) and private treatment plants (of which none currently exist in New York). The RDSGEIS did not consider whether there are other, less environmentally harmful, options that exist for flowback and produced water. More importantly, the RDSGEIS fails to evaluate the potentially significant adverse environmental impacts and human health risks associated with these disposal options.

3.14 Air Quality and Odors

For supporting technical information for the comments provided in this section, refer to Chapters 17 and 20 of the Harvey Consulting, LLC report (Attachment 1).

3.14.1 Air Quality Modeling Assumptions

The air quality analysis in the RDSGEIS contains some substantial improvements compared to the DSGEIS, but the assumptions used still warrant additional review and justification. For example, the RDSGEIS did not consider the reasonable worst case scenario air impacts resulting from simultaneous operations of spatially proximate well sites. In addition, the mobile source impact assessment under-predicts the number of miles that will be driven by heavy equipment to transport supplies to and haul wastes away from drillsites, especially wastewater that is hauled out of state to treatment and disposal facilities. Modeling for mobile source air impacts resulting from wastewater transport must be consistent with reasonable worst case scenario forecasts of wastewater volume (which impacts the number of truck trips needed per well site) as well as forecasted in and out of state disposal options (which impacts distance traveled per disposal). Limitations used in the modeling assumptions must all be translated into SGEIS mitigation measures and codified in the proposed regulations to ensure that the National Ambient Air Quality Standards will not be exceeded.

3.14.2 Air Quality Monitoring Program

The RDSGEIS includes a commitment to develop a regional air quality monitoring program to address the potential for significant adverse air quality impacts. However, more information is needed to understand the scope and duration of NYSDEC's proposed air monitoring program. A more rigorous monitoring program proposal is needed that identifies: the scope of the monitoring program; the location of the monitoring sites; the amount of equipment and personnel needed to run each site; the duration of monitoring proposed at each site; along with the cost. It is anticipated that a program used to assess both regional and local impacts will require long term monitoring stations placed in key locations, not just infrequent and unrepresentative sampling. The SGEIS should require the monitoring program to commence prior to Marcellus Shale gas development to verify background levels and continue until NYSDEC can scientifically justify that data collection is no longer warranted, in consultation with EPA. The obligation to fund the air monitoring program needs to be clearly tied to a permit condition requirement.

3.14.3 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigation Plan

The RDSGEIS took a step in the right direction with the inclusion of a requirement for greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) impact mitigation plans. However, this requirement needs to be further defined. NYSDEC should require a GHG Mitigation Plan that provides for measureable emissions

reductions and includes enforceable requirements. The GHG Impacts Mitigation Plan should list all Natural Gas STAR Program best management technologies and practices that have been determined by EPA to be technically and economically feasible, and operators should select and use the emission control(s) that will achieve the greatest emissions reductions. The GHG Impacts Mitigation Plan should be submitted and approved prior to drillsite construction, GHG controls should be installed at the time of well construction, and NYSDEC should conduct periodic reviews to ensure that GHG Impacts Mitigation Plans include state of the art emission control technologies. Further, the extent of compliance with adopted emission mitigation control plans should be documented throughout the well's potential to emit GHGs. The GHG Impacts Mitigation Plan requirement should be included in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure and codified in the proposed regulations. This requirement should apply to all natural gas operations, not just HVHF operations.

3.14.4 Flare and Venting of Gas Emissions

Flares may be used during well drilling, completion, and testing to combust hydrocarbon gases that cannot be collected because gas processing and pipeline systems have not been installed. During production operations, high pressure gas buildup may require gas venting via a pressure release valve, or gas may need to be routed to a flare during an equipment malfunction. Reducing gas flaring and venting is widely considered best practice for reducing air quality impacts of natural gas development. The RDSGEIS air quality analyses of flaring assumed it would be limited to three days based on statements from industry, even though the actual duration should be longer. Planned flaring should be limited to no more than three days. In all other cases flaring should be limited to safety purposes only. If NYSDEC finds there is an operational necessity to flare an exploration well for more than a three-day period, the SGEIS impact analysis should evaluate the air pollutant impact, particularly the potential for relatively high short-term emission impacts, from longer flaring events, before approving such operations. The SGEIS should provide justification for allowing a maximum of 5 MMscf of vented gas and 120 MMscf of flared gas at a drillsite during any consecutive 12-month period. The RDSGEIS does not contain information to show that these limits are equivalent to the lowest levels of venting and flaring that can be achieved through use of best practices, and it is unclear if these rates were used in the modeling assessment. Flaring and venting restrictions should be included in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure and codified in the proposed regulations. This requirement should apply to all natural gas operations, not just HVHF operations.

3.14.5 Reduced Emission Completions

Reduced Emission Completions (RECs, also known as “green completions”) control methane and other GHG emissions following HVHF operations. RECs also reduce nitrogen oxide (NOx) pollution, which otherwise would be generated by flaring gas wells, and hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) emissions, which otherwise would be released when gas is vented directly into the atmosphere. The RDSGEIS requires RECs where an existing gathering line is located near the well in question, which allows the gas to be collected and routed for sale. While the addition of this requirement represents a substantial improvement that protects air quality and increases the efficiency and productivity of wellsites, NYSDEC should consider expanding its REC requirements to more categories of wells—i.e., wells that are drilled prior to construction of gathering lines. Under the current proposal, a large number of wells could be exempt from the REC requirement, resulting in the flaring or venting of a significant amount of gas that could, instead, be captured for sale. Furthermore, NYSDEC proposes to postpone making a decision on the number of wells that can be drilled on a pad without the use of RECs until two years after the first HVHF permit is issued. NYSDEC should not defer the decision to implement RECs for two more years. The requirement to use RECs in all practicable situations should be included in the SGEIS as a

mitigation measure and codified in the proposed regulations. This requirement should apply to all natural gas operations, not just HVHF operations.

3.14.6 Gas Dehydrators

Dehydrator units remove water moisture from the gas stream. Dehydrator units typically use triethylene glycol (TEG) to remove the water; the TEG absorbs methane, VOCs, and HAPs. Gas dehydration units can emit significant amounts of HAPs and VOCs, and it is best practice to use control devices with gas dehydration units to mitigate HAP and VOC emissions. The 2011 RDSGEIS requires emissions modeling, using the EPA approved and industry standard model GRI-GlyCalc, and the installation of emission controls for dehydrator units emitting more than one ton per year of benzene. This is an important and substantial improvement. In addition to this requirement, natural gas operators should be required to evaluate the technical and economic feasibility of installing methane emission controls on gas dehydrators; installation should be mandatory unless an infeasibility determination is made. This requirement should be included in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure and codified in the proposed regulations. This requirement should apply to all natural gas operations, not just HVHF operations.

3.14.7 Diesel Engine Emissions Control

NRDC's 2009 comments recommended limiting diesel engines to Tier 2 or higher. The RDSGEIS takes a step in the right direction by prohibiting "Tier 0" engines and requiring Tier 2 engines in most cases. To further strengthen air quality protection from diesel emissions SGEIS should examine whether it is possible to eliminate Tier 1 engine use altogether.

3.14.8 Leak Detection and Control

Unmitigated gas leaks pose a risk of fire and explosion, and contribute to GHG, VOC, and HAP emissions, that could otherwise be avoided by routine detection and repair programs. NYSDEC's proposed Leak Detection and Repair Program should be revised to require: a drillsite Leak Detection and Repair inspection at start-up; quarterly testing with an infrared camera with additional follow-up testing and repair if a leak is indicated; testing of all equipment located on the drillsite up to and including the gas meter outlet which is connected to the pipeline inlet. These requirements should be included in the SGEIS as mitigation measures and codified in the proposed regulations, and be required for all natural gas operations, not just HVHF operations.

3.14.9 Cleaner Power and Fuel Supply Options

The RDSGEIS did not examine cleaner power and fuel supply options as was requested in NRDC's 2009 comments. In suburban and urban areas of NYS, where a connection to the electric power grid is available, electric engines should be used in lieu of diesel wherever practicable, eliminating the local diesel exhaust from those engines. In rural areas, where highline power is not readily available, an operator should be required to evaluate whether there is a natural gas supply that could be used as fuel; if so, use of the natural gas supply should be mandatory to the extent practicable. Cleaner power and fuel selection requirements should be included in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure and codified in the proposed regulations. These requirements should apply to all natural gas operations, not just HVHF operations.

3.14.10 Hydrogen Sulfide (H₂S) (“Sour Gas”) Emissions

In addition to air quality risks associated with emissions of criteria pollutants and air toxics resulting from natural gas development, additional air quality risks can occur as a result of the release of hydrogen sulfide (H₂S) or sour gas. H₂S gas produces a malodorous smell of rotten eggs at low concentrations, can cause very serious health symptoms, and can be deadly at the higher concentrations found in some oil and gas wells.

Therefore, proper handling of H₂S is important from both a quality-of-life and human-safety standpoint for workers and nearby public. The RDSGEIS does not analyze H₂S impacts based on the argument (supported by limited evidence) that to date H₂S has not been detected in high concentrations in HVHF operations in Pennsylvania. However, the early experience in Pennsylvania does not mean that there is no potential for H₂S issues to develop over time in New York.

A supplemental permit condition proposed in the RDSGEIS appropriately requires monitoring for H₂S during the drilling phase. However, a requirement should be added to the HVHF regulations to ensure that periodic monitoring occurs throughout production as gas fields age and sour. H₂S monitoring requirements should apply to all wells and therefore should be addressed through regulations, rather than through permit conditions that can be altered without public review. The regulations should stipulate that when monitoring detects H₂S, nearby neighbors, local authorities and public facilities should be notified of the risk of H₂S gas. They should be provided information on safety and control measures that the operator will be required to undertake to protect human health and safety. In cases where elevated H₂S levels are present, audible alarms should be installed to alert the public when immediate evacuation procedures are warranted.

3.15 Socioeconomics

This section addresses the socioeconomic impacts of HVHF. For supporting technical information for these comments, refer to the technical report from Dr. Susan Christopherson (Attachment 5).

3.15.1 NYSDEC’s Socioeconomic Impact Analysis

Although NYSDEC has included more information on the social and economic impacts of gas development using HVHF in the RDSGEIS than it did in the 2009 draft, the RDSGEIS still does not effectively assess those impacts or provide appropriate mitigation strategies. There are a number of substantive concerns raised by the discussion of socioeconomic impacts presented in the RDSGEIS and by the Economic Assessment Report (EAR) prepared by NYSDEC’s consultant, Environment and Ecology, on which that discussion is based.

1. The assessment of economic benefits (jobs and taxes) relies on questionable assumptions about the amount of gas extractable in the New York portion of the Marcellus Shale. The range of estimates for extractable gas appears to be skewed to the high end, leading to an overestimation of economic benefits.

2. The model used in the RDSGEIS to assess social and economic impacts presents natural gas development as a gradual, predictable process beginning with a “ramp-up” period and then proceeding through a regular pattern of well development over time. This model is misleading, and because many of the negative social and economic impacts of HVHF gas extraction (such as housing shortages followed by excess supply) are a consequence of unpredictable development, the model cannot appropriately assess those impacts.

3. The RDSGEIS does not assess public costs associated with natural gas development. A fiscal impact analysis of the base costs to the state and localities that will occur with any amount of HVHF gas development is required, along with an estimate of how costs will increase and accumulate as development expands.
4. The long-term economic consequences of HVHF gas development for the regions where production occurs are not addressed despite a widely recognized literature indicating that such regions have poor economic outcomes when resource extraction ends.
5. Mitigation of enumerated negative social and economic impacts of HVHF gas development is presumed to occur by means of phased development and regulation of the industry, but no evidence or information is provided to indicate whether, and if so how, that would occur.

3.15.2 Uncertainty and Volatility of Natural Gas Production and its Socioeconomic Impacts

The EAR's projections concerning population, jobs, housing, and revenue are predicated on the assumption of a regular, predictable roll-out of the exploratory, drilling, and production phases of the natural gas development process, rather than the irregular pattern typically associated with such development.

Natural gas drilling is a speculative venture and the commercially extractable gas from any particular well is uncertain. This central feature of natural gas development has critical implications for the economies of natural gas development regions. As production fluctuates, they may experience short- and medium-term volatility in population, jobs, revenues, and housing vacancies. The model used in the RDSGEIS to project socioeconomic impacts ignores those issues, however, and assumes instead that the HVHF natural gas development in New York will have a different pattern than that historically associated with such development. Rather than occurring in irregularly recurring waves (or "boom-bust cycles"), development in New York is assumed to be steady and predictable. Many of the economic benefits that the RDSGEIS and EAR associate with natural gas development are predicated on this unlikely gradual, regular development scenario, raising doubts about the projection of economic benefits based on that model.

The spatial distribution of impacts is also uneven. Some wells will have long production phases; others will have dramatic declines in productivity after a relatively short period. The uncertainties in the geographic extent of drilling and the potential for intensive development in "hot spots" have implications for social and economic impacts. If drilling is concentrated in particular locations rather than rolled out uniformly across sub-regions of the landscape (as was modeled in the RDSGEIS), wealth effects and tax revenues also will be concentrated in particular localities. The social and economic costs of spatially concentrated drilling, however, will be experienced across a much wider geographic area, because public services will be required in areas without HVHF development (and therefore not receiving tax revenues from drilling), but close enough to serve the transient population associated with the industry.

Contrary to the RDSGEIS' contention that the regularized development model "does not significantly affect the socioeconomic analysis," smoothing out the unpredictability and unevenness of development covers up many of the negative cumulative social and economic impacts that arise from the unpredictability of shale gas development. Finally, the RDSGEIS does not sufficiently model the resource depletion phase of the exploration, drilling, production, and resource depletion cycle and its implications for local and regional economies.

3.15.3 Economic Impact Study Fails to Address Costs

The 2011 RDSGEIS analyzes potential *economic benefits* of HVHF, but fails to provide the same level of analysis of the potential *costs* of HVHF. A central component of the EAR is use of a Regional Industrial Multiplier System (RIMS) model. This type of model is useful for comparing different types of investments and for examining inter-industry linkages, but it has a significant drawback as the central model for the RDSGEIS analysis of socioeconomic impacts because it can only project economic benefits. It cannot measure or assess the costs of proposed gas development using HVHF.

The RDSGEIS assumes, based on the RIMS model, that economic benefits from HVHF gas development, presumably including benefits to revenue, will be substantial, but there is no fiscal impact analysis or cost-benefit analysis to substantiate that assumption. A fiscal impact analysis is required, given that:

- (1) Many purchases by drilling companies are tax exempt.
- (2) Costs to the state that will reduce or offset tax revenues are not calculated.
- (3) Substantial negative fiscal impacts are detailed in the EAR that are not quantified or fully acknowledged in the RDSGEIS, including public costs associated with the increased demand for community social services, police and fire departments, first responders, schools, etc., as well as costs associated with monitoring and inspection and infrastructure maintenance. Although experience in other shale gas plays demonstrates that these costs are likely, the RDSGEIS makes no attempt to calculate the costs and consider them in the context of a fiscal impact assessment.
- (4) There is no analysis of the expected 2-3 year lag between immediate costs and anticipated revenues, during which communities will be faced with significant public service costs.

Given the inability of the EAR input-output model to address the costs of gas development and the significance of local and state costs to decisions about shale gas drilling in the state, revised EAR findings regarding costs must be prepared and an opportunity for public review and comment on the revised EAR afforded before the SGEIS is finalized.

3.15.4 Impacts on Other Industries

HVHF has the potential to have significant adverse effects on the viability of other industries in New York, particularly tourism and agriculture. In contrast with the pages of projected benefits from gas development, the RDSGEIS offers no detailed description and no quantitative analysis of the effects of HVHF development on existing industries and the associated impact on the state of New York's economy. This omission is particularly important for the counties defined in the EAR as "representative" because industries, including agriculture and tourism, are significant employers in those counties and are important to the overall economy of the State. There is no analysis of how the "crowding out" of existing industries may impact the regional or statewide economy or of the implications of the loss of industrial diversity to the long-term prospects for regional economic sustainability.

The inadequate assessment of the impacts on existing industries in the region that will be affected by HVHF gas development is problematic not only because the state does not have adequate information to assess costs and benefits of HVHF gas development, but also because negative impacts on industries such as tourism and agriculture, including dairies and wineries, will undermine

state investments intended to support those industries. Given the importance of these industries in the state and regional economy, the evidence that they will be negatively affected by HVHF gas development should have been analyzed in detail and quantified when possible.

3.15.5 Housing and Property Value Impacts

The potential impacts of HVHF on the housing supply, housing costs, and housing financing are inadequately addressed in the EAR. In addition, the social and economic impacts of unpredictable shortfalls in housing followed by periods in which there is an excess supply are not addressed.

The report assumes that the current housing stock would be used to house any workers who move to the production region on a “permanent” (more than one year) basis. However, given the quality and age of the housing stock in the region, evidence from Pennsylvania indicates that it is likely that there will be a demand for new single-family housing. This new housing stock will create new and additional construction jobs, increasing population pressure, accelerating the “boomtown” phenomenon. This housing may also contribute to sprawl around urban population centers such as Binghamton. When drilling ceases, either temporarily or permanently, the value of this new housing is likely to plummet. The social and economic impacts of unpredictable shortfalls in housing followed by periods in which there is an excess supply are not addressed. These impacts pose environmental justice concerns and require mitigation strategies.

With respect to impacts on property value, the EAR authors found that having a well on a property was associated with a 22% reduction in the value of the property; that having a well within 550 feet of a property increased its value; and that having a well located between 551 feet and 2,600 feet from a property had a negative impact on a property’s value. Thus, “...residential properties located in close proximity to the new gas wells would likely see some downward pressure on price. This downward pressure would be particularly acute for residential properties that do not own the subsurface mineral rights.” (EAR, 4-114). The EAR’s assumption of recovering property values after the completion of HVHF gas development does not take into account the potential for re-fracturing of wells to increase their productivity or the effects of waves of development in which drilling moves in and out of an area. The prospect of industrial activity is what drives down investment in regions open to boom-bust development and also negatively impacts property values. A more definitive analysis of impacts of on property values, including mortgage availability, in regions affected by drilling is needed.

3.15.6 Effects on Employment

The oil and gas industry is not likely to be a major source of jobs in New York, because of the project-based nature of the drilling phase of natural gas production (rigs and crews move from one place to another and activities are carried out at each well) and because of its capital intensity (labor is a small portion of total production costs). The emerging information on actual employment created in Pennsylvania in conjunction with Marcellus drilling shows much smaller numbers than industry-sponsored input-output models projected.

Although the industry points to years of drilling experience in New York, the oil and gas industry employed only 362 people in New York State in 2009 (0.01% of the state’s total employment). 43% of those workers (157) were employed in Region C, the region where vertical natural gas drilling is most significant in New York. Wages for these workers constituted 0.04% of the wages in the two-county region with almost 4,000 active gas wells.

In contrast, nearly 674,000 New York jobs were sustained by tourism activity last year, representing

7.9% of New York State employment, either directly or indirectly. New York State tourism generated a total income of \$26.5 billion, and \$6.5 billion in state and local taxes in 2010. In the Southern Tier alone, the tourism and travel sector accounted for 3,335 direct jobs and nearly \$66 million in labor income in 2008. When indirect and induced employment is considered, the tourism sector was responsible for 4,691 jobs and \$113.5 million in labor income. In addition, the travel and tourism sector generated nearly \$16 million in state taxes and \$15 million in local taxes, for a total of almost \$31 million in tax revenue.

The RDSGEIS assumes that as the industry “matures” in the region, local residents will be trained and hired for drilling jobs. If, as has been the case with vertical drilling in New York State and in the Western US shale plays, development follows a more irregular pattern, then the higher paid technical jobs are less likely to evolve into stable local employment. In addition, the jobs in ancillary industries (retail and services) are likely to disappear and reappear as rigs leave and re-enter the region at unpredictable intervals.

In addition, many of the highest paid jobs associated with HVHF will not be filled locally. Occupational employment statistics geographical analysis of petroleum engineers, one of the most common occupations in the oil and gas industry, indicates that the states with the highest employment in this occupation are Texas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana. This data suggests that the rural areas of New York that are likely to experience the most intensive gas development will not see an increase in highly skilled and highly paid jobs in petroleum engineering.

The creation of high-paying jobs as a result of expenditures in industries outside the extraction industry is also likely to occur outside the production region. This is important because regions where natural resource extraction takes place (and especially rural regions with little economic diversity) have been found to end up with poorer economies at the end of the resource extraction process. Although the EAR asserts that as the natural gas industry grows, more of the suppliers would locate to the representative regions and less of the indirect and induced economic impacts would leave the regions, no evidence is presented to substantiate this assumption. The more likely outcome is indicated by a study of the impact of gas drilling on Western State economies, which found that natural gas drilling may have positive fiscal impacts at the state level, but negative fiscal impacts for the regions in which it occurs.

3.15.7 Regional Plan of Development Approach to Mitigating Socioeconomic Impacts

The mitigation chapter of the RDSGEIS implies that negative impacts will be mitigated through the permitting process and a secondary level of review triggered by the operator’s identification of inconsistencies with comprehensive land use plans. The measures are only advisory. The RDSGEIS proposes no requirements to mitigate adverse socioeconomic impacts in this process.

Mitigation measures should be developed that would require operating companies to submit plans for exploration and development in a county or counties to county planning offices for review of cumulative impacts and mitigation (for example truck traffic routing), a model used in Western U.S. drilling regions. Because the RDSGEIS acknowledges that the pace and scale of development are difficult to ascertain until exploration and production begin to proceed, it is critical that a permit and regional Plan of Development (POD) review process be set up that alerts local officials to the need for long term planning for land use, schools, public safety and public health. The POD, outlining the pace, scale, and general location in which development will occur enables local government to anticipate and develop strategies to mitigate cumulative impacts. The near-term projections of development activity should include all secondary facilities (e.g., water extraction, waste disposal,

pipeline construction) in the area to be affected. A POD would allow communities in that region to prepare for the disruption and negotiate the least disruptive and damaging development plan.

To further assist communities in planning for socioeconomic impacts, a series of reporting requirements should be incorporated into the RDSGEIS and regulations. As development activities begin and progress, the information provided in initial projections should be confirmed or revised on a semiannual basis. This information is critical to forecasting and meeting housing and service demands.

In addition, mitigation strategies need to be developed and described in the RDSGEIS that address long term costs to affected regions and the impacts of the resource depletion phase of the exploration, drilling, and development process, when population and jobs leave the region and tax revenues may be insufficient to pay for the capital investments made to serve the population influx during the drilling and production phases of development. Finally, mitigation strategies should include policies to prevent negative impacts on existing industries, including agriculture, tourism and manufacturing.

3.16 Traffic and Transportation

While the RDSGEIS improves upon the 2009 DSGEIS regarding estimates truck trip generation, the impact of HVHF on roadway congestion and safety has not been adequately addressed in the RDSGEIS.

The impacts of a typical multi-well development on congestion and safety should be analyzed in detail; such analysis should include a cumulative traffic effects analysis using a reasonable worst case development scenario. The reasonable worst case development scenario for regional traffic impacts should include indirect traffic generation associated with increased economic development and population growth attributable to natural gas extraction and related economic activity.

The LBG technical memo (Attachment 7) details the specific analyses that should be undertaken and describes how the transportation mitigation commitments described in the RDSGEIS should be incorporated into regulations or permit conditions to ensure they are enforceable. The transportation plan requirement in the RDSGEIS is a good first step, but additional detail is needed on the transportation plan including required contents, methodologies and impact criteria to make this mitigation measure meaningful.

3.17 Noise and Vibration

The construction and operation phase noise impact assessments presented in RDSGEIS are improved over the 2009 DSGEIS, but still contain important flaws that understate the impacts.

For example, the drilling and fracturing impact assessment presented is for one well, ignoring the cumulative impact of multiple wells being developed at the same time. Even using the analysis for a single well, the sound levels associated with the fracturing process are so extreme that hearing damage could result from exposure for 8-hours at a distance of 500 feet from the well pad.

Transportation-related noise impacts are not quantified in the RDSGEIS. Potential noise effects on wildlife are not evaluated, even though the noise of a single well and even more so the combination of noise of multiple wells could affect wildlife (especially sensitive bird species). The cumulative

effects of noise on wildlife habitat and fragmentation effects of almost continual disturbance are not evaluated.

Vibration impacts and low-frequency noise impacts (which are associated with health impacts) are similarly not addressed in the RDSGEIS. The LBG technical memo details the specific analyses that should be undertaken and describes how the noise mitigation commitments described in the RDSGEIS should be incorporated into regulations or permit conditions to ensure they are enforceable.

Similar to the transportation plan requirement mentioned above, the noise mitigation plan requirement lacks specificity regarding the analyses required and the thresholds that trigger the need for mitigation. A best practice template for NYSDEC to consider adopting to specify the requirements for noise impact analysis and mitigation plans is the Alberta Energy Resources Conservation Board (ERCB) Noise Control Directive (#38).

3.18 Visual Resources

The RDSGEIS describes in very broad terms the potential direct and cumulative impacts of various phases of natural gas development on NYSDEC-designated visually sensitive resources. This assessment should incorporate best practices for analyzing visual impacts, such as identifying the relevant view groups, landscape zones and photo simulations of well development in various contexts.

The RDSGEIS mitigation section for visual resources suggests that mitigation measures would only be considered when designated significant visual resources (parks, historic resources, scenic rivers, etc.) are present *and* within the viewshed of proposed wells. This approach fails to consider visual impacts on nearby residences or tourists in areas where a significant visual resource is not present. In these situations, no mitigation would be required for individual wells to be consistent with the RDSGEIS. NYSDEC should make basic and low-cost mitigation measures mandatory for all well development sites (such as keeping lighting levels at the minimum level required and directing lights downward to minimize light pollution), regardless of whether or not state designated significant visual resources are present. For more information on the adequacy of the proposed mitigation measures and suggested changes, refer to the LBG technical memorandum (Attachment 7).

3.19 Land Use

The RDSGEIS fails to provide any analysis of the reasonably foreseeable cumulative land use impacts that would result if HVHF development goes forward in New York. This should be corrected by providing information on existing land use patterns and analyzing the impact of the level of development anticipated in the economic impact study on land use change. The RDSGEIS fails to provide any discussion of mitigation measures for land use impacts. Mitigation measures such as buffer distances for incompatible land uses should be described and incorporated into enforceable regulations or supplemental permit conditions, as appropriate. For more information on the adequacy of the proposed mitigation measures and suggested changes, refer to the LBG technical memorandum (Attachment 7).

3.20 Community Character

Community character is an amalgam of various elements that give communities their distinct "personality." These elements include a community's land use, architecture, visual resources,

historic resources, socioeconomics, traffic, and noise.¹⁰ The community character impact assessment portion of the RDSGEIS lists some of the community character impacts that could be expected (focused on demographic and economic impacts), but does not analyze the significance of these impacts or draw conclusions on how HVHF would affect community character in the short-term and long-term. The impact assessment does not mention the contribution of visual, land use or historic resource impacts to community character. The discussion of traffic and noise impacts is superficial (two sentences each). A complete community character impact assessment is needed (including regional cumulative impacts) to ensure appropriate mitigation measures are included in the HVHF regulatory framework.

3.21 Cultural Resources

In addition to the ecological effects of the massive ground disturbance and industrial development that will occur with HVHF in New York, the integrity of historic architectural resources, archaeological sites and culturally significant areas to Native Americans is also threatened. The RDSGEIS does not address comments provided by New York Archaeological Council during scoping in 2008 on cultural resource issues and does not adequately address this important resource topic. There is no section of the RDSGEIS specifically devoted to the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of HVHF on cultural resource or any discussion of mitigation measures (except for impacts related to visual resources). The reliance on the 1992 GEIS for protection of cultural resources is not sufficient given the significantly different type and scale of impacts that could occur with HVHF and the length of time that passed since the 1992 GEIS was prepared. The role of the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) in the review of individual permit applications is not clear in the RDSGEIS. In addition, the RDSGEIS does not explained how tribal consultation regarding impacts to cultural resources will be accomplished in a manner consistent with NYSDEC's own 2009 policy *Contact, Cooperation, and Consultation with Indian Nations*. Cultural resource impacts, mitigation measures and project-level review requirements must be addressed before HVHF is approved. Refer to the LBG technical memorandum for more information supporting these comments (Attachment 7).

3.22 Ecosystems and Wildlife

The ecological effects of HVHF and related infrastructure development include direct losses of habitat, fragmentation of existing habitats and indirect "edge effects" such as the spread of invasive species and noise disturbance of wildlife. The RDSGEIS qualitatively acknowledges these impacts and summarizes the findings of studies conducted in other locations, but does not provide build-out analyses that could quantify the range of cumulative habitat loss and fragmentation effects in New York. As evidenced by The Nature Conservancy's build-out analysis of Tioga County, such an analysis is readily achievable with existing GIS tools and datasets available to NYSDEC.¹¹ The RDSGEIS should include quantitative build-out analysis of habitat fragmentation and edge effects using estimates of development potential consistent with those developed for the RDSGEIS economic impact assessment and include the impacts from reasonably foreseeable infrastructure such as pipelines and compressor stations. Based on the results of the build-out analysis, NYSDEC should also analyze the potential diminution of critical ecosystem services associated with the disruption of forest cover and soils (carbon sequestration and storage, air filtration, watershed flow rates and volume, surface water quality and thermal condition).

¹⁰ New York City Mayor's Office of Environmental Coordination. 2010. City Environmental Review Technical Manual.

¹¹ The Nature Conservancy. 2011 . "An Assessment of the Potential Impacts of High Volume Hydraulic Fracturing on Forest Resources."

The RDSGEIS characterizes the ecological impacts of HVHF as “unavoidable” and fails to consider alternative mitigation approaches that could lessen significant adverse environmental impacts. The site-specific ecological assessments and mitigation measures required by the RDSGEIS for well pads in grasslands greater than 30 acres and forest patches greater than 150 acres is a fragmented approach. It does not address the importance of landscape connectivity between habitat patches, which is essential to the movement and long-term viability of numerous species. A preferable methodology would be to set limits on deforestation, fragmentation and increases in impervious surface cover based upon ecological planning units such as the sub watershed. The SGEIS process should consider an alternative where rather than the current spacing unit requirements (which are intended to maximize production), land disturbance would be restricted region wide based on ecological carrying capacity. An ecologically oriented planning framework could significantly lessen the adverse impacts of HVHF development on terrestrial and aquatic systems.

In addition, consideration should be given to cumulative changes to land use within each watershed that could lead to detrimental changes in the affected stream to support critical species habitat. Limiting the percent increase in impervious area to less than five percent (inclusive of existing uses) in trout supporting watersheds, including upstream tributaries, would reduce the potential for adverse impacts to sensitive aquatic organisms and the loss of a waters best use designation.

The RDSGEIS fails to provide any meaningful guidance regarding the ultimate restoration of well pads, pipeline right-of-ways and access roads to full ecosystem functionality upon decommissioning. Effective restoration requires a comprehensive, site-level assessment of the existing plant community prior to disturbance and the use of local reference ecosystems as templates for restoration. Ecological restoration is based upon the concept of rebuilding degraded areas such that they are structurally and functionally similar to pre-disturbance conditions. Reclamation is not restoration. Grassy fields neither function in a biologically similar manner as a forest nor supply the ecosystem benefits of a forest system. The replacement of a decades-old, complex assemblage of woodland species with a simple mix of grasses is not “restoration”. It may retard erosion but it does not replace the original functionality and structure of the displaced ecosystem.

For supporting technical information for these comments and additional comments on ecological impacts and mitigation measures, refer to the technical report from Kevin Heatley (Attachment 8) and LBG (Attachment 7).

3.23 Climate Change

The RDSGEIS ignores the real possibility that climate change impacts will undermine the safety of HVHF operations, frustrate mitigation efforts proposed by NYSDEC, and therefore exacerbate adverse impacts to the environment and human health resulting from HVHF operations. Increases in extreme weather events, such as floods, pose considerable obstacles to the safety of HVHF operations and infrastructure in and around low-lying coastal areas and floodplains. Precipitation changes coupled with enormous surface and groundwater withdrawals may result in modified groundwater flow patterns, which may cause unexpected groundwater contamination that jeopardizes drinking water supplies. Increased temperatures can volatilize dangerous chemical compounds at drill sites, exposing workers and nearby residents to airborne carcinogens at a rate greater than would be expected by modeling baseline temperatures without climate change. Remarkably, the effect of climate change on the availability of water resources is ignored in the section on the cumulative impact of water withdrawals, and no provision is made for situations where HVHF operations and public needs may conflict over water usage. Underscoring these concerns is the notable failure of NYSDEC to conduct a comprehensive Health Impact Assessment, despite the real possibility that climate change impacts confluent with HVHF operations can pose serious human

health problems. Reliable reports on the effect of climate change on New York abound, including some produced within the last year by New York governmental bodies. The RDSGEIS fails to include current information relevant to climate change's potential effects on New York State, which may pose potentially significant adverse environmental and public health threats in conjunction with HVHF operations that should be identified and mitigated to the maximum extent possible.

For supporting technical information regarding these comments, refer to the technical report from Dr. Kim Knowlton (Attachment 9).

3.24 Health Impact Assessment

Numerous health concerns have been associated with natural gas development using hydraulic fracturing, and while the RDSGEIS addresses some aspects of a subset of these health issues, it fails to address other important health risks. The RDSGEIS not only omits several issues, but also it only addresses only some aspects of other issues such as air, water quality, and heightened traffic without fully considering health impacts in those areas. Lastly, it doesn't consider health issues as a group in a formal Health Impact Assessment (HIA), including interactive effects on the health of local residents and communities. A full HIA as part of the RDSGEIS is a necessary component, as there are already numerous reports of health complaints including dizziness, sinus disorders, depression, anxiety, difficulty concentrating, and many others, among people who live near natural gas drilling and fracturing operations in other states. Without a full assessment and mitigation of the impacts of the risks, the health of New York State residents and communities is likely to suffer.

For supporting technical information regarding these comments, refer to the technical report from Dr. Gina Solomon (Attachment 10).

3.25 Induced Seismicity

The RDSGEIS fails to require operators of HVHF wells to consider the risk of induced seismicity when siting wells and designing hydraulic fracture treatments. The justification provided is that high volume hydraulic fracturing is not expected to cause induced seismicity that will result in adverse impacts. Since the RDSGEIS was written, hydraulic fracturing has been confirmed to have caused induced seismicity strong enough to be felt at the surface. The RSDGEIS assumes that operators will manage seismic risks voluntarily and makes statements regarding the frequency of use of seismic monitoring techniques that are internally contradictory. It also fails to recognize the potential significance of unmapped faults and relies too heavily on the occurrence of natural seismicity as a future predictor of the potential for induced seismicity. Finally, it underestimates the potential adverse consequences of induced seismicity, which include risks to drinking water, well integrity, private and public property, and New York City drinking water supply infrastructure. The RSDGEIS provides insufficient analysis and scientific evidence to support its conclusion that regulations to reduce the risk of induced seismicity from hydraulic fracturing are not necessary. The RSDGEIS must require operators to evaluate and manage the risk of induced seismicity from hydraulic fracturing through proper site characterization and hydraulic fracture treatment design.

For supporting technical information regarding these comments, refer to the technical report from Briana Mordick (Attachment 11).

Attachment 1

Harvey Consulting, LLC.

2011 NYS RDSGEIS

Revised Draft Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement On the Oil, Gas & Solution Mining Regulatory Program

Well Permit Issuance for Horizontal Drilling and High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing to Develop the Marcellus Shale and Other Low-Permeability Gas Reservoirs and

Proposed Revisions to the New York Code of Rules and Regulations

Best Technology and Practice Recommendations

Report to:

Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)

Prepared by:



Oil & Gas, Environmental, Regulatory Compliance, and Training

January 9, 2011

Contents

1.	Introduction.....	3
2.	Scope of SGEIS – Marcellus Only	4
3.	Liquid Hydrocarbon Impacts (Oil and Condensate).....	10
4.	Water Protection Threshold	12
5.	Conductor Casing.....	15
6.	Surface Casing	17
7.	Intermediate Casing	31
8.	Production Casing.....	41
9.	Permanent Wellbore Plugging & Abandonment Requirements	49
10.	HVHF Design and Monitoring	63
11.	Hydraulic Fracture Treatment Additive Limitations	83
12.	Drilling Mud Composition and Disposal.....	90
13.	Reserve Pit Use & Drill Cuttings Disposal.....	94
14.	HVHF Flowback Surface Impoundments at Drillsite.....	101
15.	HVHF Flowback Centralized Surface Impoundments Off-Drillsite	102
16.	Repeat HVHF Treatment Life Cycle Impacts	105
17.	Air Pollution Control and Monitoring	108
18.	Surface Setbacks from Sensitive Receptors.....	130
19.	Disposal of Drilling & Production Waste and Equipment Containing Naturally Occurring Radioactive Material (NORM).....	138
20.	Hydrogen Sulfide	149
21.	Chemical & Waste Tank Secondary Containment	152
22.	Fuel Tank Containment.....	155
23.	Corrosion & Erosion Mitigation & Integrity Monitoring Programs.....	161
24.	Well Control & Emergency Response Capability	167
25.	Financial Assurance Amount.....	171
26.	Seismic Data Collection.....	174

Appendix A – Surface Casing Table

Appendix B – Intermediate Casing Table

Appendix C – Production Casing Table

Appendix D – List of Acronyms

1. Introduction

This report responds to the Natural Resources Defense Council's (NRDC), and its partner organizations Earthjustice, Inc., Riverkeeper, Inc., Catskill Mountainkeeper and Delaware Riverkeeper Network, request for a review of the New York State (NYS) 2011 Revised Draft Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement (RDSGEIS) on the Oil, Gas & Solution Mining Regulatory Program Well Permit Issuance for Horizontal Drilling and High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing to Develop the Marcellus Shale and Other Low-Permeability Gas Reservoirs and proposed revisions to the New York Code of Rules and Regulations (NYCRR).

NRDC, and its partners, requested a technical review of the RDSGEIS and the proposed revisions to the NYCRR to determine if best technology and practices were included. NRDC has also commissioned additional experts; therefore, this list of recommendations is not exhaustive and is complementary to the work assigned to other experts. A complete list of expert recommendations can be found in the summary cover letter submitted by The Louis Berger Group, Inc., on behalf of NRDC, to the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) during the RDSGEIS public comment period.

This report makes recommendations for improving the SGEIS and the proposed revisions to the NYCRR. Overall, HCLLC found that NYSDEC made a number of significant improvements in both the RDSGEIS and the proposed revisions to the NYCRR. HCLLC commends NYSDEC for integrating a number of new best practices and technology alternatives into its 2011 RDSGEIS and proposed regulations.

This report highlights the RDSGEIS areas of improvement and reinforces the importance of retaining those improvements in the final SGEIS and the proposed NYCRR revisions. However, there remain significant areas for improvement. This report provides additional technical justification and scientific support for best practices and technology that warrant further NYSDEC consideration. It also recommends area of further study. Recommendations are highlighted in blue text boxes throughout the document.

A systemic problem persists in the 2011 RDSGEIS, where NYSDEC proposes to build on the existing 1992 Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS) for oil and gas drilling in NYS by providing additional information on the Marcellus Shale reservoir and high-volume hydraulic fracturing without addressing the fact that the technology and practices required by the 1992 GEIS are over two decades old.

Since 1992, numerous best technology and best management practice improvements have been made in the oil and gas industry. By relying on 1992-vintage decisions and technology as the foundation for Marcellus Shale development, NYS' RDSGEIS starts with an unstable foundation. This problem is magnified in the proposed revisions to the NYCRR where NYSDEC proposes to retain, with little revision, antiquated technology and practices for all oil and gas development in NYS, while proposing that new technology and practices only apply to HVHF operations. This creates a technically and scientifically unsupported two-tiered system for oil and gas regulation in NYS.

Accordingly, the first and most logical step in the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) analysis is to examine the 1992 GEIS foundation and identify new best technology and best practice improvements have been made since 1992 that warrant adoption. Then, and only then, can NYS build a well-supported incremental analysis that examines the impact of new techniques such as horizontal drilling and high-volume fracture treatments.

2. Scope of SGEIS – Marcellus Only

Background: In 2009, NYSDEC proposed that the SGEIS cover all horizontal drilling and HVHF in low-permeability gas reservoirs, at all depths. However, only the Marcellus Shale Gas Reservoir was studied in any detail. The DSGEIS was incomplete for all other low-permeability gas reservoirs.

In 2009, HCLLC recommended that NYSDEC either include additional information and analysis on the impacts of exploring and developing other low-permeability gas reservoirs or limit the scope of the SGEIS to the Marcellus Shale Gas Reservoir.

NYSDEC's consultant, Alpha Geoscience, disagreed with HCLLC's recommendation to limit the SGEIS scope to the Marcellus Shale, stating that the time to modify the scope had lapsed.¹ Alpha Geoscience concluded that it would be best for NYSDEC to determine at a future date, once a specific application was before them, whether the SGEIS covered High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing (HVHF) operations in other low-permeability reservoirs.

HCLLC disagrees with Alpha Geoscience's recommendation, because it lacks technical and scientific basis and misconstrues HCLLC's recommendation. HCLLC did not recommend that other low-permeability gas reservoirs be excluded from the analysis because they should not be studied at all. On the contrary, HCLLC recommended that if low-permeability gas reservoirs were included in the SGEIS, they should be thoroughly studied. The 2009 DSGEIS should have included a complete assessment of the Marcellus **and** all other low-permeability gas reservoirs in NYS; however, it did not. Unfortunately, the 2011 RDSGEIS suffers from the same lack of data on other low-permeability gas reservoirs.

Consequently, there is a technical and scientific choice that needs to be made in declaring whether the SGEIS content satisfies its title. Either the SGEIS had to be revised to cover all low-permeability gas formations in NYS, or the SGEIS had to conclude that NYSDEC has insufficient data and/or resources to examine anything more than the Marcellus Shale at this time, and limit the scope of the SGEIS.

HCLLC's 2009 recommendation was made to ensure the SGEIS document title matches its content. The title of the SGEIS purports to provide an environmental impact analysis on all low-permeability gas reservoirs, yet, as explained in HCLLC's 2009 comments, the SGEIS did not provide sufficient analysis of the Utica Shale, and provided no analysis of the other Lower Paleozoic, Devonian (other than Marcellus), and Middle to Upper Paleozoic low-permeability gas reservoirs.^{2,3} If NYSDEC has additional information to support a complete SGEIS for the Marcellus **and** all other low-permeability gas reservoirs, it should certainly include that complete assessment.

Unfortunately, the 2011 RDSGEIS suffers from the same narrow focus on the Marcellus shale. There was little additional work completed to advance NYSDEC's understanding of exploration and development impacts from the Utica Shale and other low-permeability gas reservoirs.

¹ Alpha Geoscience, Review of the DSGEIS and Identification Best Technology and Best Practices Recommendations Harvey Consulting, LLC, December 28, 2009, prepared for NYSERDA on January 20, 2011, Page 3.

² Ryder, R.T., 2008, Assessment of Appalachian Basin Oil and Gas Resources: Utica-Lower Paleozoic Total Petroleum System: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2008-1287.

³ Milici, R.C., and Swezey, C.S., 2006, Assessment of Appalachian Basin Oil and Gas Resources: Devonian Shale-Middle and Upper Paleozoic Total Petroleum System: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2006-1237.

2011 RDSGEIS: The 2011 RDSGEIS provides some additional information on the Utica Shale Gas Reservoir, mostly in the form of geologic assessment. However, the RDSGEIS does not examine the peak or cumulative impacts of Utica Shale development.

No additional information is provided in the 2011 RDSGEIS on other low-permeability gas reservoirs in the region. The 2011 RDSGEIS states that industry's main focus in the near term is the Marcellus and Utica Shales; however, NYSDEC wants to cover all other low-permeability formations in the SGEIS because it may receive applications in the future for those formations:

*The Department of Environmental Conservation (Department) has received applications for permits to drill horizontal wells to evaluate and develop the Marcellus and Utica Shales for natural gas production...**Other shale and low-permeability formations in New York may also be targeted for future application of horizontal drilling and high-volume hydraulic fracturing** [emphasis added].⁴*

Chapter 4 provides a geologic description of the Marcellus and Utica shale gas reservoirs; however, no other low-permeability gas reservoirs are studied. Yet, it is well known that most unconventional reservoirs vary in mineralogy, permeability, rock mechanics, and natural fracture parameters (length, orthogonal spacing, connectivity, anisotropy) and that there will be differences between formations that could lead to different drilling, stimulation, and development techniques.

Chapters 5 and 6 provide an analysis of drilling, fracturing, and development approaches in the Marcellus Shale Gas Reservoir. Chapters 5 and 6 are essentially silent on how the Utica Shale Gas Reservoir would be developed. No other low-permeability gas reservoirs are examined.

A search of the 1537 page electronic version of the RDSGEIS for the term “low-permeability gas reservoirs” shows that the term is only used a few times in the entire document. This term is used twice in the Executive Summary, where NYSDEC concludes that it has effectively studied “low-permeability gas reservoir” air quality impacts; yet, as further explained in Chapter 17 of this report there is insufficient information in the RDSGEIS to support that conclusion. The next occurrence of the term “low-permeability gas reservoirs” is not found until page 618 in the Air Quality Section, where again, NYSDEC states that it has included the impacts of “low-permeability gas reservoirs” in the air quality analysis; yet, there is insufficient information in the RDSGEIS to support that conclusion. The next occurrence, after the Air Quality Section, is found at page 1008, where NYSDEC defends exclusion of pipeline and compressor stations. A few minor references to this term are found at page 1071 in Chapter 9 (Alternative Actions). More simply put, the RDSGEIS contents do not match the title, and that there is insufficient information contained in the RDGSEIS to support development of all unnamed, unanalyzed low-permeability gas reservoirs in NYS. NYS has not developed a technical or scientific case to justify that the impacts described for the Marcellus Shale are representative of the peak or cumulative impact that would result from development of all unnamed, unanalyzed low-permeability gas reservoirs in NYS.

The 2011 RDSGEIS does not include a complete list of the formation names that it considers fit under the umbrella term of “low-permeability” formations. The only place that the term “low-permeability” formation is defined is in the Glossary at the end of the document:


Gas bearing rocks (which may or may not contain natural fractures) which exhibit in-situ gas permeability of less than 0.10 milidarcies.⁵

⁴ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 1-1.

⁵ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Glossary.

Using this definition, a low-permeability formation could include a shale, sandstone, limestone or other formation that is gas bearing with a permeability of less than 0.10 milidarcies. The RDSGEIS does not address the scope of the formations that could be encompassed by this definition.

Figure 4.2 of the RDSGEIS⁶ includes a stratigraphic section showing existing known oil and gas intervals above the Marcellus and Utica Shales, including numerous shale and other low-permeability formations that are known to exist, that were not examined in the SGEIS.



On the next page is a table summarizing historical oil and gas production data from 1967 to 2010 in NYS.⁷ This table shows that there is numerous gas zones present both above and below the Marcellus Shale that have been producing gas. Some of these reservoirs are low-permeability reservoirs that may be further developed using horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing techniques. Additionally, this table shows that there has been no Utica Shale production in NYS from 1967 to 2010; therefore, little is known about its productivity or how it may be developed.

⁶ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 4-7.

⁷ NYS Oil & Gas Data Summary 1967-2010, compiled by Briana Mordick, NRDC, December 2011, using NYS data found at <http://www.dec.ny.gov/energy/1601.html>. 1967-1999 data came from summary production history files. 2000-2010 data came from oil and gas production files.

NYS Oil & Gas Data Summary 1967-2010								
		Formation	Oil (bbl)	Gas (mcf)		Oil (bbl)	Gas (mcf)	
Devonian	Upper	DEVONIAN SHALE	12,274	323,975				
		UPPER DEVONIAN	364,054	881,848	DEVONIAN SHALE	376,328	1,208,697	
		UPPER DEVONIAN SHALE	-	2,874				
		Canadaway Undifferentiated						
		GLADE	1,392,255	449,124				
		BRADFORD	7,665,427	1,639,511				
		BRADFORD 1ST & 2ND	21	-				
		BRADFORD & CHIPMUNK	416,357	676,506				
		Bradford 1st & Chipmunk	6,609	2,497				
		CHIPMUNK, BRADFORD 1ST & 2ND	44,943	10,217				
		CHIPMUNK	7,369,293	1,012,975				
		CHIPMUNK & BRADFORD 2ND	2,454,948	16,415				
		BRADFORD SECOND	21,724	2,520				
		CHIPMUNK, BRADFORD 2ND & 3RD	237,195	162,809	CANADAWAY UNDIFFERENTIATED	23,945,472	7,271,139	
		Chipmunk, Bradford 1st,2nd,3rd	9,719	8,321				
		BRADFORD 2ND & 3RD	37,780	9,353				
		CHIPMUNK & BRADFORD 3RD	33,186	34,858				
		Chipmunk & Harrisburg	2,442	1,026				
		Harrisburg	1,682	-				
		SCIO	137,258	2,520				
		PENNY	13,232	46,567				
		PENNY & FULMER VALLEY	42,660	71,003				
		RICHBURG	4,057,637	3,121,677				
		RICHBURG-WAUGH & PORTER	1,104	3,240				
		Canadaway PERRYSBURG	-	395				
		BRADFORD THIRD	228,582	112,002				
		CLARKSVILLE	39,387	36,864	PERRYSBURG	2,055,287	4,746,392	
		WAUGH & PORTER	42,100	247,245				
		FULMER VALLEY	1,745,218	4,349,886				
		Nunda	-	-				
		RHINESTREET	-	3,409				
		TULLY	1,108	275,643	TULLY	1,108	275,643	
		HAMILTON	-	20,416	HAMILTON	-	20,416	
		MARCELLUS	-	747,399	MARCELLUS	-	747,399	
		ONONDAGA	647,251	25,843,114	ONONDAGA	647,251	25,843,114	
ONONDAGA-ORISKANY	-	223,157						
ORISKANY	10,582	31,738,725	ORISKANY	10,582	31,961,882			
HELDERBERG	-	10,230,425	HELDERBERG	-	10,230,425			
ONONDAGA-BASS ISLAND	532,310	3,118,389						
BASS ISLAND	1,021,802	5,739,620	BASS ISLAND	1,580,509	9,416,091			
BASS ISLAND/MEDINA	26,397	558,082						
AKRON	1,577	1,729,358	AKRON	1,577	1,729,358			
SALINA	1,278	5,778						
CAMILLUS	-	60						
SYRACUSE	570	2,338						
VERNON	-	358,405						
CLINTON	-	87,231						
LOCKPORT	-	69,528						
ROCHESTER SHALE	-	70,693						
SAUQUOIT	-	210						
SODUS SHALE	-	164,071						
MEDINA	213,688	514,545,705						
GRIMSBY	-	1,501,854	MEDINA	213,688	521,205,687			
WHIRLPOOL	-	893,326						
MEDINA-QUEENSTON	-	4,264,802						
HERKIMER	-	5,849,567						
HERKIMER-ONEIDA	-	1,178,375						
ONEIDA	-	1,024,647	HERKIMER-ONEIDA-OSWEGO	-	9,169,025			
ONEIDA-OSWEGO	-	1,094,384						
QUEENSTON	-	56,439,648	QUEENSTON	-	56,439,648			
OSWEGO	-	22,052						
UTICA	-	-						
TRENTON	-	485,477	TRENTON	-	485,477			
BLACK RIVER	-	318,316,063	BLACK RIVER	-	318,316,063			
LITTLE FALLS	-	501,440	LITTLE FALLS	-	501,440			
THERESA	-	3,588,222	THERESA	-	3,588,222			
POTSDAM	-	-						

NYS Oil & Gas Data Summary 1967-2010, compiled by Briana Mordick, NRDC, December 2011.

Using the Marcellus Shale impact assessment and proposed mitigation measures as a surrogate for peak and cumulative impact assessment in the Utica and all other unnamed low-permeability formations is an inadequate approach.

For example, the Utica Shale Gas Reservoir is almost twice as deep as the Marcellus Shale Gas Reservoir. The Utica Shale dips to 9,000' deep,⁸ while the Marcellus Shale is approximately 5,000' deep.⁹ Utica Shale wells will take longer to drill than Marcellus Shale wells, generating more air pollution and drilling waste, HVHF waste and resulting in longer duration surface impacts (e.g. noise, light, fuel and chemical storage periods, etc.). Additionally, waste generated translates into additional transportation and surface use impacts. Utica Shale development will also require more resources and equipment. Deeper shale gas formations will have higher reservoir pressure, and will penetrate more known oil and gas zones before reaching the Utica Shale, meaning increased blowout risk. Higher reservoir pressure will require additional combustion equipment to meet higher pump pressure and energy demands. Deeper wells can have more complex well construction designs. Fully cemented casing strings will be more difficult to complete at deeper depths and higher temperature cement mixtures will be required if subsurface temperatures exceed 200 °F. Therefore, the maximum impact assessment for a Marcellus Shale well is not sufficient to examine the maximum impact of a Utica Shale well.

Additionally, there is little information in Petroleum Engineering technical literature on the Utica Shale, and how it may be effectively developed. The 2011 RDSGEIS assumes that the Utica Shale will be developed using the same exact techniques as the Marcellus Shale; however, this may not be the case. For example, a 2007 paper prepared by Universal Well Services Inc., CESI Chemical A Flotek Industries Co., in collaboration with the State University of New York noted some significant differences in the Utica Shale, and the likelihood for a unique stimulation method:

*The primary purpose of stimulating fractured shale reservoirs is the extension of the drainage radius via creation of a long fracture sand pack that interconnects with natural fractures thereby establishing a flow channel network to the wellbore. **However, there is limited understanding of a successful method capable of stimulating Utica Shale reservoirs. Indeed most attempts to data have yielded undesirable results.** This could be due to several factors, including formation composition, entry pressure, and premature pad fluid leak-off. Furthermore, stimulation of Utica shale reservoirs with acid alone has not been successful. This treatment method leads to a fracture length and drainage radius less than expected resulting in poor well productivity [emphasis added].¹⁰*

*...several recently drilled Utica shale wells have not responded well to the normal shale fracturing practices. **An understanding of Utica shale mineralogy and rock mechanics is necessary before a stimulation method and fluid are selected** [emphasis added].¹¹*

Additionally, the authors point out that the Utica, unlike the Marcellus, contains a high percentage of acid soluble carbonate and dolomite that may require chemical treatment (e.g. acids) to treat the carbonates and dolomite to reduce entry pressures. They suggest that an acid stimulation treatment could potentially be the main stimulation method instead of a HVHF, or alternatively be added as an additional pre-

⁸ 2009 NYSDEC, DSGEIS, Page 4-5.

⁹ 2009 NYSDEC, DSGEIS, Page 4-14.

¹⁰ Paktinat, J., Pinkhouse, J.A., and Fontaine, J., (Universal Well Services Inc.), Lash, G. G., State University of New York College at Fredonia, Penny, G.S., CESI Chemical A Flotek Industries Co., Investigation of Methods to Improve Utica Shale Hydraulic Fracturing in the Appalachian Basin, Society of Petroleum Engineers, SPE Paper 111063, 2007, Page 1.

¹¹ Paktinat, J., Pinkhouse, J.A., and Fontaine, J., (Universal Well Services Inc.), Lash, G. G., State University of New York College at Fredonia, Penny, G.S., CESI Chemical A Flotek Industries Co., Investigation of Methods to Improve Utica Shale Hydraulic Fracturing in the Appalachian Basin, Society of Petroleum Engineers, SPE Paper 111063, 2007, Page 2.

treatment to a HVHF. The Utica also contains a higher percentage of clays than the Marcellus, and has the potential to generate both siliceous and organic fines that may require additional chemical treatment.

Moreover, there are low-permeability gas reservoirs that are present at depths shallower than the Marcellus Shale, which were not studied at all. Those unnamed, unanalyzed low-permeability reservoirs are in closer proximity to protected water resources, and warrant a complete technical and scientific assessment. Most importantly, HVHF modeling and fracture design requirements should be established to ensure that man-made induced fractures in these shallower reservoirs do not propagate in a manner that pollutes protected groundwater resources. Man-made induced fractures in shallower formations will tend to propagate on the horizontal plane; however, the size of that horizontal fracture must be constrained so that it does not intersect with existing improperly constructed or improperly abandoned wells or transmissive faults and fractures that can provide a direct pollution pathway to protected groundwater resources.

Best technology and best practices and cumulative impacts, in many cases, are reservoir specific. Because the RDSGEIS does not contain information on the depth, type, activity, or equipment requirements for the general category called “*other low-permeability gas reservoirs*,” it is not possible to determine if the maximum impact assessment for a Marcellus Shale well sufficiently covers the maximum impact from “*other low-permeability gas reservoirs*.” Nor is it possible to determine whether best technology and best practices developed for the Marcellus Shale would apply to the Utica Shale since there is very little information and understanding of the optimal Utica Shale stimulation method at this time.

Recommendation No. 1: The SGEIS should either include additional information and analysis on the impacts of exploring and developing the Utica Shale and other unnamed low-permeability gas reservoirs, or acknowledge that there is insufficient information and analysis to study the impacts of this development. In the latter case, the SGEIS should conclude that its examination of impacts and mitigation measures is limited to the Marcellus Shale Gas Reservoir, and therefore any Utica Shale or other unnamed low-permeability gas reservoir development will warrant a site-specific supplemental environmental impact statement review or should be covered under another, future SGEIS process.

3. Liquid Hydrocarbon Impacts (Oil and Condensate)

Background: NYS 2009 Annual Oil and Gas Report¹² show that NYS produced 323,536 barrels of oil in 2009, primarily from the western counties of:

Cattaraugus	201,688 barrels
Allegany	47,421 barrels
Chautauqua	40,187 barrels
Steuben	9,992 barrels

NYSDEC did not separately report the amount of condensate or natural gas liquids production.

Chapter 2 of this report includes a table summarizing oil and gas production from 1967 to 2010 in NYS, showing that oil gas been produced from above the Marcellus and Utica Shale formations, verifying the potential to encounter liquid hydrocarbons while drilling into the Marcellus and Utica formations.

2011 RDSGEIS: The 2011 RDSGEIS describes natural gas exploration and production, but does not address the potential for shale gas wells to also encounter liquid hydrocarbons. Natural gas exploration can identify oil and condensate development opportunities. If liquid hydrocarbons are found while drilling a shale gas well, additional wells and drillsites may be needed to develop those oil resources.

Liquid hydrocarbons found during natural gas exploration have the potential to contaminate the environment through spills and well blowouts. The risk of oil spills during shale gas exploration has not been analyzed in the RDSGEIS. While blowouts are infrequent, they do occur, and are a reasonably foreseeable consequence of exploratory drilling operations. Blowouts can occur from gas and/or oil wells. They can last for days, weeks, or months until well control is achieved. On average, a blowout occurs in 7 out of every 1,000 onshore exploration wells.¹³ Two recent gas well blowouts occurred in Pennsylvania due to Marcellus Shale drilling.^{14,15}

The 2011 RDSGEIS provided several useful maps and a stratigraphic section that aid in understanding the overlap of NYS' oil and gas production intervals. Figure 4.2 includes a Stratigraphic Section of Southwestern NYS that shows oil is produced from the Upper Devonian, at shallower depths than the Marcellus Shale, meaning that wells drilled in this region may encounter oil before penetrating the Marcellus. An annotated version of Figure 4.2 is also shown in Chapter 2 of this report. Figures 4.8 and 4.9 indicate that there is an overlap of current oil production with possible Marcellus Shale development in Cattaraugus, Allegany, Chautauqua, and Steuben counties.

Oil is also found below the Marcellus Shale and above the Utica Shale in the Upper Silurian. Therefore wells drilled into the Utica Shale may encounter oil before penetrating the Utica. Figure 4.6 indicates that there is an overlap of current oil production with possible Utica Shale development in Steuben County.

¹² New York State Oil, Gas and Mineral Resources, 26th Annual Report for Year 2009 and Appendices, Prepared by NYSDEC, 2009.

¹³ Rana, S., Environmental Risks- Oil and Gas Operations Reducing Compliance Cost Using Smarter Technologies, Society of Petroleum Engineering Paper 121595-MS, Asia Pacific Health, Safety, Security and Environment Conference, 4-6 August 2009, Jakarta, Indonesia, 2009.

¹⁴ Blowout Occurs at Pennsylvania Gas Well, Wall Street Journal, June 4, 2010.


¹⁵ Pennsylvania Fracking Spill: Natural Gas Well Blowout Spills Thousands of Gallons of Drilling Fluid, The Huffington Post, April 20, 2011.

There are low-permeability gas reservoirs that are present at depths both shallower and deeper than the Marcellus Shale, which were not studied in detail in the RDSGEIS. Absent geologic maps for these unnamed, unanalyzed low-permeability reservoirs, it is not clear where oil development and shale gas development overlap for these reservoirs may occur.

Recommendation No. 2: The SGEIS should examine the potential for shale gas wells to also encounter liquid hydrocarbons. The SGEIS should also examine the incremental risks of oil well blowouts and oil spills, as well as the impacts from the additional wells and drillsites that may be required to develop oil resources identified by shale gas exploration and production activities.

4. Water Protection Threshold

Background: The regulations promulgated under the federal Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) define an Underground Source of Drinking Water (USDW) as an aquifer or part of an aquifer, which is not exempted (per 40 CFR § 146.4), and: (1) which supplies a public water system; or (2) which contains a sufficient quantity of groundwater to supply a public water system and either supplies drinking water for human consumption or contains fewer than 10,000 milligrams/liter of Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) [10,000 ppm TDS]. 40 CFR § 144.3. An EPA diagram depicting a USDW is shown below.¹⁶



The 2011 RDSGEIS: The 2011 RDSGEIS is based on the protection of potable water as defined as water containing less than 250 ppm of sodium chloride or 1,000 ppm TDS. The RDSGEIS states:

*For oil and gas regulatory purposes, **potable fresh water is defined as water containing less than 250 ppm of sodium chloride or 1,000 ppm TDS** and salt water is defined as containing more than 250 ppm sodium chloride or 1,000 ppm TDS [emphasis added].¹⁷*

The RDSGEIS identifies 850' as the depth where 250 ppm of sodium chloride or 1,000 ppm TDS is typically reached, however the RDSGEIS notes that in some cases potable water is found deeper than 850'.

¹⁶ USEPA, Karen Johnson, Chief Ground Water & Enforcement Branch, 2010 PowerPoint Presentation, EPA's Underground Injection Control Program, Regulation of Disposal Wells in Pennsylvania.

¹⁷ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 2-23.

Groundwater from sources below approximately 850 feet in New York typically is too saline for use as a potable water supply; however, there are isolated wells deeper than 850 feet that produce potable water and wells less than 850 feet that produce salt water. A depth of 850 feet to the base of potable water is commonly used as a practical generalization for the maximum depth of potable water; however, a variety of conditions affect water quality, and the maximum depth of potable water in an area should be determined based on the best available data [emphasis added].¹⁸

By comparison, USDWs are based on a TDS cutoff of 10,000 ppm. The RDSGEIS has not explained why it proposes, and NYS regulations rely on, a 1,000 ppm TDS threshold instead of the federally required USDW threshold of 10,000 ppm TDS.

Ohio issued updated Oil and Gas Well Construction Rules on October 28, 2011, that require surface casing and intermediate casing to be set to protect the deepest underground source of drinking water (USDW); Ohio's rules are based on the 10,000 ppm federal TDS threshold.¹⁹

Recommendation No. 3: The SGEIS and the NYCRR should require wells to be constructed to protect Underground Sources of Drinking Water (USDWs), as defined by the Safe Drinking Water Act.

NYS' use of a 1,000 ppm TDS cut-off instead of the USDW threshold of 10,000 ppm TSD is a two-fold problem: First, the RDSGEIS states that surface casing ("water protection piping") setting depths will be 925' if no other data is available.²⁰ The 925' surface casing setting depth is based on an 850' base plus 75'²¹, where NYSDEC has assumed that TDS will exceed 1,000 ppm at deeper than 850'. The 925' casing setting depth does not take into account the fact that drinking water, under the SDWA definition of a USDW, could exist at depths below 850'. Therefore the RDSGEIS has not provided scientific justification for the default 925' casing setting depth, nor has it explained how such a proposal comports with federal law.

Second, the entire RDSGEIS is premised on the conclusion that a HVHF well initiated at a depth of 2,000' would be safe, because NYSDEC assumes that NYS does not have any drinking water resources deeper than 850' deep. However, the RDSGEIS does not indicate that any examination of the depth of 10,000 ppm TDS water or of the availability of drinking water resources below 850' has been or will be conducted and, therefore, cannot support its 850' assumption.

Additionally, the RDSGEIS states that potable water is found deeper than 850'. Therefore, the 2,000' threshold depth for initiating a HVHF under this SGEIS requires re-evaluation. And as explained in Chapter 10 of this report, HCLLC is recommending that initial drilling and completions occur below 4,000', while site-specific data is gathered in NYS to justify safe drilling at shallower depths.

¹⁸ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 2-23.

¹⁹ Proposed Ohio Oil and Gas Well Construction Rules, October 28, 2011, currently under public review and comment.

²⁰ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-50.

²¹ See Chapter 6 of this report, where a 100' buffer is recommended, instead of 75'.

Recommendation No. 4: The SGEIS should re-examine the 925' casing default setting and the 2000' HVHF cut-off, and justify how these proposed thresholds will protect USDW sources. Protecting to a 10,000 ppm TDS standard will likely increase both depths.

The SGEIS should include data on the location of Underground Sources of Drinking Water (USDWs), as defined by the Safe Drinking Water Act, across NYS. The SGEIS should include USDW maps for all areas that will be affected by the proposed scope of the SGEIS. This data will be an important tool for industry and the public alike to ensure USDWs are protected.

NYCRR Proposed Revisions: Well construction regulations at 6 NYCRR § 550-559 instruct operators to construct oil and gas wells in a manner that protects potable fresh water, i.e., only water containing less than 250 ppm of sodium chloride or less than 1,000 ppm of TDS. 6 NYCRR § 550.3 (ai).

The NYCRR does not protect, under its definition of “potable fresh water,” water resources with less than 10,000 ppm TDS but greater than 1,000 ppm TDS, which could qualify as USDWs under the Safe Drinking Water Act. See 40 CFR §§ 144.3, 146.4.

Regulations at 6 NYCRR § 554.1 require operators to prevent pollution to “surface or ground fresh water”; however, this term is not defined by the NYCRR, so it is unclear what additional groundwater beyond “potable fresh water” would be protected or how.

Recommendation No. 5: The NYCRR should be consistent with federal law [Underground Sources of Drinking Water (USDWs)] or NYSDEC should propose more protective standards for NYS if needed to protect NYS' future water supply needs, if the federal threshold is found insufficient.

5. Conductor Casing

Background: In 2009, HCLLC recommended the NYCRR and the SGEIS be revised to include conductor casing construction standards. While a number of changes were made to improve conductor casing requirements in the RDSGEIS, the proposed revisions to the NYCRR do not include conductor casing construction standards. Please refer to HCLLC's September 16, 2009 Report, *New York State (NYS) Casing Regulation Recommendations* for more specific recommendations on conductor casing and the technical basis for HCLLC's recommendations.

Conductor casing construction standards are only partially addressed in the 2011 RDSGEIS, under Appendix 10, Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF, and Appendix 9, Existing Fresh Water Supplementary Permit Conditions Required for Wells Drilled in Primary and Principal Aquifers.

2011 RDSGEIS: The 2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 9, Existing Fresh Water Supplementary Permit Conditions Required for Wells Drilled in Primary and Principal Aquifers, includes a conductor casing requirement that limits drilling fluid types. The requirement excludes synthetic muds and oil based muds from being used while drilling shallow sections of the wellbore.

Any hole drilled for conductor or surface casing (i.e., "water string") must be drilled on air, fresh water, or fresh water mud. For any holes drilled with mud, techniques for removal of filter cake (e.g., spacers, additional cement, appropriate flow regimes) must be considered when designing any primary cement job on conductor and surface casing.

Excluding synthetic muds and oil based muds from being used while drilling shallow sections of the wellbore is a best practice.

Appendix 9 also includes procedures for ensuring conductor pipe is cemented from top to bottom, and firmly affixed in a central location in the wellbore, with a continuous, equally thick layer of cement around the pipe.

If conductor pipe is used, it must be run in a drilled hole and it must be cemented back to surface by circulation down the inside of the pipe and up the annulus, or installed by another procedure approved by this office. Lost circulation materials must be added to the cement to ensure satisfactory results.

Additionally, at least two centralizers must be run with one each at the shoe and at the middle of the string. In the event that cement circulation is not achieved, cement must be grouted (or squeezed) down from the surface to ensure a complete cement bond. In lieu of or in combination with such grouting or squeezing from the surface, this office may require perforation of the conductor casing and squeeze cementing of perforations. This office must be notified _____ hours prior to cementing operations and cementing cannot commence until a state inspector is present.

The 2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 10, Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF, includes a conductor casing condition that states:

When drive pipe (conductor casing) is left in the ground, a pad of cement shall be placed around the well bore to block the downward migration of surface pollutants. The pad shall be three feet square or, if circular, three feet in diameter and shall be crowned up to the drive pipe (conductor casing), unless otherwise approved by the Department.

NYCRR Proposed Revisions: In summary, NYSDEC has included important conductor casing construction guidelines in the 2011 RDSGEIS for wells drilled in primary and principal aquifer areas and HVHF wells, but has not proposed to codify those changes in the NYCRR.

The conductor casing construction guidelines listed in the 2011 RDSGEIS should apply to all wells in NYS, and should not just be limited to wells drilled in primary and principal aquifer areas and HVHF wells. These are best practices for construction of all oil and gas wells.

NYSDEC should set a conductor casing depth criterion, requiring conductor casing be set to a sufficient depth to provide solid structural anchorage. Also, the regulations should specify that conductor casing design be based on site-specific engineering and geologic factors.

Recommendation No. 6: Conductor casing requirements listed in the Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF and Existing Fresh Water Supplementary Permit Conditions Required for Wells Drilled in Primary and Principal Aquifers should be codified in the NYCRR and should apply to all wells drilled in NYS, not just HVHF wells. Additionally, NYSDEC should set a conductor casing depth criterion, requiring conductor casing be set to a sufficient depth to provide a solid structural anchorage. Regulations should specify that conductor casing design be based on site-specific engineering and geologic factors.

6. Surface Casing

Background: In 2009, HCLLC recommended the NYCRR be revised to include additional surface casing construction standards. Please refer to HCLLC's September 16, 2009 Report, *New York State (NYS) Casing Regulation Recommendations* for more specific recommendations on surface casing the technical basis for HCLLC's recommendations.

Surface casing plays a very important role in protecting groundwater aquifers, providing the structure to support blowout prevention equipment, and providing a conduit for drilling fluids while drilling the next section of the well.

The drilling engineer determines the depth of surface casing installation with these key factors in mind: surface casing should stop above any significant pressure or hydrocarbon zone, ensuring the blowout preventer can be installed prior to drilling into a pressure or hydrocarbon zone, and surface casing should provide a protective barrier to prevent hydrocarbons from contaminating aquifers when the well is drilled deeper (below the surface casing) into hydrocarbon bearing zones.

Stray gas may impact ground water and surface water from poor well construction practices. Properly constructed and operated oil and gas wells are critical to mitigating stray gas and thereby protecting water supplies and public safety. If a well is not properly cased and cemented, natural gas in subsurface formations may migrate from the wellbore through bedrock and soil. Stray gas may adversely affect water supplies, accumulate in or adjacent to structures such as residences and water wells, and has the potential to cause a fire or explosion.

Instances of improperly constructed wellbores leading to the contamination of drinking water with natural gas are well documented in Pennsylvania.²² Gas well leaks from improperly constructed gas wells have resulted in contamination of the Susquehanna River and adjacent private water supply wells.²³ A 2011 Duke University study covering Pennsylvania and New York found methane contamination of drinking water associated with shale-gas extraction. Duke University found that methane concentrations were 17 times higher, on average, in drinking water wells in active drilling and extraction areas than in wells in nonactive areas.²⁴

The 2011 RDSGEIS and the proposed revisions to the NYCRR include important improvements for surface casing. Overall, NYS' surface casing requirements are fairly robust when the NYCRR, guidance documents, and standard stipulations are combined. NYSDEC proposed a number of substantial improvements in the surface casing requirements, most notably improved cement quality, casing quality, and installation techniques.

This chapter reviews the proposed changes and supports the improvements that have been made. It also makes suggestions for improved regulatory clarity and adds a few additional recommendations for NYSDEC to consider in completing its surface casing regulatory program revision.

²² See, e.g., DEP Reaches Agreement with Cabot to Prevent Gas Migration, Restore Water Supplies in Dimock Township, Agreement Requires DEP Approval for Well Casing, Cementing, November 4, 2009, available at <http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/newsroom/14287?id=2418&typeid=1>.

²³ See, e.g., DEP Monitors Stray Gas Remediation in Bradford County Requires Chesapeake to Eliminate Gas Migration, Chesapeake Commits to Evaluate, Remediate All PA Wells to Conform with Improved Casing Regulations, September 17, 2010, available at <http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/newsroom/14287?id=14274&typeid=1>.

²⁴ Osborn, S.G., A. Vengosh, N.R. Warner, R.B. Jackson, 2011 Methane contamination of drinking water accompanying gas- well drilling and hydraulic fracturing, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, U.S.A.; DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1100682108, Page 2.

The main recommendation in this section is to streamline surface casing regulations by amending the NYCRR to include requirements contained in the 2011 RDSGEIS and standard stipulations. As proposed, NYSDEC has included a number of surface casing requirements in the 2011 RDSGEIS at Appendices 8, 9, and 10 (Proposed Permit Conditions). NYSDEC also included some, but not all, of these requirements in the NYCRR. Unfortunately, there are a number of inconsistencies between the permit conditions and the NYCRR that create uncertainty about what will be required.

Additionally, there are a number of new surface casing requirements proposed for HVHF wells that are standard industry best practices for all oil and gas wells. These requirements should be included in the NYCRR Part 554 (drilling practices for all oil and gas wells), and not just contained in NYCRR Part 560 (drilling practices for HVHF wells).

In 2009, HCLLC recommended that improved casing and cementing practices be codified in the NYCRR, rather than through a combined patchwork of permit conditions and regulations. HCLLC's concern was that the proposed requirements, in a number of cases, were inconsistent with existing regulations, and could be more efficiently consolidated into a single, more concise set of regulations.

NYSDEC's consultant Alpha Geoscience disagreed. Alpha Geoscience concluded that it would be more logical to use a patchwork of regulations, add a long list of conditions to each permit, and forgo regulatory revision.

Harvey Consulting suggests that NYSDEC revise the NYS oil and gas regulations to specifically address new casing and cementing practices and fresh water aquifer supplementary permit conditions. The purpose of the SGEIS, however, is not to revise regulations. The purpose of the Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for shale gas activities is to customize the existing regulations and guideline framework to fit new and changing industry, relieving the need for frequent regulatory changes. Permit conditions must be met by the party seeking a permit for a proposed action, so whether or not the permit conditions are included in the New York State regulations is irrelevant.²⁵

HCLLC disagrees with Alpha Geoscience's recommendation. It is relevant whether new requirements are found in regulation or a permit condition. Foremost, revising the outdated NYCRR provides simplicity and clarity for industry and the public. It provides a concise set of co-located rules. Conversely, layering a complex patchwork of permit conditions on outdated NYCRR creates confusion, inconsistency, and enforcement challenges. Furthermore, permit conditions can be revised and modified by staff, without public review, and can be applied in a more discretionary manner. Regulations are not discretionary, and are not subject to modification without a formal public review process. Therefore, HCLLC recommends that requirements that apply to all wells be codified in the NYCRR, and permit conditions be reserved for site-specific, project-specific requirements. This will improve clarity and certainty for industry and the public alike, and will afford NYSDEC the opportunity to apply site-specific, project specific requirements to address unique project issues.

NYSDEC evidently agreed with HCLLC's recommendation to revise the NYCRR by proposing revisions for public review; however, the regulations have only been partially updated to include new surface casing best practices. Therefore inconsistency remains, and needs resolution.

Recommendation No. 7: The surface casing and cementing requirements should be consistent throughout the SGEIS text and with the NYCRR.

²⁵ Alpha Geoscience, Review of the DSGEIS and Identification Best Technology and Best Practices Recommendations, Harvey Consulting, LLC, December 28, 2009, prepared for NYSERDA on January 20, 2011, Page 13.

An analysis of the proposed RDSGEIS conditions found in Appendices 8, 9, and 10 is provided below and compared to the proposed NYCRR revisions. Recommendations are made to improve consistency in the documents and highlight additional best practices that should be considered.

The 2011 RDSGEIS: It appears that NYSDEC's intent is to require that all wells meet the minimum standards found at Appendix 8 (NYSDEC's Casing and Cementing Practices), and then layer on additional requirements for wells drilled in primary and principal aquifers (Appendix 9 Existing Fresh Water Supplementary Permit Conditions Required for Wells Drilled in Primary and Principal Aquifers). It appears that a third layer of requirements will be applied to wells that undergo HVHF stimulation treatments (Appendix 10 Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF).

Therefore, it is assumed that a shale gas well that is drilled in a primary and principal aquifer, and will undergo a HVHF stimulation treatment must meet all the conditions found in Appendices 8, 9, and 10; however, this would not be possible because the permit conditions are discordant. An evaluation of these layered conditions reveals inconsistencies, as explained in the text and summary table below.

The 2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 8: Appendix 8 Casing and Cementing Practices requires: surface casing be set at least 75' below freshwater or at least 75' into bedrock, whichever is deeper; surface casing be set before hydrocarbons are encountered; new pipe be used (or used pipe if tested); and centralizers and cement baskets be used.

2. *Surface casing shall extend at least 75 feet beyond the deepest fresh water zone encountered or 75 feet into competent rock (bedrock), whichever is deeper, unless otherwise approved by the Department. However, the surface pipe must be set deeply enough to allow the BOP [blow-out preventer] stack to contain any formation pressures that may be encountered before the next casing is run.*
3. *Surface casing shall not extend into zones known to contain measurable quantities of shallow gas. In the event that such a zone is encountered before the fresh water is cased off, the operator shall notify the Department and, with the Department's approval, take whatever actions are necessary to protect the fresh water zone(s).*
4. *All surface casing shall be a string of new pipe with a mill test of at least 1,100 pounds per square inch (psi), unless otherwise approved. Used casing may be approved for use, but must be pressure tested before drilling out the casing shoe or, if there is no casing shoe, before drilling out the cement in the bottom joint of casing. If plain end pipe is welded together for use, it too must be pressure tested. The minimum pressure for testing used casing or casing joined together by welding, shall be determined by the Department at the time of permit application. The appropriate Regional Mineral Resources office staff will be notified six hours prior to making the test. The results will be entered on the drilling log.*
5. *Centralizers shall be spaced at least one per every 120 feet; a minimum of two centralizers shall be run on surface casing. Cement baskets shall be installed appropriately above major lost circulation zones.²⁶*

Appendix 8 requires the use of: 25% excess cement, spacer fluids between the drilling muds and cement, and lost circulation additives. Appendix 8 also requires that gas flows or lost circulation be addressed and

²⁶ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 8, Page 1.

the hole be conditioned before cementing. NYSDEC reserves the right to require a cement evaluation log if cement does not return to the surface.

6. *Prior to cementing any casing strings, all gas flows shall be killed and the operator shall attempt to establish circulation by pumping the calculated volume necessary to circulate. If the hole is dry, the calculated volume would include the pipe volume and 125% of the annular volume. Circulation is deemed to have been established once fluid reaches the surface. A flush, spacer or extra cement shall be used to separate the cement from the bore hole spacer or extra cement shall be used to separate the cement from the bore hole fluids to prevent dilution. If cement returns are not present at the surface, the operator may be required to run a log to determine the top of the cement.*
7. *The pump and plug method shall be used to cement surface casing, unless approved otherwise by the Department. The amount of cement will be determined on a site-specific basis and a minimum of 25% excess cement shall be used, with appropriate lost circulation materials, unless other amounts of excesses are approved or specified by the Department.²⁷*

Appendix 8 requires: the water used in the cement be tested for pH and temperature; the cement be prepared according to manufacturer specifications; and the cement be allowed to harden to a compressive strength of at least 500 psi before being disturbed.

8. *The operator shall test or require the cementing contractor to test the mixing water for pH and temperature prior to mixing the cement and to record the results on the cementing ticket.*
9. *The cement slurry shall be prepared according to the manufacturer's or contractor's specifications to minimize free water content in the cement.*
10. *After the cement is placed and the cementing equipment is disconnected, the operator shall wait until the cement achieves a calculated compressive strength of 500 psi before the casing is disturbed in any way. The waiting-on-cement (WOC) time shall be recorded on the drilling log.²⁸*

The 2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 9: Appendix 9, Existing Fresh Water Supplementary Permit Conditions Required for Wells Drilled in Primary and Principal Aquifers, applies to wells drilled in primary and principal aquifer zones. Appendix 9 includes conditions that require: surface casing to be set at least 100' below the deepest freshwater zone and at least 100' into bedrock; the annulus be at least 1-1/4" wide to optimize cement placement and cement sheath width: the entire annulus be cemented, using at least 50% excess cement; the cement design include additives to control lost circulation; centralizers be run at least every 120'; new pipe be used (or reconditioned tested pipe); and NYSDEC be notified and present for cementing operations.

²⁷ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 8, Pages 1-2.

²⁸ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 8, Page 2.

A surface casing string must be set at least 100' below the deepest fresh water zone and at least 100' into bedrock. If shallow gas is known to exist or is anticipated in this bedrock interval, the casing setting depth may be adjusted based on site-specific conditions provided it is approved by this office. There must be at least a 2½" difference between the diameters of the hole and the casing (excluding couplings) or the clearance specified in the Department's Casing and Cementing Practices, whichever is greater. Cement must be circulated back to the surface with a minimum calculated 50% excess. Lost circulation materials must be added to the cement to ensure satisfactory results. Additionally, cement baskets and centralizers must be run at appropriate intervals with centralizers run at least every 120'. Pipe must be either new API graded pipe with a minimum internal yield pressure of 1,800 psi or reconditioned pipe that has been tested internally to a minimum of 2,700 psi. If reconditioned pipe is used, an affidavit that the pipe has been tested must be submitted to this office before the pipe is run. This office must be notified _____ hours prior to cementing operations and cementing cannot commence until a state inspector is present.²⁹

Appendix 9 requires the surface hole be drilled using compressed air or Water-Based Muds (WBM), meaning no Synthetic-Based Muds (SBM) or Oil-Based Muds (OBM) may be used.

Any hole drilled for conductor or surface casing (i.e., "water string") must be drilled on air, fresh water, or fresh water mud. For any holes drilled with mud, techniques for removal of filter cake (e.g., spacers, additional cement, appropriate flow regimes) must be considered when designing any primary cement job on conductor and surface casing.³⁰

As found in Appendix 9, freshwater zone depths and the potential for shallow gas hazards must be estimated and documented in drilling applications; actual data must be collected during drilling to identify any freshwater zones and shallow gas hazards that require additional NYSDEC review and approval.

If multiple fresh water zones are known to exist or are found or if shallow gas is present, this office may require multiple strings of surface casing to prevent gas intrusion and/or preserve the hydraulic characteristics and water quality of each fresh water zone. The permittee must immediately inform this office of the occurrence of any fresh water or shallow gas zones not noted on the permittee's drilling application and prognosis. This office may require changes to the casing and cementing plan in response to unexpected occurrences of fresh water or shallow gas, and may also require the immediate, temporary cessation of operations while such alterations are developed by the permittee and evaluated by the Department for approval.³¹

Appendix 9 requires cement fill the surface casing annulus, and if cement placement in the annulus is not initially successful, additional cement must be pumped into the annulus until it is filled with cement.

In the event that cement circulation is not achieved on any surface casing cement job, cement must be grouted (or squeezed) down from the surface to ensure a complete cement bond. This office must be notified _____ hours prior to cementing operations and cementing cannot commence until a state inspector is present. In lieu of or in

²⁹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 9, Page 1.

³⁰ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 9, Page 1.

³¹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 9, Page 2.

*combination with such grouting or squeezing from the surface, this office may require perforation of the surface casing and squeeze cementing of perforations.*³²

In Appendix 9, NYSDEC reserves the right to require the operator to run a cement bond log; however, it does not require one to verify the integrity of all surface casing cement jobs.

*This office may also require that a cement bond log and/or other logs be run for evaluation purposes. In addition, drilling out of and below surface casing cannot commence if there is any evidence or indication of flow behind the surface casing until remedial action has occurred. Alternative remedial actions from those described above may be approved by this office on a case-by-case basis provided site-specific conditions form the basis for such proposals.*³³

The 2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 10: Appendix 10 contains Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF operations, including additional surface casing requirements. The 2011 RDSGEIS does not explain why these additional pollution prevention and quality control/quality assurance (QC/QA) requirements do not apply to all oil and gas wells in NYS.

The 2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 10 requires new casing and the use of American Petroleum Institute (API) standards for: casing thread compounds, centralizer placement, and cement composition (including the requirement to use gas-blocking additives).

31) With respect to all surface, intermediate and production casing run in the well, and in addition to the requirements of the Department's "Casing and Cementing Practices" and any approved centralizer plan for intermediate casing, the following shall apply:

- a) Casing must be new and conform to American Petroleum Institute (API) Specification 5CT, Specifications for Casing and Tubing (April 2002), and welded connections are prohibited;*
- b) Casing thread compound and its use must conform to API Recommended Practice (RP) 5A3, RP on Thread Compounds for Casing, Tubing, Line Pipe, and Drill Stem Elements (November 2009);*
- c) At least two centralizers (one in the middle and one at the top) must be installed on the first joint of casing (except production casing) and all bow-spring style centralizers must conform to API Specification 10D for Bow-Spring Casing Centralizers (March 2002);*
- d) Cement must conform to API Specification 10A, Specifications for Cement and Material for Well Cementing (April 2002 and January 2005 Addendum). Further, the cement slurry must be prepared to minimize its free water content in accordance with the same API specification and it must contain a gas-block additive...*³⁴

³² 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 9, Page 2.

³³ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 9, Page 2.

³⁴ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 10, Pages 5-6.

Appendix 10 also requires: drilling mud be circulated and conditioned prior to cementing; spacer fluid be used to separate the drilling mud from the cement, to avoid drilling mud contamination; and cement be installed using methods that inhibit voids in the cement.

- e) *Prior to cementing any casing string, the borehole must be circulated and conditioned to ensure an adequate cement bond... The surface casing must be run and cemented immediately after the hole has been adequately circulated and conditioned.*
- f) *A spacer of adequate volume, makeup and consistency must be pumped ahead of the cement;*
- g) *The cement must be pumped at a rate and in a flow regime that inhibits channeling of the cement in the annulus...³⁵*

Appendix 10 establishes a specific period of time for the cement to harden, and a compressive strength standard that the cement must achieve before drilling continues deeper in the hole. This avoids disturbing the cement until it has completely set.

h) After the cement is pumped, the operator must wait on cement (WOC):

- 1. until the cement achieves a calculated (e.g., performance chart) compressive strength of at least 500 psig, and*
- 2. a minimum WOC time of 8 hours before the casing is disturbed in any way, including installation of a blow-out preventer (BOP). The operator may request a waiver from the Department from the required WOC time if the operator has bench tested the actual cement batch and blend using mix water from the actual source for the job, and determined that 8 hours is not required to reach a compressive strength of 500 psig.³⁶*

Appendix 10 requires records be kept for a period of 5 years and be available to NYSDEC upon request.

A copy of the cement job log for any cemented casing in the well must be available to the Department at the wellsite during drilling operations, and thereafter available to the Department upon request. The operator must provide such to the Department upon request at any time during the period up to and including five years after the well is permanently plugged and abandoned under a Department permit. If the well is located on a multi-well pad, all cementing records must be maintained and made available during the period up to and including five years after the last well on the pad is permanently plugged and abandoned under a Department permit.³⁷

³⁵ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 10, Page 6.

³⁶ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 10, Page 6.

³⁷ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 10, Page 6.

Appendix 10 reserves the right for NYSDEC to require additional casing strings to be set in the well if the surface casing fails to adequately protect water resources or poses a safety hazard.

38) The installation of an additional cemented casing string or strings in the well as deemed necessary by the Department for environmental and/or public safety reasons may be required at any time.³⁸

Appendix 10 requires NYSDEC's Casing and Cementing Practices be followed. NYSDEC's Casing and Cementing Practices are included in the 2011 RDSGEIS as Appendix 8. Yet, a number of the Casing and Cementing Practices found in Appendix 8 conflict with the new requirements in Appendix 10 for wells subject to HVHF.

The RDSGEIS does not provide a rationale or basis for the use of a 75' surface casing setting depth for some wells and a 100' surface casing setting depth for others. NYSDEC determined that a 100' setting depth is best practice for groundwater protection in areas of primary and principal aquifers, but does not explain why a 100' standard would not be best practice for all wells, or at least wells that undergo HVHF.

An analysis of the surface casing permit condition requirements and inconsistencies is provided in table format as Appendix A. Recommendations are listed in the table.

NYCRR Proposed Revisions: A number of the requirements listed in the RDSGEIS Appendices 8, 9, and 10 are not codified in the NYCRR, or conflict with the proposed changes to the NYCRR.

Listed below is an analysis of the proposed NYCRR revisions for surface casing and cementing. Specific recommendations for improving surface casing design, installation, and quality control/ quality assurance requirements are also included.

Surface Casing Setting Depth: 6 NYCRR § 554.1(d) requires that:

Surface casing shall be run in all wells to extend below the deepest potable fresh water level.

Neither the 75' nor the 100' setting depths below the deepest protected water zone (described in the RDSGEIS) are specified in regulation. Furthermore, this regulation only protects "potable fresh water." As explained in Chapter 4 of this report, NYSDEC should consider its long-term water needs.

Recommendation No. 8: 6 NYCRR § 554.1(d) should be revised to require the surface casing setting depth to be at least 100' below protected groundwater for all wells, or NYSDEC should provide a technical justification for reducing the setting depth to 75' for some wells.

Surface Casing Definition: 6 NYCRR § 550.3(au) reads:

Surface casing shall mean casing extending from the surface through the potable fresh water zone.

This definition requires surface casing be set through only the protected water zone, and does not require the casing be set deeper. This definition, as written, does not include the important requirement for the casing to be set at least 100' below protected groundwater and be cemented in place.

³⁸ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 10, Page 8.

Recommendation No. 9: 6 NYCRR § 550.3(a) should be revised to read: surface casing shall mean casing installed and cemented from the surface, through protected groundwater, to a point at least 100' below the deepest protected groundwater. Protected groundwater should be defined in a way that meets NYS' long-term water needs.

Rotary Tool Drilling Practices: 6 NYCRR § 554.4 should be revised to be consistent with the proposed RDSGEIS surface casing conditions, and remove reference errors. 6 NYCRR § 554.4(a) provides the operator with a choice of installing surface casing in accordance with 6 NYCRR § 554.1(b) (which does not provide specific instruction to the operator) or by cementing the production casing from below the deepest potable fresh water level to the surface (which does not provide specific instruction to the operator).

§554.4 Rotary tool drilling practices

(a) On all wells where rotary tools are employed, and the subsurface formations and pressures to be encountered have been reasonably well established by prior drilling experience, the operator shall have the option of either running surface casing as provided in section 554.1(b) of this Part or of cementing the production casing from below the deepest potable fresh water level to the surface. In areas where the subsurface formations and pressures to be encountered are unknown or uncertain, surface casing shall be run as provided in section 554.1(b) of this Part.

6 NYCRR § 554.1(b) does not provide any specific direction on the type or amount of surface casing to be installed; it just says:

Pollution of the land and/or of surface or ground freshwater resulting from exploration or drilling is prohibited.

Nor does 6 NYCRR § 554.4(a) provide any specific direction on the type or amount of surface casing to be installed, other than to say that it must be set below *the deepest potable fresh water level*, but the minimum depth that the casing must be set below the deepest freshwater located is not specified.

Recommendation No. 10: 6 NYCRR § 554.1(d) and 6 NYCRR § 554.4(a) should be combined or at least be consistent to require the surface casing setting depth to be at least 100' below protected groundwater.

NYCRR does not provide the operator with instructions on how to determine protected groundwater depth. The RDSGEIS explains that the depth of potable freshwater in NYS is typically 850' deep, but this depth will vary across the state. Using the 850' benchmark may not sufficiently protect all groundwater covered under the Safe Drinking Water Act. NYCRR should be revised to provide instructions to the operator on how to estimate protected water depth in drilling applications and well construction designs. NYCRR should require that depth be confirmed before setting surface casing.

Recommendation No. 11: NYCRR should require the protected groundwater depth be estimated in the drilling application to aid in well construction design. NYCRR should require the protected water depth be verified with a resistivity log or other sampling method during drilling. If the protected water depth is deeper than estimated, an additional string of intermediate casing should be required. Additionally, the NYCRR needs to be clear on whether its purpose is to protect potable freshwater only, or a broader definition of protected groundwater, which would result in surface casing being set deeper.

6 NYCRR § 554.4(b) correctly requires: cement be placed by the pump and plug or displacement methods; cement be placed in the entire annulus; and a wait on cement time before further drilling. However, 6 NYCRR § 554.4(b) does not include the best practices listed in the permit conditions (Appendices 8 and 9). Additionally, many of the best practices included in Appendix 10 for HVHF wells should be included in regulations for all oil and gas wells.

Recommendation No. 12: 6 NYCRR § 554.4(b) should be revised to be consistent with the proposed Appendices 8 and 9 permit conditions. Also, the best practices listed in Appendix 10 for HVHF should apply to all oil and gas wells and be included in 6 NYCRR § 554.4(b).

Cable Tool Drilling Practices: 6 NYCRR § 554.3 includes requirements for cable tool drilling.

Recommendation No. 13: NYSDEC should verify whether cable tool drilling is still anticipated in NYS. If cable tool drilling is still allowed, 6 NYCRR § 554.3 should be revised to require these wells be constructed to the same quality standards as wells drilled with rotary drilling equipment.

Newly proposed surface casing regulations for HVHF wells at 6 NYCRR § 560.6(c)(10) require casing be run in accordance with the “department’s casing and cementing requirements.” Presumably this refers to the requirements set out in the RDSGEIS at Appendix 8, but this needs to be clarified. All surface casing requirements for HVHF operations should be codified in NYCRR.

A number of new requirements proposed at 6 NYCRR § 560.6(c)(10) should be applied to all wells in NYS, not just those that will undergo a HVHF treatment. 6 NYCRR § 560.6(c)(10) proposes to add these requirements only to HVHF wells.

(10) With respect to all surface, intermediate and production casing run in the well, and in addition to the department's casing and cementing requirements and any approved centralizer plan for intermediate casing, the following shall apply:

(i) all casings must be new and conform to industry standards specified in the permit to drill;

(ii) welded connections are prohibited;

(iii) casing thread compound and its use must conform to industry standards specified in the permit to drill;

(iv) in addition to centralizers otherwise required by the department, at least two centralizers, one in the middle and one at the top of the first joint of casing, must be installed (except production casing) and all bow-spring style centralizers must conform to the industry standards specified in the permit to drill;

(v) cement must conform to industry standards specified in the permit to drill and the cement slurry must be prepared to minimize its free water content in accordance with the industry standards and specifications, and contain a gas-block additive;

(vi) prior to cementing any casing string, the borehole must be circulated and conditioned to ensure an adequate cement bond;

(vii) a spacer of adequate volume, makeup and consistency must be pumped ahead of the cement;

(viii) the cement must be pumped at a rate and in a flow regime that inhibits channeling of the cement in the annulus;

(ix) after the cement is pumped, the operator must wait on cement (WOC) until the cement achieves a calculated (e.g., performance chart) compressive strength of at least 500 psig, and a minimum WOC time of 8 hours before the casing is disturbed in any way, including installation of a blowout preventer. The operator may request a waiver from the department from the required WOC time if the operator has bench tested the actual cement batch and blend using mix water from the actual source for the job, and determined that 8 hours is not required to reach a compressive strength of 500 pounds per square inch gage; and

(x) a copy of the cement job log for any cemented casing string in the well must be available to the department at the well site during drilling operations, and thereafter available to the department upon request. The operator must provide such log to the department upon request at any time during the period up to and including five years after the well is permanently plugged and abandoned under a department permit issued pursuant to Part 550 of this Title. If the well is located on a multi-well pad, all cementing job logs must be maintained and made available during the period up to and including five years after the last well on the pad is permanently plugged and abandoned under a department permit issued pursuant to Part 550 of this Title.

(11) The surface casing must be run and cemented as soon as practicable after the hole has been adequately circulated and conditioned.

The zone of critical cement (e.g. cement placed at bottom of surface casing, typically bottom 300-500') should achieve a 72-hour compressive strength standard of 1,200 psi and the free water separation for the cement should be no more than 6 ml per 250 ml of cement. For example, this requirement is found in the Pennsylvania surface casing code (25 PaCode § 78.85 (b))

An analysis of the proposed Appendices 8, 9, and 10 permit condition requirements and inconsistencies, with comparisons to NYCRR, is provided in table format as Appendix A. Recommendations for improving requirements and addressing inconsistencies are listed in the table.

Recommendation No. 14: The recommendations listed in the Surface Casing Analysis Table (Appendix A to this report) should be considered for the SGEIS and the NYCRR, including:

Surface Casing Setting Depth: NYSDEC should consider a 100' protection for all oil and gas wells. Additionally, NYSDEC needs to clarify whether this setting depth is intended to protect potable freshwater only, or include a broader definition of protected groundwater, which would result in deeper surface casing depths. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells.

Protected Water Depth Verification: The freshwater depth should be estimated in the drilling application to aid in well construction design. The actual protected water depth should be verified with a resistivity log or other sampling method. If the actual protected water depth extends beyond the estimated protected water depth, an additional string of intermediate casing should be required. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells.

Cement Sheath Width: A cement sheath of at least 1-1/4" should be installed on all oil and gas wells. Thin cement sheaths are easily cracked and damaged. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells.

Amount of Cement in Annulus: The surface casing annulus should be completely filled with cement; this should be clearly specified. There should be no void space in the annulus. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells.

Shallow Gas Hazards: If a shallow gas hazard is encountered, surface hole drilling must stop, and surface casing must be set and cemented, before drilling deeper into hydrocarbon resources. All oil and gas well designs and applications should plan for shallow gas hazards. Any shallow gas hazards encountered while drilling should be recorded. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells.

Excess Cement Requirements: 25% excess cement is standard practice, unless a caliper log is run to more accurately assess hole shape and required cement volume. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells.

Cement Type: The cement must conform to API Specification 10A, Specifications for Cement and Material for Well Cementing (April 2002 and January 2005 Addendum). Further, the cement slurry must be prepared to minimize its free water content, in accordance with the same API specification, and it must contain a gas-block additive. HVHF cement quality requirements (including API specifications and the use of gas-blocking additives) is best practice. These practices should apply to all wells, not just HVHF wells.

Cement Mix Water Temperature and pH Monitoring: Best practice is for the free water separation to average no more than six milliliters per 250 milliliters of tested cement, in accordance with the current API RP 10B. Best practice is to test for pH to evaluate water chemistry and ensure cement is mixed to manufacturer's recommendations. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells, not just HVHF wells.

Lost Circulation Control: Lost circulation control is best practice. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells, not just HVHF wells.

Spacer Fluids: The use of spacer fluids to separate mud and cement, to avoid mud contamination of the cement, is best practice. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells, not just HVHF wells.

Hole Conditioning: Hole conditioning before cementing is best practice. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells, not just HVHF wells.

Cement Installation and Pump Rate: The requirement for cement to be pumped at a rate and in a flow regime that inhibits channeling of the cement in the annulus is a good practice; this requirement should apply to all oil and gas wells, not just HVHF wells.

Rotation and Reciprocation: Rotating and reciprocating casing while cementing is a best practice to improve cement placement. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells.

Centralizers: The proposed conditions reference an outdated API casing centralizer standard. Best practice is to use at least two centralizers and follow API RP 10D-2 (July 2010). This requirement should apply to all NYS wells, not just HVHF wells.

Casing Quality: New casing should be used in all wells. Once installed, surface casing remains in the well for the life of the well, and typically remains in place when the well is plugged and abandoned. It is important that the surface casing piping string (known as "the water protection piping string") is of high quality to maximize the corrosion allowance and life-cycle of the piping. The installation of older, used, thinner pipe, with less remaining corrosion allowance, may be a temporary solution, but not a long-term investment in groundwater protection. Used piping may pass an initial pressure test; however, it will not last as long as new piping, and will not be as protective of water resources in the long-term.

Casing Thread Compound: The requirement to use casing thread compound that conforms to API RP 5A3 (November 2009) is a good practice. This requirement should apply to all oil and gas wells, not HVHF wells.

Drilling Mud: The use of compressed air or WBM (with no toxic additives) is best practice when drilling through protected water zones. This should be a requirement for all NYS wells.

Cement Setting Time: Best practice is to have surface casing strings stand under pressure until the cement has reached a compressive strength of at least 500 psi in the zone of critical cement, before drilling out the cement plug or initiating a test. Additionally, the cement mixture in the zone of critical cement should have a 72-hour compressive strength of at least 1,200 psi. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells.

NYS Inspectors: Best practice is to have a state inspector on site during cementing operations, to verify surface casing cement is correctly installed, before attaching the blowout preventer and drilling deeper into the formation. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells.

Cement QA/QC: Circulating cement to the surface is one indication of successfully cemented surface casing, but it is not the only QA/QC check that should be conducted. Cement circulation to surface can be achieved even when there are mud or gas channels, or other voids, in the cement column. Circulating cement to the surface also may not identify poor cement to casing wall bonding. These integrity problems, among others, can be further examined using a cement evaluation tool and temperature survey.

Formation Integrity Test: It is best practice to complete a formation integrity test to verify the integrity of the cement in the surface casing annulus at the surface casing shoe. The test should be conducted after drilling out of the casing shoe, into at least 20 feet, but not more than 50 feet of new formation. The test results should demonstrate that the integrity of the casing shoe is sufficient to contain the anticipated wellbore pressures identified in the application for the Permit to Drill. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells.

BOP Installation: The Appendix 8 requirement is best practice. Additionally, the surface casing should be pressure tested to ensure it can hold the required working pressure of the BOP. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells.

Record Keeping: Best practice is to keep permanent records for each well, even after the well is plugged and abandoned (P&A'd). This information will be needed by NYSDEC and industry during the well's operating life, will be critical for designing the P&A, and may be required if the well leaks post P&A. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells, not just HVHF wells. P&A'd wells do occasionally leak, and well information is may be needed to develop a re-entry, repair, re-P&A plan.

Additional Casing or Repair: NYSDEC should reserve the right to require industry to install additional cemented casing strings in wells, and repair defective casing or cementing, as deemed necessary for environmental and/or public safety reasons. This requirement should apply to all wells, not just HVHF wells.

Pressure Testing: Casing and piping should be pressure tested.³⁹

³⁹ Pennsylvania Governor's Marcellus Shale Advisory Commission Report, July 22, 2011, recommends pressure testing each casing to ensure initial integrity of casing design and cement, and pressure testing and logging to verify the mechanical integrity of the casing and cement over the life of the well, p. 109.

7. Intermediate Casing

Background: In 2009, HCLLC recommended the NYCRR be revised to include additional intermediate casing construction standards. Please refer to HCLLC's September 16, 2009 Report, *New York State (NYS) Casing Regulation Recommendations* for more specific recommendations on intermediate casing and the technical basis for HCLCC's recommendations.

Intermediate casing provides a transition from the surface casing to the production casing. This casing may be required to seal off anomalous pressure zones, lost circulation zones, and other drilling hazards. A drilling engineer may set hundreds or thousands of feet of intermediate casing to: isolate unstable hole sections (to prevent collapse); isolate high or low pressure zones; isolate geologic "thief" zones prone to robbing mud from the well bore (lost circulation); put gas or saltwater zones behind pipe before drilling into the production zone; or provide additional wellbore structure.

Intermediate casing is set prior to drilling through the hydrocarbon bearing zone, and may be cemented behind the entire casing string from the top of the well to the bottom of the casing shoe, depending on intermediate casing depth. Intermediate casing provides an additional protective barrier across to prevent contamination of protected groundwater zones.

The 2011 RDSGEIS and the proposed revisions to the NYCRR include important improvements for intermediate casing. Overall, NYSDEC's intermediate casing requirements for HVHF wells are robust. NYSDEC proposed a number of substantial improvements in the intermediate casing requirements. The most notable improvement to the RDSGEIS mitigation and the NYCRR is that intermediate casing will be required in wells that undergo HVHF treatments to provide an additional protective layer of casing and cementing in the well. The RDSGEIS and the NYCRR requires intermediate casing be fully cemented, and the cement placement and bond be verified by well logging tools.

However, the remaining area for improvement in the NYCRR is to establish intermediate casing and cementing standards for all wells that will not undergo HVHF treatment, but will require the installation of intermediate casing. The proposed NYCRR is silent on the intermediate casing and cementing standards for wells that will not undergo HVHF treatment. NYS should provide instruction on intermediate casing standards for all wells that require it.

There are a number of new intermediate casing requirements proposed for HVHF wells that are standard industry best practices for all oil and gas wells. Those requirements should be included in the NYCRR Part 554 (drilling practices for all oil and gas wells), and not just covered in the new NYCRR Part 560 (drilling practices for HVHF wells).

Recommendation No. 15: The NYCRR should be revised to establish intermediate casing and cementing standards for all wells at NYCRR Part 554 (drilling practices for all oil and gas wells).

This section reviews the proposed changes to intermediate casing requirements and supports the improvements that have been made. It also makes suggestions for improved regulatory clarity and offers recommendations for regulatory program revisions.

An analysis of the proposed RDSGEIS conditions found in Appendices 8, 9, and 10 is provided below, and compared to the proposed NYCRR. Recommendations are made to improve consistency in the documents and highlight additional best practices that should be considered.

The 2011 RDSGEIS: The 2011 RDSGEIS recommends that intermediate casing be required in wells that undergo HVHF treatments, to provide an additional protective layer of casing and cementing in the well. The 2011 RDSGEIS recommends that intermediate casing be fully cemented, and the cement placement and bond be verified by well logging tools. This is an excellent recommendation. The 2011 RDSGEIS states:

*Current casing and cementing practices attached as conditions to all oil and gas well drilling permits state that intermediate casing string(s) and cementing requirements will be reviewed and approved by the Department on an individual well basis. **The Department proposes to require, via permit condition and/or regulation, that for high-volume hydraulic fracturing the installation of intermediate casing in all wells covered under the SGEIS would be required.** However, the Department may grant an exception to the intermediate casing requirement when technically justified [emphasis added].⁴⁰*

The current dSGEIS proposes to require in most cases fully cemented intermediate casing, with the setting depths of both surface and intermediate casing determined by site-specific conditions⁴¹

Requirement for fully cemented production casing or intermediate casing (if used), with the cement bond evaluated by use of a cement bond logging tool; and⁴²

Fully cemented intermediate casing would be required unless supporting site-specific documentation to waive the requirement is presented. This directly addresses gas migration concerns by providing additional barriers (i.e., steel casing, cement) between aquifers and shallow gas-bearing zones.⁴³

Depending on the depth of the well and local geologic conditions, there may be one or more intermediate casing string.⁴⁴

Use of centralizers to ensure that the cement sheath surrounds the casing strings, including the first joint of surface and intermediate casings.⁴⁵

The 2011 RDSGEIS proposes a waiver process to exclude intermediate casing under some circumstances:

A request to waive the intermediate casing requirement would need to be made in writing with supporting documentation showing that environmental protection and public safety would not be compromised by omission of the intermediate string. An example of circumstances that may warrant consideration of the omission of the intermediate string and granting of the waiver could include: 1) deep set surface casing, 2) relatively shallow total depth of well and 3) absence of fluid and gas in the section between the surface casing and target interval. Such intermediate casing waiver request may also be supported by the inclusion of information on the subsurface and geologic conditions from offsetting wells, if available.⁴⁶

⁴⁰ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-52.

⁴¹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Executive Summary, Page 25.

⁴² 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 1-12.

⁴³ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 1-12.

⁴⁴ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 5-92.

⁴⁵ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-42.

⁴⁶ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-52.

The proposed waiver process conflicts with the stated intent of requiring intermediate casing for HVHF wells. The RDSGEIS states that the reason intermediate casing is required for a HVHF well is because it:

...directly addresses gas migration concerns by providing additional barriers (i.e., steel casing, cement) between aquifers and shallow gas-bearing zones.⁴⁷

As proposed, NYSDEC would consider a waiver if the surface casing is set “deep” or if the well is “shallow”; however, these depths are not defined. The RDSGEIS does not explain how the use of deep-set surface casing or shallow surface casing provides the same protection to aquifers as installing a second string of intermediate casing and cement.

Additionally, as proposed, NYSDEC would consider a waiver if there is an “*absence of fluid and gas in the section between the surface casing and target interval.*”⁴⁸ This requirement is incongruous, because there will always be some type of fluid in the formation between the surface casing and target interval; therefore, the conditions for this waiver to occur would never be realized.

Recommendation No. 16: The SGEIS and NYCRR should be revised to remove the waiver provisions for intermediate casing on HVHF wells, or the SGEIS and NYCRR should be revised to include technical justifications, rationale and thresholds for proposed waivers.

The 2011 RDSGEIS requires that intermediate casing be cemented and evaluated for quality as follows:

Intermediate casing would be cemented to the surface and cementing would be by the pump and plug method with a minimum of 25% excess cement unless caliper logs are run, in which case 10% excess would suffice.⁴⁹

The operator would run a radial cement bond evaluation log or other evaluation approved by the Department to verify the cement bond on the intermediate casing and the production casing. The quality and effectiveness of the cement job would be evaluated using the above required evaluation in conjunction with appropriate supporting data per Section 6.4 “Other Testing and Information” under the heading of “Well Logging and Other Testing” of API Guidance Document HF1 (First Edition, October 2009). Remedial cementing would be required if the cement bond is not adequate to drill ahead and isolate hydraulic fracturing operations, respectively.⁵⁰

The requirements for intermediate casing are listed in Appendices 8, 9, and 10 of the RDSGEIS.

The 2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 8: Appendix 8 Casing and Cementing Practices requires intermediate casing be set only in certain circumstances.

Intermediate casing string(s) and the cementing requirements for that casing string(s) will be reviewed and approved by Regional Mineral Resources office staff on an individual well basis.⁵¹

⁴⁷ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 1-12.

⁴⁸ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-52.

⁴⁹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-53.

⁵⁰ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-54.

⁵¹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 8, Page 2.

The 2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 9: Appendix 9 Existing Fresh Water Supplementary Permit Conditions Required for Wells Drilled in Primary and Principal Aquifers requires intermediate casing be set:

If multiple fresh water zones are known to exist or are found or if shallow gas is present, this office may require multiple strings of surface casing to prevent gas intrusion and/or preserve the hydraulic characteristics and water quality of each fresh water zone. The permittee must immediately inform this office of the occurrence of any fresh water or shallow gas zones not noted on the permittee's drilling application and prognosis. This office may require changes to the casing and cementing plan in response to unexpected occurrences of fresh water or shallow gas, and may also require the immediate, temporary cessation of operations while such alterations are developed by the permittee and evaluated by the Department for approval.⁵²

The main problem with the conditions of Appendices 8 and 9 is that there is no specific guidance for intermediate casing and cementing, if the intermediate casing string is required as part of the well construction design.

Recommendation No. 17: The SGEIS (Appendices 8 and 9) and NYCRR should be revised to provide specific intermediate casing and cementing requirements, as explained further in Appendix B.

The 2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 10: Appendix 10 contains Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF operations, including additional intermediate casing requirements.

The 2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 10 requires intermediate casing be set, unless a waiver is granted:

Intermediate casing must be installed in the well. The setting depth and design of the casing must consider all applicable drilling, geologic and well control factors. Additionally, the setting depth must consider the cementing requirements for the intermediate casing and the production casing as noted below. Any request to waive the intermediate casing requirement must be made in writing with supporting documentation and is subject to the Department's approval. Information gathered from operations conducted on any single well or the first well drilled on a multi-well pad may serve to form the basis for the Department waiving the intermediate casing requirement on subsequent wells in the vicinity of the single well or subsequent wells on the same multi-well pad.⁵³

The 2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 10 requires intermediate casing be completely cemented and the department be notified of cementing operations:

This office must be notified _____ hours prior to intermediate casing cementing operations. Intermediate casing must be fully cemented to surface with excess cement. Cementing must be by the pump and plug method with a minimum of 25% excess cement unless caliper logs are run, in which case 10% excess will suffice. (Blank to be filled in based on well's location and Regional Minerals Manager's direction.)⁵⁴

The 2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 10 requires a cement bond evaluation log:

⁵² 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 9, Page 2.

⁵³ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 10, Page 7.

⁵⁴ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 10, Page 7.

The operator must run a radial cement bond evaluation log or other evaluation approved by the Department to verify the cement bond on the intermediate casing. The quality and effectiveness of the cement job shall be evaluated by the operator using the above required evaluation in conjunction with appropriate supporting data per Section 6.4 “Other Testing and Information” under the heading of “Well Logging and Other Testing” of American Petroleum Institute (API) Guidance Document HF1 (First Edition, October 2009). Remedial cementing is required if the cement bond is not adequate for drilling ahead (i.e., diversion or shut-in for well control).⁵⁵

The 2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 10 requires new casing and the use of American Petroleum Institute (API) standards for: casing thread compounds, centralizer placement, and cement composition (including the requirement to use gas-blocking additives).

With respect to all surface, intermediate and production casing run in the well, and in addition to the requirements of the Department’s “Casing and Cementing Practices” and any approved centralizer plan for intermediate casing, the following shall apply:

- a) Casing must be new and conform to American Petroleum Institute (API) Specification 5CT, Specifications for Casing and Tubing (April 2002), and welded connections are prohibited;*
- b) casing thread compound and its use must conform to API Recommended Practice (RP) 5A3, RP on Thread Compounds for Casing, Tubing, Line Pipe, and Drill Stem Elements (November 2009);*
- c) at least two centralizers (one in the middle and one at the top) must be installed on the first joint of casing (except production casing) and all bow-spring style centralizers must conform to API Specification 10D for Bow-Spring Casing Centralizers (March 2002);*
- d) cement must conform to API Specification 10A, Specifications for Cement and Material for Well Cementing (April 2002 and January 2005 Addendum). Further, the cement slurry must be prepared to minimize its free water content in accordance with the same API specification and it must contain a gas-block additive...⁵⁶*

Appendix 10 requires: drilling mud be circulated and conditioned prior to cementing; the use of a spacer fluid to separate drilling mud from cement, avoiding drilling mud contamination; and cement installation methods that inhibit voids in the cement.

- e) Prior to cementing any casing string, the borehole must be circulated and conditioned to ensure an adequate cement bond;*
- f) A spacer of adequate volume, makeup and consistency must be pumped ahead of the cement; and*
- g) The cement must be pumped at a rate and in a flow regime that inhibits channeling of the cement in the annulus...⁵⁷*

⁵⁵ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 10, Page 7.

⁵⁶ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 10, Pages 5-6.

⁵⁷ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 10, Page 6.

Appendix 10 establishes a specific period of time required for the cement to harden and a compressive strength standard that the cement must achieve before drilling continues deeper in the hole. This avoids disturbing the cement until it has completely set.

h) After the cement is pumped, the operator must wait on cement (WOC):

1. until the cement achieves a calculated (e.g., performance chart) compressive strength of at least 500 psig, and

2. a minimum WOC time of 8 hours before the casing is disturbed in any way, including installation of a blow-out preventer (BOP). The operator may request a waiver from the Department from the required WOC time if the operator has bench tested the actual cement batch and blend using mix water from the actual source for the job, and determined that 8 hours is not required to reach a compressive strength of 500 psig.⁵⁸

Appendix 10 requires records be kept as follows:

i) A copy of the cement job log for any cemented casing in the well must be available to the Department at the wellsite during drilling operations, and thereafter available to the Department upon request. The operator must provide such to the Department upon request at any time during the period up to and including five years after the well is permanently plugged and abandoned under a Department permit. If the well is located on a multi-well pad, all cementing records must be maintained and made available during the period up to and including five years after the last well on the pad is permanently plugged and abandoned under a Department permit.⁵⁹

An analysis of the Appendices 8, 9, and 10 permit conditions requirements is provided in table format in Appendix B. Recommendations are listed in the table for improving the requirements and addressing inconsistencies.

NYCRR Proposed Revisions: The existing regulations at 6 NYCRR § 554 do not include specific requirements for intermediate casing, when intermediate casing is part of the well construction design.

A new section of regulations at 6 NYCRR § 560.6(c)(13, 14 and 15) proposes to add intermediate casing requirements for HVHF wells:

(13) Intermediate casing must be installed in the well. The setting depth and design of the casing must be determined by taking into account all applicable drilling, geologic and well control factors. Additionally, the setting depth must consider the cementing requirements for the intermediate casing and the production casing as noted below. Any request to waive the intermediate casing requirement must be made in writing with supporting documentation and is subject to the department's approval. Information gathered from operations conducted on any single well or the first well drilled on a multi-well pad may be considered by the department upon a request for a waiver of the intermediate casing requirement on subsequent wells in the vicinity of the single well or subsequent wells on the same multi-well pad.

⁵⁸ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 10, Page 6.

⁵⁹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 10, Page 6.

(14) As specified on a permit to drill, deepen, plug back and convert, the department must be notified prior to intermediate casing cementing operations. Intermediate casing must be fully cemented to surface with excess cement. Cementing must be by the pump and plug method with a minimum of 25 percent excess cement unless caliper logs are run, in which case 10 percent excess will suffice.

(15) The operator must run a radial cement bond evaluation log or other evaluation approved by the department to verify the cement bond on the intermediate casing. Remedial cementing is required if the cement bond is not adequate for drilling ahead (i.e., diversion or shut-in for well control).

Additional intermediate casing and cementing standards are included at 6 NYCRR § 560.6(c)(10) for HVHF wells:

(10) With respect to all surface, intermediate and production casing run in the well, and in addition to the department's casing and cementing requirements and any approved centralizer plan for intermediate casing, the following shall apply:

(i) all casings must be new and conform to industry standards specified in the permit to drill;

(ii) welded connections are prohibited;

(iii) casing thread compound and its use must conform to industry standards specified in the permit to drill;

(iv) in addition to centralizers otherwise required by the department, at least two centralizers, one in the middle and one at the top of the first joint of casing, must be installed (except production casing) and all bow-spring style centralizers must conform to the industry standards specified in the permit to drill;

(v) cement must conform to industry standards specified in the permit to drill and the cement slurry must be prepared to minimize its free water content in accordance with the industry standards and specifications, and contain a gas-block additive;

(vi) prior to cementing any casing string, the borehole must be circulated and conditioned to ensure an adequate cement bond;

(vii) a spacer of adequate volume, makeup and consistency must be pumped ahead of the cement;

(viii) the cement must be pumped at a rate and in a flow regime that inhibits channeling of the cement in the annulus;

(ix) after the cement is pumped, the operator must wait on cement (WOC) until the cement achieves a calculated (e.g., performance chart) compressive strength of at least 500 psig, and a minimum WOC time of 8 hours before the casing is disturbed in any way, including installation of a blowout preventer. The operator may request a waiver from the department from the required WOC time if the operator has bench tested the actual cement batch and blend using mix water from the actual source for the job, and determined that 8 hours is not required to reach a compressive strength of 500 pounds per square inch gage; and

(x) a copy of the cement job log for any cemented casing string in the well must be available to the department at the well site during drilling operations, and thereafter available to the department upon request. The operator must provide such log to the department upon request at any time during the period up to and including five years after the well is permanently plugged and abandoned under a department permit issued

pursuant to Part 550 of this Title. If the well is located on a multi-well pad, all cementing job logs must be maintained and made available during the period up to and including five years after the last well on the pad is permanently plugged and abandoned under a department permit issued pursuant to Part 550 of this Title.

An analysis of the proposed Appendices 8, 9, and 10 permit conditions requirements and the proposed changes to NYCRR is provided in table format in Appendix B. Recommendations for improving requirements are listed in the table.

Recommendation No. 18: The recommendations listed in the Intermediate Casing Analysis Table (Appendix B to this report) should be considered for the SGEIS and the NYCRR, including:

Waiver Provisions: It is best practice to install intermediate casing on a case-by-case basis for most wells; however, it is best practice to install it on all HVHF wells. The waiver provision proposed in the RDSGEIS to exclude intermediate casing on HVHF wells is not technically justified.

Setting Depth: Best practice is to set intermediate casing at least 100' below the deepest protected groundwater, to seal off anomalous pressure zones, lost circulation zones, and other drilling hazards. Although intermediate casing setting depth is site specific, there should be criteria for determining that depth. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells.

Protected Water Depth Verification: The freshwater depth should be estimated in the drilling application to aid in well construction design. The actual protected water depth should be verified with a resistivity log or other sampling method during drilling, ensuring intermediate casing protects that groundwater. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells where intermediate casing is set.

Cement Sheath Width: A cement sheath of at least 1-1/4" should be installed. Thin cement sheaths are easily cracked and damaged. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells where intermediate casing is set.

Amount of Cement in Annulus: It is best practice to fully cement intermediate casing if technically feasible to isolate protected water zones, and to seal off anomalous pressure zones, lost circulation zones, and other drilling hazards. If the casing cannot be fully cemented, most states require cement to be placed from the casing shoe to a point at least 500-600' above the shoe. This requirement should apply to all wells where intermediate casing is set.

Excess Cement: 25% excess cement is standard practice, unless a caliper log is run to assess the hole shape and required cement volume. This requirement should apply to all wells where intermediate casing is set.

Cement Type: Cement must conform to API Specification 10A, Specifications for Cement and Material for Well Cementing (April 2002 and January 2005 Addendum). The cement slurry must be prepared to minimize its free water content, in accordance with the same API specification, and it must contain a gas-block additive. HVHF cement quality requirements (including API specifications and the use of gas-blocking additives) are best practice. However, these practices should apply to all wells where intermediate casing is installed, not just HVHF wells.

Cement Mix Water Temperature and pH Monitoring: Best practice is for the free water separation to average no more than six milliliters per 250 milliliters of tested cement, in accordance with the

current API RP 10B. Best practice is to test for pH to evaluate water chemistry and ensure cement is mixed to manufacturer's recommendations. These requirements should apply to all NYS wells where intermediate casing is required, not just HVHF wells.

Lost Circulation Control: Lost circulation control is best practice. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells where intermediate casing is required.

Spacer Fluids: The use of spacer fluids to separate mud and cement, to avoid mud contamination of the cement, is best practice. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells where intermediate casing is used, not just HVHF wells.

Hole Conditioning: Hole conditioning before cementing is best practice. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells, not just HVHF wells.

Cement Installation and Pump Rate: The requirement for cement to be pumped at a rate and in a flow regime that inhibits channeling of the cement in the annulus is a good practice. This requirement should apply to all oil and gas wells, not just HVHF wells.

Rotation and Reciprocation: Rotating and reciprocating casing while cementing is a best practice to improve cement placement. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells.

Centralizers: The proposed conditions reference an outdated API casing centralizer standard. Best practice is to use at least two centralizers and follow API Recommended Practice for Centralizer Placement, API RP 10D-2 (July 2010). This requirement should apply to all NYS wells where intermediate casing is installed.

Casing Quality: The use of new pipe conforming to API Specification 5CT is best practice. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells where intermediate casing is set.

Casing Thread Compound: The requirement to use casing thread compound that conforms to API RP 5A3 (November 2009) is a good practice. This requirement should apply to all oil and gas wells, not just HVHF wells.

Drilling Mud: The use of compressed air or WBM (with no toxic additives) is best practice when drilling through protected water zones. This should be a requirement for all wells during the period when drilling occurs through protected water zones.

Cement Setting Time: Best practice is to have casing strings stand under pressure until cement reaches a compressive strength of at least 500 psi in the zone of critical cement, before drilling out the cement plug or initiating a test. Additionally, the cement mixture in the zone of critical cement should have a 72-hour compressive strength of at least 1,200 psi. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells, not just HVHF wells.

NYSDEC Inspector: Best practice is to have a state inspector onsite during cementing operations. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells where intermediate casing is installed.

Cement QA/QC: The use of a cement evaluation logging tool is best practice. This requirement should apply to all wells where intermediate casing is set.

Record Keeping: Best practice is to keep permanent records for each well, even after the well is plugged and abandoned (P&A'd). This information will be needed by NYSDEC and industry during the well's operating life, will be critical for designing the P&A, and may be required if the

well leaks post P&A. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells, not just HVHF wells. P&A'd wells do occasionally leak, and well information is may be needed to develop a re-entry, repair, re-P&A plan.

Additional Casing or Repair: NYSDEC should reserve the right to require industry to install additional cemented casing strings in wells, and repair defective casing or cementing, as deemed necessary for environmental and/or public safety reasons. This requirement should apply to all wells.

Pressure Testing: Casing and piping should be pressure tested.⁶⁰

⁶⁰ Pennsylvania Governor's Marcellus Shale Advisory Commission Report, July 22, 2011, recommends pressure testing each casing to ensure initial integrity of casing design and cement, and pressure testing and logging to verify the mechanical integrity of the casing and cement over the life of the well, Page 109.

8. Production Casing

Background: In 2009, HCLLC recommended NYCRR be revised to include additional production casing construction standards. Please refer to HCLLC's September 16, 2009 Report, *New York State (NYS) Casing Regulation Recommendations* for more specific recommendations on production casing the technical basis for HCLCC's recommendations.

Production casing is the last string of casing set in the well. It is called "production casing" because it is set across the hydrocarbon-producing zone, or alternatively sets just above the hydrocarbon zone. Production casing can be run all the way from the surface of the well across the hydrocarbon zone (production casing string) or can be hung from the surface or intermediate casing at a point deeper in the well (production liner).

If production casing is set across the hydrocarbon-producing zone, it is called a "cased hole" completion. In this scenario, production casing is lowered into the hole and cemented in place. Explosives are then lowered inside the production casing (perforation guns) to perforate holes through the pipe/cement barrier to allow oil and/or gas to enter the wellbore. In some cases, a drilling engineer may elect not to set production casing. This is called an "open hole" completion.

NYSDEC recommends a full string of production casing be set across the production zone and be run to surface, and that the production casing be cemented in place. This is a best practice for HVHF wells.

Production casing is used to isolate hydrocarbon zones and contain formation pressure. Production casing pipe and cement integrity is very important, because it is the piping/cement barrier that is exposed to fracture pressure, acid stimulation treatments, and other workover/stimulation methods used to increase hydrocarbon production.

The 2011 RDSGEIS and proposed revisions to the NYCRR include substantial improvements for production casing. NYSDEC's proposed production casing requirements for HVHF wells are robust. The most notable improvement to the NYCRR is that production casing must be set from the well surface through the production zone. This provides an additional protective layer of casing and cementing in the well during HVHF treatments. The RDSGEIS and NYCRR requires production casing be fully cemented, if intermediate casing is not set. If intermediate casing is set, it requires production casing be tied into the intermediate casing. NYCRR also requires the cement placement and bond be verified by well logging tools. These requirements are best practice.

NYSDEC's proposed HVHF production casing design prevents pollution of protected groundwater by constraining the HVHF pressurized fluid treatment to the inside of the production casing string as it passes the protected groundwater zone. Additionally, behind the production casing string there are two additional layers of casing and cement installed as a barrier across protected waters (e.g. surface and intermediate casing).

This section reviews the proposed changes to production casing requirements and supports the improvements that have been made. It also makes suggestions for improved regulatory clarity and offers recommendations for regulatory program revisions.

An analysis of the proposed RDSGEIS conditions found in Appendices 8, 9, and 10 is provided below, and compared to the proposed NYCRR. Recommendations are made to improve consistency in the documents and highlight additional best practices that should be considered.

The 2011 RDSGEIS: The 2011 RDSGEIS requires that production casing be installed and fully cemented across the production zone in wells that undergo HVHF treatments. The 2011 RDSGEIS states:

Requirement for fully cemented production casing or intermediate casing (if used), with the cement bond evaluated by use of a cement bond logging tool.⁶¹

Anticipated Marcellus Shale fracturing pressures range from 5,000 pounds per square inch (psi) to 10,000 psi, so production casing with a greater internal yield pressure than the anticipated fracturing pressure must be installed.⁶²

The 2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 8: Appendix 8 NYSDEC's Casing and Cementing Practices includes the following production casing requirements for all wells.

12. *The production casing cement shall extend at least 500 feet above the casing shoe or tie into the previous casing string, whichever is less. If any oil or gas shows are encountered or known to be present in the area, as determined by the Department at the time of permit application, or subsequently encountered during drilling, the production casing cement shall extend at least 100 feet above any such shows. The Department may allow the use of a weighted fluid in the annulus to prevent gas migration in specific instances when the weight of the cement column could be a problem.*
13. *Centralizers shall be placed at the base and at the top of the production interval if casing is run and extends through that interval, with one additional centralizer every 300 feet of the cemented interval. A minimum of 25% excess cement shall be used. When caliper logs are run, a 10% excess will suffice. Additional excesses may be required by the Department in certain areas.*
14. *The pump and plug method shall be used for all production casing cement jobs deeper than 1500 feet. If the pump and plug technique is not used (less than 1500 feet), the operator shall not displace the cement closer than 35 feet above the bottom of the casing. If plugs are used, the plug catcher shall be placed at the top of the lowest (deepest) full joint of casing.*
15. *The casing shall be of sufficient strength to contain any expected formation or stimulation pressures.*
16. *Following cementing and removal of cementing equipment, the operator shall wait until a compressive strength of 500 psi is achieved before the casing is disturbed in any way. The operator shall test or require the cementing contractor to test the mixing water for pH and temperature prior to mixing the cement and to record the results on the cementing tickets and/or the drilling log. WOC time shall be adjusted based on the results of the test.⁶³*

The 2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 9: Appendix 9 Existing Fresh Water Supplementary Permit Conditions Required for Wells Drilled in Primary and Principal Aquifers does not include any additional requirements for production casing.

⁶¹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 1-12.

⁶² 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 5-92.

⁶³ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 8, Page 2-3.

The 2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 10: Appendix 10 contains Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF operations, including additional production casing requirements.

The 2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 10 requires production casing run the entire length of the wellbore, which is an excellent recommendation. Appendix 10 also requires production casing be tied into intermediate casing with at least 500' of cement:

36) Production casing must be run to the surface. This office must be notified _____ hours prior to production casing cementing operations. If installation of the intermediate casing is waived by the Department, then production casing must be fully cemented to surface. If intermediate casing is installed, the production casing cement must be tied into the intermediate casing string with at least 500 feet of cement measured using True Vertical Depth (TVD).⁶⁴

Appendix 10 requires a cement bond evaluation log, which is another excellent recommendation:

The operator must run a radial cement bond evaluation log or other evaluation approved by the Department to verify the cement bond on the production casing. The quality and effectiveness of the cement job shall be evaluated by the operator using the above required evaluation in conjunction with appropriate supporting data per Section 6.4 "Other Testing and Information" under the heading of "Well Logging and Other Testing" of American Petroleum Institute (API) Guidance Document HF1 (First Edition, October 2009). Remedial cementing is required if the cement bond is not adequate to effectively isolate hydraulic fracturing operations.⁶⁵

However, Appendix 10 includes a waiver provision that would exempt an operator from installing production casing cement as described above. This waiver provision is based solely on whether oil and gas might migrate from one pool or stratum to another. It does not address any of the other reasons why production casing cementing is important and required by NYSDEC in HVHF wells.

Any request to waive any of the preceding cementing requirements must be made in writing with supporting documentation and is subject to the Department's approval.

The Department will only consider a request for a waiver if the open-hole wireline logs including a narrative analysis of such and all other information collected during drilling from the same well pad or offsetting wells verify that migration of oil, gas or other fluids from one pool or stratum to another will be prevented. (Blank to be filled in based on well's location and Regional Minerals Manager's direction.)⁶⁶

Recommendation No. 19: The production casing cementing waiver should be removed for HVHF wells, or NYSDEC should provide more technical justification and rationale for the waiver. NYSDEC should show how environmental protection and safety objectives can be achieved to the same level with the waiver as without it.

The 2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 10 requires new casing and the use of American Petroleum Institute (API) standards for: casing thread compounds, centralizer placement, and cement composition (including the requirement to use gas-blocking additives).

⁶⁴ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 10, Page 7.

⁶⁵ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 10, Page 7.

⁶⁶ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 10, Page 7.

31) *With respect to all surface, intermediate and production casing run in the well, and in addition to the requirements of the Department's "Casing and Cementing Practices" and any approved centralizer plan for intermediate casing, the following shall apply:*

- e) Casing must be new and conform to American Petroleum Institute (API) Specification 5CT, Specifications for Casing and Tubing (April 2002), and welded connections are prohibited;*
- f) Casing thread compound and its use must conform to API Recommended Practice (RP) 5A3, RP on Thread Compounds for Casing, Tubing, Line Pipe, and Drill Stem Elements (November 2009);*
- g) At least two centralizers (one in the middle and one at the top) must be installed on the first joint of casing (except production casing) and all bow-spring style centralizers must conform to API Specification 10D for Bow-Spring Casing Centralizers (March 2002);*
- h) Cement must conform to API Specification 10A, Specifications for Cement and Material for Well Cementing (April 2002 and January 2005 Addendum). Further, the cement slurry must be prepared to minimize its free water content in accordance with the same API specification and it must contain a gas-block additive...⁶⁷*

Appendix 10 requires: drilling mud be circulated and conditioned prior to cementing; the use of spacer fluid to separate drilling mud from cement, avoiding drilling mud contamination; and cement installation methods that inhibit voids in the cement.

- e) Prior to cementing any casing string, the borehole must be circulated and conditioned to ensure an adequate cement bond;*
- f) A spacer of adequate volume, makeup and consistency must be pumped ahead of the cement;*
- h) The cement must be pumped at a rate and in a flow regime that inhibits channeling of the cement in the annulus...⁶⁸*

Appendix 10 establishes a specific period of time required for the cement to harden and a compressive strength standard that the cement must achieve before drilling continues deeper in the hole. This avoids disturbing the cement until it has completely set.

h) After the cement is pumped, the operator must wait on cement (WOC):

- 1. until the cement achieves a calculated (e.g., performance chart) compressive strength of at least 500 psig, and*
- 2. a minimum WOC time of 8 hours before the casing is disturbed in any way, including installation of a blow-out preventer (BOP). The operator may request a waiver from the Department from the required WOC time if the operator has bench tested the actual cement batch and blend using mix water from the actual source for the job, and determined that 8 hours is not required to reach a compressive strength of 500 psig.⁶⁹*

⁶⁷ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 10, Pages 5-6.

⁶⁸ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 10, Page 6.

⁶⁹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 10, Page 6.

Appendix 10 requires records be kept as follows:

A copy of the cement job log for any cemented casing in the well must be available to the Department at the wellsite during drilling operations, and thereafter available to the Department upon request. The operator must provide such to the Department upon request at any time during the period up to and including five years after the well is permanently plugged and abandoned under a Department permit. If the well is located on a multi-well pad, all cementing records must be maintained and made available during the period up to and including five years after the last well on the pad is permanently plugged and abandoned under a Department permit.⁷⁰

An analysis of the Appendices 8, 9, and 10 permit conditions requirements is provided in table format in Appendix C. Recommendations are listed in the table for improving the requirements and addressing inconsistencies.

NYCRR Proposed Revisions: The existing regulations at 6 NYCRR § 554 include requirements for production casing:

If it is elected to complete a rotary-drilled well and production casing is run, it shall be cemented by a pump and plug or displacement method with sufficient cement to circulate above the top of the completion zone to a height sufficient to prevent any movement of oil or gas or other fluids around the exterior of the production casing. In such instance, operations shall be suspended until the cement has been permitted to set in accordance with prudent current industry practices.⁷¹

A new section of regulations at 6 NYCRR § 560.6(c)(16) proposes to add production casing requirements for HVHF wells.

*(16) Production casing must be run to the surface. If installation of the intermediate casing is waived by the department, then production casing must be fully cemented to surface. **If intermediate casing is installed, the production casing cement must be tied into the intermediate casing string with at least 300 feet of cement measured using True Vertical Depth.** Any request to waive any of the cementing requirements of this paragraph must be made in writing with supporting documentation and must be approved by the department. The department will only consider a request for a waiver if the open-hole wireline logs including a narrative analysis of such and all other information collected during drilling from the same well pad or offsetting wells verify that migration of oil, gas or other fluids from one pool or stratum to another will otherwise be prevented [emphasis added].*

The proposed regulations at 6 NYCRR § 560.6(c)(16) are inconsistent with the Appendix 10 requirement to cement the production casing with a 500' overlap into the intermediate casing.

If intermediate casing is installed, the production casing cement must be tied into the intermediate casing string with at least 500 feet of cement measured using True Vertical Depth (TVD).⁷²

⁷⁰ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 10, Page 6.

⁷¹ 6 NYCRR V.B. §554.4(d)

⁷² 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 10, Page 7.

Recommendation No. 20: A production casing 500' cement overlap into the intermediate casing is more protective; 6 NYCRR § 560.6(c)(16) should be revised to match Appendix 10.

A new section of regulations at 6 NYCRR § 560.6(c)(17) requires production casing cement be verified for HVHF wells:

(17) The operator must run a radial cement bond evaluation log or other evaluation approved by the department to verify the cement bond on the production casing. Remedial cementing is required if the cement bond is not adequate to effectively isolate hydraulic fracturing operations.

Additional production casing and cementing standards are included at 6 NYCRR § 560.6(c)(10) for HVHF wells.

(10) With respect to all surface, intermediate and production casing run in the well, and in addition to the department's casing and cementing requirements and any approved centralizer plan for intermediate casing, the following shall apply:

(i) all casings must be new and conform to industry standards specified in the permit to drill;

(ii) welded connections are prohibited;

(iii) casing thread compound and its use must conform to industry standards specified in the permit to drill;

(v) cement must conform to industry standards specified in the permit to drill and the cement slurry must be prepared to minimize its free water content in accordance with the industry standards and specifications, and contain a gas-block additive;

(vi) prior to cementing any casing string, the borehole must be circulated and conditioned to ensure an adequate cement bond;

(vii) a spacer of adequate volume, makeup and consistency must be pumped ahead of the cement;

(viii) the cement must be pumped at a rate and in a flow regime that inhibits channeling of the cement in the annulus;

(ix) after the cement is pumped, the operator must wait on cement (WOC) until the cement achieves a calculated (e.g., performance chart) compressive strength of at least 500 psig, and a minimum WOC time of 8 hours before the casing is disturbed in any way, including installation of a blowout preventer. The operator may request a waiver from the department from the required WOC time if the operator has bench tested the actual cement batch and blend using mix water from the actual source for the job, and determined that 8 hours is not required to reach a compressive strength of 500 pounds per square inch gage; and

(x) a copy of the cement job log for any cemented casing string in the well must be available to the department at the well site during drilling operations, and thereafter available to the department upon request. The operator must provide such log to the department upon request at any time during the period up to and including five years after the well is permanently plugged and abandoned under a department permit issued pursuant to Part 550 of this Title. If the well is located on a multi-well pad, all cementing job logs must be maintained and made available during the period up to and including five years after the last well on the pad is permanently plugged and abandoned under a department permit issued pursuant to Part 550 of this Title.

An analysis of the proposed Appendices 8, 9, and 10 permit conditions requirements and the proposed changes to the NYCRR is provided in table format in Appendix C. Recommendations for improving requirements are listed in the table.

Recommendation No. 21: The recommendations listed in the Production Casing Analysis Table (Appendix C to this report) should be considered for the SGEIS and the NYCRR, including:

Casing Design: For all wells, it is best practice for the productive horizon(s) to be determined by coring, electric log, mud-logging, and/or testing to aide in optimizing final production string design and placement. It is best practice to install production casing on a case-by-case basis for most wells; however, it is best practice to install a full string of production casing on HVHF wells to provide a conduit for the HVHF job and provide an extra layer of casing and cement.

Cement Sheath Width: A cement sheath of at least 1-1/4" should be installed on all oil and gas wells. Thin cement sheaths are easily cracked and damaged. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells.

Amount of Cement in Annulus: Cementing production casing to surface if technically feasible (becomes more difficult with increasing depth), or at least 500' into the intermediate casing string is best practice. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells where production casing is set.

Excess Cement Requirements: 25% excess cement is standard practice, unless a caliper log is run to assess the hole shape and required cement volume. This requirement should apply to all wells where production casing is set.

Cement Type: Cement must conform to API Specification 10A, Specifications for Cement and Material for Well Cementing (April 2002 and January 2005 Addendum). Further, the cement slurry must be prepared to minimize its free water content in accordance with the same API specification and it must contain a gas-block additive. HVHF cement quality requirements (including API specifications and the use of gas-blocking additives) are best practice. However, these practices should apply to all wells where production casing is installed, not just HVHF wells.

Cement Mix Water Temperature and pH Monitoring: Best practice is for the free water separation to average no more than six milliliters per 250 milliliters of tested cement, in accordance with the current API RP 10B. Best practice is to test for pH to evaluate water chemistry and ensure cement is mixed to manufacturer's recommendations. These requirements should apply to all NYS wells where production casing is required, not just HVHF wells.

Lost Circulation Control: Lost circulation control is best practice. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells where production casing is required.

Spacer Fluids: The use of spacer fluids to separate mud and cement, to avoid mud contamination of the cement, is best practice. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells where production casing is used, not just HVHF wells.

Hole Conditioning: Hole conditioning before cementing is best practice. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells, not just HVHF wells.

Cement Installation and Pump Rate: The requirement for cement to be pumped at a rate and in a flow regime that inhibits channeling of the cement in the annulus is a good practice. This requirement should apply to all oil and gas wells, not just HVHF wells.

Rotation and Reciprocation: Rotating and reciprocating casing while cementing is a best practice to improve cement placement. This will become more difficult with a deviated wellbore, but should be attempted if achievable. This requirement should apply to all NYS oil and gas wells, not just HVHF wells.

Centralizers: Best practice is to use at least two centralizers and follow API Recommended Practice for Centralizer Placement, API RP 10D-2 (July 2010). This requirement should apply to all NYS wells where production casing is installed.

Casing Quality: The use of new pipe conforming to API Specification 5CT is best practice. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells where production casing is set.

Casing Thread Compound: The requirement to use casing thread compound that conforms to API RP 5A3 (November 2009) is a good practice. This requirement should apply to all oil and gas wells, not just HVHF wells.

Cement Setting Time: Best practice is to have casing strings stand under pressure until cement reaches a compressive strength of at least 500 psi in the zone of critical cement, before drilling out the cement plug or initiating a test. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells, not just HVHF wells.

NYSDEC Inspector: Best practice is to have a state inspector onsite during cementing operations. This is more typical for surface and intermediate casing, but can be considered for production casing as well.

Cement QA/QC: The use of a cement evaluation logging tool is best practice. This requirement should apply to all wells where production casing is set.

Record Keeping: Best practice is to keep permanent records for each well, even after the well is P&A'd. This information will be needed by NYSDEC and industry during the well's operating life, will be critical for designing the P&A, and may be required if the well leaks post P&A. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells, not just HVHF wells. P&A'd wells do occasionally leak, and well information is may be needed to develop a re-entry, repair, re-P&A plan.

Additional Casing or Repair: NYSDEC should reserve the right to require industry to install additional cemented casing strings in wells, and repair defective casing or cementing, as deemed necessary for environmental and/or public safety reasons. This requirement should apply to all wells, not just HVHF wells.

Pressure Testing: Casing and piping should be pressure tested.⁷³

⁷³ Pennsylvania Governor's Marcellus Shale Advisory Commission Report, July 22, 2011, recommends pressure testing each casing to ensure initial integrity of casing design and cement, and pressure testing and logging to verify the mechanical integrity of the casing and cement over the life of the well, p. 109.

9. Permanent Wellbore Plugging & Abandonment Requirements

Background: In 2009, HCLLC recommended that NYSDEC establish specific criteria to determine when a well must be permanently plugged and abandoned (P&A'd) and recommended improvements in NYS' well plugging regulations, incorporating best technology and practices.

Several terms are used to describe the condition of oil and gas wells that are not active hydrocarbon producers.

- **Temporary Abandonment.** This term is used to describe a well that may be temporarily suspended as a production well. The well may be shut-in awaiting repairs, a stimulation treatment, workover (e.g. drilling into a new zone) or a decision to finally P&A the well. A reasonable amount time should be afforded to the operator to complete the well work, or to decide when to P&A the well; however, a well should not be temporarily abandoned for a long period of time, because it poses a risk to the environment, especially if the well is known to have a leak or mechanical malfunction. Leaking or malfunctioning wells should be repaired in a timely manner or the well should be permanently P&A'd.

In 2003, ICF Consulting produced a report for the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA) that concluded NYS had 5,900 shut-in or temporarily abandoned wells, 39% of the 15,000 known wells.⁷⁴ ICF concluded that more than half the 5,900 wells have been “temporarily” abandoned for more than nine years. ICF concluded that:

*NYS is one of the few oil and gas producing states that have no specific regulatory provisions for long-term shut-in wells (more than two years). New York's current regulations allow an initial shut in period of one-year and an extension of up to one year, renewable for additional successive periods...*⁷⁵

ICF concluded that while operators are required to contact NYS to justify temporary abandonment extensions beyond one year, NYS' lack of resources to oversee the program has resulted in many wells remaining idle and not properly P&A'd for years:

*The practical effect is that New York's idle well regulation cannot be adequately enforced due to constraints on manpower and other agency resources, and as a result, New York has a defacto long-term inactive well program. For example New York has approximately 1,379 gas wells and 1440 oil wells with either inactive or unknown status that have no reported production since 1992.*⁷⁶

- **Permanent Abandonment.** A well that is no longer needed to produce hydrocarbons should be plugged (e.g. cement barriers installed, failed casing removed, mechanical plugs set), surface equipment removed (e.g. wellhead and piping), and permanently abandoned. Operators typically do not monitor well condition once a P&A'd job is complete and approved by an agency.

⁷⁴ ICF Consulting, Well Characterization and Evaluation Program for New York State Oil and Gas Wells, Draft Report, Prepared for the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, PSA No. 7012, July 2003, Page 1. A final version of this report could not be located on the world-wide web.

⁷⁵ ICF Consulting, Well Characterization and Evaluation Program for New York State Oil and Gas Wells, Draft Report, Prepared for the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, PSA No. 7012, July 2003, Page 5.

⁷⁶ ICF Consulting, Well Characterization and Evaluation Program for New York State Oil and Gas Wells, Draft Report, Prepared for the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, PSA No. 7012, July 2003, Page 36.

- **Improperly Abandoned Well.** This term describes a well that was P&A'd, but was done so in a manner where the well still poses a risk to the environment (e.g. insufficient barriers or cement used to seal the well). Because operators typically do not monitor the condition of P&A'd wells, improperly abandoned wells often go un-resolved.

The problem of improperly abandoned wells in NYS may be a significant issue, because NYS' P&A regulations currently only require 15' cement plugs, which NYSDEC now recognizes as deficient. Therefore, most wells in the state were not P&A'd using a quality standard that would be considered best technology and best practice today.

- **Orphaned Well.** This term describes a well that was orphaned by the well operator (e.g. insolvent, absentee, or non-responsive well owners) and the well was not P&A'd. Because, by definition, an "orphaned well" does not have an operator to monitor its condition, permanent abandonment of these wells typically becomes a government or property owner responsibility. Given limited agency resources, the magnitude of the environmental hazard posed by any particular orphaned well often is unknown. Unless government or property owners make it a priority to fund well monitoring or plug the well, the potential environmental impacts of orphaned wells cannot be ascertained.

In 2003, ICF Consulting, further examined 4,140 of the long-term inactive wells in NYS and concluded that:

- 546 of the 4,140 wells (13%) were drilled and completed before 1924 (over 87 years old now);
- 1,568 of the 4,140 wells (38%) were drilled and completed from 1924-1964 (at least 47 years old now, and possibly up to 87 years old); and
- 2,026 of the 4,140 wells (49%) had no information on the date of complete or condition.⁷⁷

Therefore, there are 2,114 wells that are at least 47 years old and some more than 87 years old that still have not been properly abandoned in NYS, and 2,026 wells where the age and condition is unknown (and must be assumed improperly abandoned).

NYS' 2009 Annual Oil and Gas Report⁷⁸ shows improperly abandoned and orphaned wells continue to be a significant problem in NYS. NYSDEC reports:

Abandoned, unreported and inactive wells continued to be a problem. In 2009 a total of 450 operators reported 3,043 wells with zero production. This is in addition to over 4,100 orphaned and inactive wells in the Department's records. Enforcement actions have reduced the number of unreported wells yet some operators refused to file their annual reports. The operators that remained out of compliance have been referred to the Office of General Counsel for additional enforcement actions.[emphasis added]

DEC has at least partial records on 40,000 wells, but estimates that over 75,000 oil and gas wells have been drilled in the State since the 1820s. **Most of the wells date from before New York established a regulatory program. Many of these old wells were never properly plugged or were plugged using older techniques that were less reliable and long-lasting than modern methods.** [emphasis added]

⁷⁷ ICF Consulting, Well Characterization and Evaluation Program for New York State Oil and Gas Wells, Draft Report, Prepared for the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, PSA No. 7012, July 2003, Page 32.

⁷⁸ New York State Oil, Gas and Mineral Resources, 26th Annual Report for Year 2009 and Appendices, Prepared by NYSDEC, 2009, pp. 22-23.

Every year while conducting scheduled inspections or investigating complaints, DEC staff discover more abandoned wells. Extensive courthouse research is often required to identify a well's previous owners. Many of these cases take several years to resolve as DEC pursues legal action against the responsible parties.

*New York has an Oil and Gas Account which was created to plug problem abandoned wells. It is funded by a \$100 per well permit fee; at the end of 2009 the balance was \$208,806. DEC has over 500 wells on its priority plugging list. Since **the funds are insufficient to plug all the priority wells**, DEC continues to pursue other mechanisms to plug abandoned wells [emphasis added].*

Well construction standards, techniques and technology have improved over time, and it is reasonable to assume that most of these long-term idle wells were not constructed to today's standards, have been subject to mechanical wear and corrosion, and warrant proper abandonment to mitigate risk to protected groundwater resources.

To compound problems, many wells that have not been properly abandoned do not have financial security (e.g. bonds) in place to fund P&A work. ICF reported that, in 2003, NYS had more than 3,500 wells that needed to be P&A'd, but there was no financial security in place (e.g. wells that were grandfathered from NYS bonding requirements). Additionally, ICF reported that 675 of the existing oil and gas wells in NYS have operators that do not comply with the current bonding requirements, and numerous operators that might comply with the existing bonding requirements have plugging liability in amounts that exceed NYS' current bonding requirements, which are too low and do not keep pace with the actual costs of P&A'ing wells today.⁷⁹

The number of temporarily abandoned wells, improperly abandoned wells, and orphaned wells in NYS is a significant issue as shale gas resources are developed, because these old wells could provide a vertical conduit for pollutants to reach protected aquifers. Shale gas wells drilled and fracture stimulated nearby a temporarily abandoned, improperly abandoned, or orphaned well pose a risk. For example, a HVHF treatment can propagate a fracture that, depending on geology, HVHF design, and well depths, could pose a risk of intersection with a nearby well (active producer, abandoned or orphaned well).

Temporarily abandoned wells, improperly abandoned wells, and orphaned wells all pose a risk to the environment. Wellbore infrastructure can corrode and erode, failing over time and creating a potential pollutant pathway for hydrocarbons to move vertically through failed casing or cement to groundwater resources. These wells can either leak gas on their own or provide a vertical pollutant pathway to groundwater resources that can be activated by new well activity nearby.

In 2009, HCLLC recommended that temporary abandonment be limited to no longer than a one-year period, with a wellbore integrity monitoring requirement to ensure that the well is not leaking during temporary abandonment, and a requirement to permanently abandon the well after it is idle for more than a year. HCLLC recommended that NYSDEC carefully examine idle wells that have not been properly P&A'd and that are in close proximity to drinking water sources and in areas under consideration for new HVHF treatments, and require those wells to be P&A'd as a high priority and before shale gas drilling operations commence in those areas.

⁷⁹ ICF Consulting, Well Characterization and Evaluation Program for New York State Oil and Gas Wells, Draft Report, Prepared for the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, PSA No. 7012, July 2003, Page 35-36.

A report documenting specific cases of well pollution caused by NYS' improperly abandoned wells or orphaned wells could not be located; however, neighboring Pennsylvania has completed an analysis of this problem, and it sheds light on the problems NYS may encounter.

Pollution caused by improperly abandoned wells in Pennsylvania is documented in a 2009 report prepared by Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP). The PADEP report lists 27 cases where improperly abandoned wells have been the source of groundwater contamination.⁸⁰ In some of the 27 cases the wells were abandoned according to the standard practices of the time, but now leak and need to be re-abandoned using improved materials and techniques. Some of the cases cited by PADEP include very old well construction techniques, for example, surface casing made out of wood that has rotted away, and wells with no surface casing or cement installed at all. These wells have provided a conduit for gas and other pollutants to reach groundwater through damaged or worn casing, poorly installed cement, or more directly where casing or cement was not initially installed.

PADEP also identified wells that need to be P&A'd, but have not yet been addressed due to the lack of a responsible party and/or on account of PADEP resource limitations.⁸¹

There were three cases cited by PADEP where fracture stimulations in an operating well communicated with a nearby abandoned well, causing a gas leak in the abandoned well.⁸² PADEP's study highlighted the importance of locating orphaned and improperly abandoned wells near new oil and gas developments, and study shows the importance of properly abandoning wells before new development proceeds.

A 2011 Duke University study covering Pennsylvania and New York found methane contamination of drinking water associated with shale-gas extraction. The study found that methane concentrations were 17 times higher, on average, in drinking water wells in active drilling and extraction areas than in wells in nonactive areas.⁸³ Clearly, the higher incidence rate of methane contamination in drinking water wells in shale gas extraction areas is not a coincidence, but is an indicator of shale gas drilling and completion operations mobilizing gas from the shale gas reservoir into protected aquifers. One of the most likely pathways for leaking of gas mobilized by HVHF is a nearby existing well that either was improperly constructed or improperly plugged. Given their failed cement, corroded casing, or lack of casing or cement, such improperly abandoned wells present vertical pathways to aquifers and drinking water resources.

Mechanical failure, human error, and engineering design flaws do occur in the construction and operation of wells. Indeed, groundwater contamination has been attributed to operational failures at various Marcellus Shale gas development operations in Pennsylvania, including operations by Cabot Oil & Gas Corporation, Catalyst Energy, Inc., and Chesapeake Energy Corporation.

⁸⁰ "Stray Natural Gas Migration Associated with Oil and Gas Wells" Draft Report. PADEP, Bureau of Oil and Gas Management. October 28, 2009.

⁸¹ "Stray Natural Gas Migration Associated with Oil and Gas Wells" Draft Report. PADEP, Bureau of Oil and Gas Management. October 28, 2009. Cases include: Independent Valley News Migration, Allegheny County – SWRO – March 2009; Versailles Migration, Versailles, Allegheny County – SWRO – 2007 through 2008; Childers Migration, Washington County – SWRO – June 2005; Groshek Migration, Keating Twp., McKean County – NWRO – 2008; and Skinner Migration, Columbus Twp., Warren County – NWRO.

⁸² "Stray Natural Gas Migration Associated with Oil and Gas Wells" Draft Report. PADEP, Bureau of Oil and Gas Management. October 28, 2009.

⁸³ Osborn, S.G., A. Vengosh, N.R. Warner, R.B. Jackson, 2011 Methane Contamination of Drinking Water Accompanying Gas Well Drilling and Hydraulic Fracturing, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, U.S.A.; DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1100682108, p.2.

For example, on February 27, 2009, the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP) issued a Notice of Violation to Cabot Oil & Gas Corporation for unpermitted discharge of polluting substances and failure to prevent gas from entering fresh groundwater, among other deficiencies, in connection with its drilling activities in Dimock Township.⁸⁴ PADEP inspectors "...discovered that the well casings on some of Cabot's natural gas wells were cemented improperly or insufficiently, allowing natural gas to migrate to groundwater...DEP ordered Cabot to cease hydro fracking natural gas wells throughout Susquehanna County."⁸⁵ In April 2010, under its consent order and agreement with PADEP, Cabot was required to plug three leaking wells that contaminated the groundwater and drinking water supplies of 14 homes in the region.⁸⁶

In 2011, PADEP issued a cease and desist order to Catalyst Energy, Inc. that prohibited the company from conducting drilling and hydraulic fracturing operations, after a PADEP investigation confirmed that private water supplies serving two homes had been contaminated by natural gas and elevated levels of iron and manganese from Catalyst's operations.⁸⁷

In May 2011, PADEP determined that improper well casing and cementing in Chesapeake Energy Corporation's shallower wells allowed migration into groundwater and caused contaminated 16 families' drinking water supplies in Bradford County.⁸⁸

Pennsylvania has found that significant planning and research is needed to identify orphaned and improperly abandoned wells before drilling nearby wells. At a 2009 Stray Gas Workshop in Pennsylvania, Garrett Velosi, from the National Energy Technology Laboratory, pointed out that one of the main problems with stray gas leaks from abandoned wells is verifying the location of improperly abandoned wells. Records on older wells are often limited or non-existent. Mr. Velosi presented methods for locating unmarked abandoned wells. They include the use of historic photos, ground magnetic surveys, and airborne surveys (equipped with magnetometers and methane detectors).⁸⁹

In January 2011, NYS' consultant Alpha Geoscience agreed that timely well plugging and abandonment requirements are important; however, it recommended that establishing "a specific timeline for plugging and abandonment is neither practical nor necessary."⁹⁰ Alpha Geoscience did not examine the large backlog of improperly abandoned wells in NYS or the risk of groundwater contamination from improperly abandoned wells located within the radius of influence of new gas wells and HVHF operations. Alpha Geoscience did not recommend any improved P&A procedures, despite NYCRR's outdated requirements. 6 NYCRR § 555.5 requires only 15' cement plugs, as compared to Texas, Alaska, and Pennsylvania regulations that require a series of 50'-200' cement plugs at various locations within the wellbore.

⁸⁴ <http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/newsroom/14287?id=2418&typeid=1>.

⁸⁵ <http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/newsroom/14287?id=2418&typeid=1>.

⁸⁶ <http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/newsroom/14287?id=10586&typeid=1>.

⁸⁷ DEP Orders Catalyst Energy to Stop Operations at Gas Wells in Forest County Village, available at <http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/newsroom/14287?id=16894&typeid=1>.

⁸⁸ DEP Fines Chesapeake Energy More Than \$1 Million, available at <http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/newsroom/14287?id=17405&typeid=1>.

⁸⁹ Veloski, G., National Energy Technology Laboratory, Methods for Locating Wells in Urban Areas – A Summary of Case Studies, Pennsylvania Stray Gas Workshop, November 2009.

⁹⁰ Alpha Geoscience, Review of the dSCEIS and Identification Best Technology and Best Practices Recommendations Harvey Consulting, LLC, December 28, 2009, prepared for NYSERDA, January 20, 2011

HCLLC disagrees with Alpha Geoscience's recommendation to NYSDEC. Alpha Geoscience's recommendation also conflicts with prior advice from ICF to NYSERDA. HCLLC finds that it is practical and necessary to properly abandon wells on a reasonable timeline, and recommends that NYCRR be improved to include best practices and techniques for permanent wellbore abandonment.

2011 RDSGEIS: The 2011 RDSGEIS document is inconsistent on its recommendations for P&A'ing wells. In Chapter 5, NYSDEC concludes that no improvements are needed in the NYCRR regulations, but proposes changes to improve the regulations at 6 NYCRR § 555.5. In Chapter 6, NYSDEC concludes that it is not possible for HVHF treatments to intersect improperly abandoned wells; yet, in Chapter 7 NYSDEC proposed mitigation to address this very risk. These inconsistencies are further explained below, with recommendations for resolving them.

Chapter 5 of the RDSGEIS concludes that well plugging procedures and requirements in the existing NYCRR (described in the 1992 GEIS) are sufficient to address the risk of improperly abandoned wells. The 2011 RDSGEIS states:

*As described in the 1992 GEIS, any unsuccessful well or well whose productive life is over must be properly plugged and abandoned, in accordance with Department-issued plugging permits and under the oversight of Department field inspectors. **Proper plugging is critical for the continue protection of groundwater, surface water bodies and soil.** Financial security to ensure funds for well plugging is required before the permit to drill is issued, and must be maintained for the life of the well [emphasis added].⁹¹*

When a well is plugged, downhole equipment is removed from the wellbore, uncemented casing in critical areas must be either pulled or perforated, and cement must be placed across or squeezed at these intervals to ensure seals between hydrocarbon and water-bearing zones. These downhole cement plugs supplement the cement seal that already exists at least behind the surface (i.e., fresh-water protection) casing and above the completion zone behind production casing.

Intervals between plugs must be filled with a heavy mud or other approved fluid. For gas wells, in addition to the downhole cement plugs, a minimum of 50 feet of cement must be placed in the top of the wellbore to prevent any release or escape of hydrocarbons or brine from the wellbore. This plug also serves to prevent wellbore access from the surface, eliminating it as a safety hazard or disposal site. Removal of all surface equipment and full site restoration are required after the well is plugged.

*The plugging requirements summarized above are described in detail in Chapter 11 of the 1992 GEIS and are enforced as conditions on plugging permits. Issuance of plugging permits is classified as a Type II action under SEQRA. Proper well plugging is a beneficial action with the sole purpose of environmental protection, and constitutes a routine agency action. **Horizontal drilling and high-volume hydraulic fracturing do not necessitate any new or different methods for well plugging that require further SEQRA review** [emphasis added].⁹²*

⁹¹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 5-143.

⁹² 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 5-144.

While NYSDEC agrees that proper well P&A is critical to the protection of groundwater, surface water, and soil, it concludes that horizontal drilling and HVHF shale gas wells do not require any new or different P&A methods. However, this conclusion is inconsistent with NYSDEC's proposed revisions to the P&A procedures at 6 NYCRR § 555.5, this proposal suggests that the existing regulations do not represent best practices.

Recommendation No. 22: The SGEIS should be revised to state that the existing P&A procedures at 6 NYCRR § 555.5 were determined to be outdated and not best practice and that NYSDEC has proposed revisions. The basis for NYSDEC's proposed revisions should be justified in the SGEIS, and include a review of other states' best practices for P&A.

Chapter 5 of the RDSGEIS does not address: (1) whether NYS has a backlog of wells requiring P&A in close proximity to drinking water sources; (2) whether NYS has a backlog of wells requiring P&A in close proximity to areas under consideration for HVHF treatments; (3) whether a procedure needs to be put in place to examine the number, type, and condition of wells requiring P&A in close proximity to new shale gas development; and (4) whether plugging improperly abandoned and orphaned wells should be required where such wells are in close proximity to new HVHF treatments.

Recommendation No. 23: The SGEIS should examine: the number of improperly abandoned or orphaned wells in NYS requiring P&A in close proximity to drinking water sources or in close proximity to areas under consideration for HVHF treatments; whether a procedure needs to be put in place to examine the number, type, and condition of wells requiring P&A in close proximity to new shale gas development; and whether plugging improperly abandoned and orphaned wells should be required where such wells are in close proximity to new HVHF treatments.

For example, maps showing the location and depth of NYS' temporarily abandoned, improperly abandoned, or orphaned wells could not be located; however, this data is needed to ensure safe development of shale gas resources. The RDSGEIS proposes that operators identify any existing well listed in NYSDEC's Oil & Gas database within one mile of the proposed HVHF well⁹³; however, ICF's 2003 report to NYSERDA points out that there are a large number of old wells in NYS where location or well condition data is not available in NYSDEC's Oil & Gas database. If NYSDEC has improved the Oil & Gas database to accurately document all existing wells this information should be included in the SGEIS and maps of the wells should be made available.

Recommendation No. 24: The SGEIS should include maps showing the location and depths of improperly abandoned, orphaned wells in NYS. These maps should correlate the locations and depths to potential foreseeable shale gas development and examine the need to properly P&A these wells before shale gas development occurs nearby. The SGEIS should assess the risk of a HVHF well intersecting a well that is not accurately documented in NYSDEC's Oil & Gas database and whether this poses and unmitigated significant impact to protected groundwater resources.

In Chapter 6 of the RDSGEIS, NYSDEC discounts the risks of new HVHF shale gas wells communicating with nearby abandoned wells. NYSDEC relies on its consultant's (ICF) analysis that concludes it is not possible for HVHF treatments to intersect with improperly abandoned wells.⁹⁴ Yet, in Chapter 7, NYSDEC recommends precautionary measures to be taken by operators to ensure that wells

⁹³ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 3-10 and Page 7-72.

⁹⁴ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 6-52.

near HVHF operations are properly P&A'd to prevent freshwater contamination. The RDSGEIS is internally inconsistent on this point and the two diametrically opposed conclusions need reconciliation.

Recommendation No. 25: Chapter 6 of the SGEIS should be revised to be consistent with and support the Chapter 7 recommendation for HVHF operators to ensure all nearby wells are properly P&A'd before HVHF operations are conducted to mitigate the risk of HVHF treatments intersecting improperly abandoned wells. This requirement should also be codified in NYCRR.

In 2009 HCLLC recommended that preventative measures be taken to identify and properly abandon existing wells before proceeding with nearby shale gas drilling and HVHF operations. NYSDEC responded favorably to this recommendation by proposing that the operator identify any existing well listed in NYSDEC's Oil & Gas database within one mile of the proposed HVHF well⁹⁵ and by proposing that any improperly abandoned wells be plugged within that one-mile radius.⁹⁶ While NYS' recommendation is a step in the right direction, additional analysis is needed to justify the one-mile radius selected.

The RDSGEIS does not provide data on the maximum horizontal fracture propagation length that could occur at NYS' proposed 2000' depth cut-off. The RDSGEIS assumes the maximum horizontal well length will be 4000'. However, as highlighted in other sections of this report, current horizontal drilling technology allows for wells to be drilled substantially longer than 4000'. Fractures induced along that horizontal wellbore section can propagate several thousand feet from the well, depending on fracture treatment design parameters. Therefore, the wellbore length and the maximum fracture length combined could result in a radius of influence of more than one mile (5,280').

Recommendation No. 26: The SGEIS should provide technical justification for selecting a one-mile wellbore intersection radius and should explain the maximum horizontal drilling length and horizontal fracture length that corresponds with the proposed one-mile radius. This will be especially important for shallower wells where fractures tend to propagate on a horizontal plane, and where there will be a large number of potential shallow well intersection possibilities.

The SGEIS should examine the potential for longer wellbores and large fracture influence zones to occur now or in the future, and a wellbore intersection radius that corresponds to the largest areas of influence that are reasonably foreseeable should be included in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure and be codified in the NYCRR. Alternatively, if NYSDEC selects a one mile radius, the SGEIS should limit drilling length and horizontal fracture length in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure and in the NYCRR to ensure that the radius of influence does not extend beyond the one-mile impact area proposed.

The RDSGEIS proposes, in Table 11.1, that operators identify and plug wells within a one-mile radius, but this requirement is not translated into a permit condition or codified in NYCRR. Table 11.1 proposes:

*Operators must identify and characterize any existing wells within the spacing unit and within one mile of proposed well and **plug and abandon any well which is open to the target formation or is otherwise and immediate threat to the environment** [emphasis added].⁹⁷*

⁹⁵ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 3-10 and Page 7-72.

⁹⁶ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Table 11.1, Page 11-5.

⁹⁷ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Table 11.1, Page 11-5.

Appendix 6, PROPOSED Environmental Assessment Form Addendum requires the operator to complete the one-mile radius of investigation, yet, there is no requirement in Appendix 10 or in the NYCRR requiring the offset wells to be plugged by the HVHF operator if needed.

In direct contrast to the conclusions reached in Chapter 6, Chapter 7 of the RDSGEIS acknowledges the potential risk of HVHF wells intersecting improperly abandoned wells and proposes a process to address these risks:

To ensure that abandoned wells do not provide a conduit for contamination of fresh water aquifers, the Department proposes to require that the operator consult the Department's Oil and Gas database as well as property owners and tenants in the proposed spacing unit to determine whether any abandoned wells are present. If (1) the operator has property access rights, (2) the well is accessible, and (3) it is reasonable to believe based on available records and history of drilling in the area that the well's total depth may be as deep or deeper than the target formation for high-volume hydraulic fracturing, then the Department would require the operator to enter and evaluate the well, and properly plug it prior to high-volume hydraulic fracturing if the evaluation shows the well is open to the target formation or is otherwise an immediate threat to the environment. If any abandoned well is under the operator's control as owner or lessee of the pertinent mineral rights, then the operator is required to comply with the Department's existing regulations regarding shut-in or temporary abandonment if good cause exists to leave the well unplugged. This would require a demonstration that the well is in satisfactory condition to not pose a threat to the environment, including during nearby high-volume hydraulic fracturing, and a demonstrated intent to complete and/or produce the well within the time frames provided by existing regulations [emphasis added].⁹⁸

While Chapter 7 correctly acknowledges the need for P&A procedure improvement and review of nearby abandoned wells before HVHF treatments, NYSDEC incongruously proposes to limit P&A due diligence to: 1) wells that are within the HVHF well operator's control and 2) wells that are "accessible." This approach discounts the risks posed by improperly abandoned wells that are owned by another operator, orphaned, or difficult to access.

The inconsistency in P&A improvement recommendations persists in the Appendix 10 HVHF Permit Conditions where the recommended improvements in Chapter 7 are not included. The Chapter 7 recommendations are not included in the revised NYCRR either.

⁹⁸ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-58.

Recommendation No. 27: If a well was not properly P&A'd to current standards, the operator should be required to work with the well owner or take the initiative itself to ensure the well is properly P&A'd before new drilling begins and before a nearby HVHF treatment occurs. Approval of a HVHF well application should be conditioned on verification that any necessary P&A work is complete. This requirement should be included in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure and codified in the NYCRR.

NYSDEC should consider requiring operators to use a variety of proven methods to locate unmarked, abandoned wells, including: historic photos, ground magnetic surveys, and airborne surveys (equipped with magnetometers and methane detectors).

The proposed mitigation measure, requiring improperly abandoned or orphaned wells to be plugged prior to a HVHF treatment, should be included in Appendix 10, of the SGEIS and codified in the NYCRR.

Additionally, NYSDEC should request ICF to further examine additional technical and scientific questions that were not addressed in its analysis.

Foremost, ICF's report does not indicate that ICF evaluated the difference in reservoir pressure near a new shale gas wellbore, drilled into an un-depleted higher pressure gas reservoir, as compared to the lower reservoir pressure in the drainage radius around a well that previously served or is currently serving as a production well. The reservoir pressure in the drainage radius around a production well will be substantially lower creating a pressure sink around that well. By the laws of physics, gas and fluid will flow from higher pressure regimes to lower pressure regimes. Therefore, if a HVHF treatment intersects the drainage radius around a nearby pressure-depleted reservoir connected to an improperly abandoned well, the HVHF fluid and associated mobilized gas will continue to move towards the improperly abandoned well, not back to the new shale gas well as ICF suggests.

As explained in Chapter 10 of this report, industry data shows that HVHF treatments are propagating well beyond the shale zone into formations located above and sometimes below the shale, meaning that the HVHF treatment can potentially intersect the depleted well drainage area of a well that has produced from a zone above or below the shale.

However, ICF concludes that, once the HVHF treatment pressure ceases, all HVHF fluid will return to the shale gas well, and there is no possibility that HVHF fluid or associated mobilized gas will travel up an improperly abandoned well conduit. This conclusion is based on the assumption that the lowest pressure pathway for HVHF fluids injected into the formation is back to the shale gas well, but such assumption does not account for the possibility that a lower pressure regime at an abandoned or active well site could influence the flow of HVHF fluids and newly mobilized gas. It also discounts the possibility that other lower pressure intervals could be located above or below the shale zone that would preferentially accept HVHF fluids and gas mobilized during the treatment.

In these cases, HVHF fluids and gas would continue towards the improperly abandoned well and up the well conduit until pressure equilibrium is reached or into adjacent lower pressured reservoirs. This could result in HVHF fluids and associated gas that is mobilized during the HVHF treatment contaminating groundwater if an exposure pathway exists in the improperly abandoned well or from an adjacent lower pressure reservoir to a shallower protected water zone.

While it is true that HVHF fluids will flow back to the new shale gas well if such well presents the lowest pressure regime for fluid to flow to, this will not always be the case, as evidenced by the fact that not all the HVHF fluid returns to the well. The RDSGEIS states that:

Flowback water recoveries reported from horizontal Marcellus wells in the northern tier of Pennsylvania range between 9 and 35 percent of the fracturing fluid pumped. Flowback water volume, then, could be 216,000 gallons to 2.7 million gallons per well, based on a pumped fluid estimate of 2.4 million to 7.8 million gallons, as presented in Section 5.9.⁹⁹

Therefore, several million gallons of HVHF treatment fluid remain in the reservoir and will travel to the lowest pressure formation/regime present, including such lower pressure regimes present around nearby existing wells that have previously produced hydrocarbons. An out-of-zone HVHF, as described in Chapter 10 of this report could potentially connect with this lower pressure reservoir, if not properly designed and implemented.

Secondly, ICF's analysis did not examine the maximum horizontal distance a HVHF could travel, nor identify minimum safe separation distances between horizontal fractures and abandoned wells. Thus, ICF did not attempt, to compare the maximum HVHF length to the closest distance that an abandoned well may occur.

Instead, ICF's analysis assumes that the HVHF impact radius would always be less than the distance to a nearby well (which may not be true in all cases, and will depend on reservoir characteristics and job design). ICF concludes, without basis, that a fracture created by a HVHF would never intersect a nearby well, but does not establish the well spacing distance required for this to be true nor does it consider the fact that Marcellus Shale fractures (as shown in Chapter 10 of this report) do routinely propagate out of zone.

Additionally, the Chapter 6 conclusion that it is not possible for a HVHF treatment to intersect an improperly abandoned well is discordant with three cases cited in PADEP's 2009 Report that document situations in which fracture stimulations in operating wells communicated with nearby abandoned wells, causing gas leaks in the abandoned wells.¹⁰⁰ PADEP's cases confirm that fracture stimulations, if improperly designed and executed, can intersect improperly abandoned and orphaned wells.

Recommendation No. 28: The SGEIS and NYCRR should require HVHF well operators to identify previously drilled wells that may be located within the hydraulic radius of the new shale gas well that may be affected during a HVHF treatment. The operator should be required to estimate the maximum horizontal and vertical extent of the fracture length that will be propagated and ensure that there are no abandoned or improperly abandoned wells in that intersection radius. An additional safety factor should be applied in this analysis to account for uncertainty in fracture design and implementation, and the potential for the actual fracture length to be longer than estimated (e.g. a conservative analysis is needed).

The HVHF treatment size should be designed to ensure that it does not intersect with any abandoned or improperly abandoned wells, with an additional margin of safety.

⁹⁹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 5-99.

¹⁰⁰ "Stray Natural Gas Migration Associated with Oil and Gas Wells" Draft Report. PADEP, Bureau of Oil and Gas Management. October 28, 2009.

Any improperly abandoned wells nearby, and just outside, the intersection radius should be properly abandoned to current standards before new drilling begins and before the HVHF treatment occurs.

NYCRR Proposed Revisions: Despite the 2011 RDSGEIS conclusion that no new P&A requirements are needed, and NYSDEC's consultant's (Alpha Geoscience) recommendation that no improvements are necessary, NYSDEC proposed revisions to its existing well P&A requirements at 6 NYCRR § 555.5, Plugging Methods, Procedures and Reports:

*(a) The plugging of a well shall be conducted in accordance with the following sequence of operations[:]. **The Division at its discretion may require the tagging of all plugs and require casing and/or cement evaluation logs to be run to determine proper plugging procedures. The following are minimum requirements for plugging and the department may impose additional requirements:** [emphasis added]*

(1) The well bore, whether to remain cased or uncased, shall be filled with cement from total depth to at least [15] 50 feet above the top of the shallowest formation from which the production of oil or gas has ever been obtained in the vicinity. Alternatively, a bridge topped with at least [15] 50 feet of cement shall be placed immediately above each formation from which the production of oil or gas has ever been obtained in the vicinity.

(2) [If] For any casing [is to be] left in the ground, a cement plug of at least [15] 100 feet in length shall be placed [at the bottom of such section of casing] 50 feet inside and 50 feet outside of the casing shoe . Uncemented casing must be pulled as deep as practical with a 50-foot plug placed in and above the stub of the casing. If the uncemented casing is unable to be pulled the casing must be ripped or perforated 50 feet below the shoe of the next outer casing and a 100-foot plug placed across that shoe. A [similar] 50 foot plug shall be placed at [the top of such section of casing unless it shall extend to]the surface. [In the latter event, the casing shall be capped in any such manner as will prevent the migration of fluids and not interfere with normal soil cultivation.]

(3) If casing extending below the deepest potable fresh water level shall not remain in the ground, a cement plug of at least [15] 50 feet in length shall be placed in the open hole at a position approximately 50 feet below the deepest potable fresh water level.

(4) If the conductor casing or surface casing is drawn, a cement plug of at least [15] 50 feet in length shall be placed immediately below the point where the lower end of the conductor or surface casing shall previously have rested. The hole thereabove shall be filled with cement, sand or rock sediment or other suitable material in such a manner as well prevent erosion of the well bore area and not interfere with normal soil cultivation.

(5) The interval between all plugs mentioned in paragraphs (1) through (4) of this subdivision shall be filled with [a heavy mud-laden] gelled fluid with a minimum density equal to 8.65 pounds per gallon with a 10 minute gel-shear strength of 15.3 to 23.5 pounds per hundred square feet or other department approved fluid.

NYSDEC's proposed revisions are a step in the right direction. Overall, NYSDEC proposes to require longer cement plugs, weighted mud, and some additional QA/QC procedures, including tagging the cement plugs and possibly running cement evaluation logs.

NYSDEC's existing P&A regulations require short cement plugs (15'), which are woefully inadequate, compared to current best practices of installing a series of 50'-200' cement plugs within a wellbore, and removing corroded casings to isolate water resources. Unfortunately, this means that most of NYS'

abandoned wells, if plugged to NYCRR's existing standards, are not likely to provide adequate groundwater protection. To address this problem, the P&A procedures used in each previously abandoned well, located near a proposed new HVHF well should be carefully examined for adequacy to determine whether the well should be re-abandoned to current, more robust P&A standards.

Recommendation No. 29: P&A procedures used in each previously abandoned well, located near a proposed new HVHF well should be carefully examined for adequacy to determine whether the well should be re-abandoned to current, more robust P&A standards and this requirement should be included in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure and codified in the NYCRR.

NYSDEC's proposed increase to 50' cement plug length is an improvement; however, best practices used in other states such as Texas, Alaska, and Pennsylvania require longer cement plugs. NYSDEC should consider enhancing the regulations to require longer and additional cement barriers to ensure that hydrocarbons and freshwater are confined to their respective indigenous strata, and are prevented from migrating into other strata or to the surface. For example, while NYSDEC has proposed to revise the NYCRR to require a 50' cement barrier, Alaska requires double that protection at 100'.¹⁰¹ Pennsylvania recently upgraded its P&A requirements from its previous 50' standard to plugs of 50'-100'.¹⁰² Texas requires cement plugs ranging from 50'-200' at numerous locations in the well, and requires cement QA/QC procedures.¹⁰³ For example, Texas requires each cement plug to be a minimum of 200' in length and extend at least 100' below and 100' above the top of each hydrocarbon stratum and the base of the deepest protected water stratum, which is a substantial difference from NYS' current requirement for 15' plugs.

Recommendation No. 30: The SGEIS mitigation measures and NYCRR should be revised to clearly specify that:

Plugging a wellbore should be performed in a manner that ensures all hydrocarbons and freshwater are confined to their respective indigenous strata, and prevented from migrating into other strata or to the surface.

All hydrocarbon-bearing strata should be permanently sealed off by installing a cement barrier at least 100 feet below the base to at least 100 feet above the top of all hydrocarbon-bearing strata (200' plug).

The plugging of a well should include effective segregation of uncased and cased portions of the wellbore to prevent the vertical movement of fluid within the wellbore. A continuous cement plug must be placed from at least 100 feet below to at least 100 feet above the casing shoe (200' plug).

The operator should be required to submit records to NYSDEC to demonstrate that the well is P&A'd in compliance with regulations.

NYSDEC should consider specifying the grade of cement required to plug the well. It should also consider requiring the use of gas blocking agents.

¹⁰¹ 20 AAC 25.

¹⁰² PA Code, § 78.91.

¹⁰³ 16 TAC Part 1, § 3.14.

Revisions to the NYCRR include some improved QA/QC procedures, but these revisions are loosely written and do not specify when QA/QC procedures will be mandatory. For example, it is best practice to tag all cement plugs to verify placement depth; this should not be an optional, discretionary procedure. Also, NYSDEC should specify under what circumstances a cement evaluation tool will be required.

Recommendation No. 31: The SGEIS mitigation measures and NYCRR should be revised to require cement quality standards, including the use of gas blocking cement. The SGEIS and NYCRR should require tagging of all cement plugs and provide instructions on when additional cement evaluation tools must be run.

10. HVHF Design and Monitoring

Background: In 2009, HCLLC recommended that NYSDEC revise its regulations to specify and require best technology and best practices for collecting data, and modeling, designing, implementing, and monitoring a fracture treatment, including:

- (a) Collecting additional geophysical and reservoir data to support a reservoir simulation model;
- (b) Developing a high-quality Marcellus Shale 3D reservoir model(s) to safely design HVHF treatments;
- (c) HVHF modeling prior to each fracture treatment to ensure that the fracture is contained to the Marcellus Shale zone;
- (d) Careful monitoring of the fracture treatment, including shutting the treatment down if data indicates casing leaks or out-of-zone fractures;
- (e) Starting with smaller fracture treatments in the deepest, thickest sections of the Marcellus Shale to gain data and experience (e.g. 4,000' deep and 150' thick);¹⁰⁴
- (f) Using the experience gained with fracture testing on deeper sections of the Marcellus to design and implement larger treatment volumes over time (potentially allowing increasingly shallower and thinner intervals *only* if technical data supports the safety of this technique); and
- (g) Documenting, reporting, and remediating fracture treatment failures to ensure drinking water protection.

In 2009, HCLLC recommended that fracture treatments be carefully monitored and shut down if pressure data indicates casing leaks. HCLLC noted the American Petroleum Institute recommends continuous and careful monitoring of surface injection pressure, slurry rate, proppant concentration, fluid rate, and sand or proppant rate,¹⁰⁵ and that fracture treatments should be immediately shutdown if abnormal pressures indicate a casing leak. The 2011 RDSGEIS now requires the operator to carefully monitor fracture treatments and shut down the treatment if data indicates casing leaks or out-of-zone fractures. This is an important improvement to the SGEIS.

Experts agree that Marcellus Shale gas production can be maximized by: 1) drilling long horizontal wells to increase the drainage area and 2) conducting hydraulic fracture treatments to improve permeability and access to trapped gas. However, successful, safe development requires hydraulic fracture treatments be properly designed and sized to remain within the shale zone. Fracture treatments that propagate outside the shale zone (fracturing out-of-zone) reduce gas recovery and risk pollutant transport. There is extensive industry literature on the importance of hydraulic fracture design, modeling, and field verification to optimize fracture stimulation. Therefore, in 2009 HCLLC recommended that the DSGEIS be improved to provide additional technical and scientific data and require specific mitigation, ensuring that operators are designing jobs that will not fracture out-of-zone.

¹⁰⁴ Smaller, deeper fracture treatments could be used initially in NYS, the performance examined, the predictive model improved based on that data, and then fracture treatment size and proximity to protected waters and other wellbores could be modified, as confidence increases in the predictive ability of the model to ensure a safe and favorable result.

¹⁰⁵ American Petroleum Institute (API) Guidance Document HF1, Hydraulic Fracturing Operations—Well Construction and Integrity Guidelines, October 2009.

Pollutant transport and pollutant toxicity issues are addressed in Dr. Tom Myers' and Dr. Glenn Miller's reports to NRDC on the 2009 DSGEIS and the 2011 RDSGEIS. HCLLC's recommendations center on what type of data, analysis, tools, and methods an engineer/operator should have in place and use to ensure that a fracture treatment can be contained within the Marcellus Shale zone.

In 2009, HCLLC observed that NYSDEC and/or operators had not provided sufficient data to demonstrate that a HVHF treatment can be contained to the Marcellus Shale. HCLLC pointed out that the 2009 DSGEIS did not require the operator to demonstrate that it is equipped with sufficient expertise, training, qualifications, and engineering tools to safely design, implement, and assess the performance of HVHF treatments. HCLLC recommended that NYSDEC consider operator qualifications.

HCLLC's recommendations on the 2009 DSGEIS explained that it is best practice in newly developed formations, such as the NYS Marcellus Shale, to build hydraulic fracture models. Fracture models are used by engineers to safely design fracture treatments. During actual fracture stimulation treatments, data are collected to verify model accuracy, and the model is continually refined to improve its predictive capability.

Because fracture treatments may be executed several thousand feet below the surface of the earth, and can only be indirectly observed, it is important for engineers to have a 3D model to guide design. While 3D modeling is not an exact science, the model provides an engineer with an estimating method for predicting both horizontal and vertical fracture length.

As further explained below, data collected during drilling, well logging, coring, and other geophysical activities and HVHF implementation can be used to continuously improve the model quality and predictive capability.

In newly developed areas it is important to conduct initial HVHF treatments in the lowest risk zones, far below protected aquifers and with large horizontal offsets from existing wells. Until the predictive capability of site-specific models improves from the input of actual field data, larger buffer zones should be used. Absent hydraulic fracture modeling in newly developed areas such as the NYS Marcellus Shale, engineers would blindly be making decisions on the size, type, and execution of HVHF treatments.

NYS' consultant, Alpha Geoscience, agreed with HCLLC's 2009 recommendations and in January 2011 reported to NYSDEC that:

Harvey Consulting's [HCLLC] assessment of the dSGEIS' discussion of hydraulic fracture design and monitoring is thorough...

Harvey Consulting has thoroughly documented its discussion of hydraulic fracture design and monitoring, citing professional journal articles, professional conference papers, technical guidance documents, and consultant reports.¹⁰⁶

Alpha Geoscience recommended to NYSDEC that HCLLC's 2009 recommendations be included in the SGEIS:

Harvey Consulting's ideas should be considered for inclusion in the dSGEIS as possible permit conditions, especially for the first wells drilled in an area.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁶ Alpha Geoscience, Review of the dSGEIS and Identification Best Technology and Best Practices Recommendations, Harvey Consulting, LLC, December 28, 2009, prepared for NYSERDA, January 20, 2011, Pages 26-27.

¹⁰⁷ Alpha Geoscience, Review of the dSGEIS and Identification Best Technology and Best Practices Recommendations, Harvey Consulting, LLC, December 28, 2009, prepared for NYSERDA, January 20, 2011, Page 28.

While Alpha Geoscience's report acknowledges the importance of proper HVHF design and monitoring, it includes several misrepresentations about HCLLC's 2009 comments that require correction.

First, Alpha Geoscience incorrectly contends that HCLLC recommended industry and NYS develop separate hydraulic fracture models; this is not correct. HCLLC recommended that industry develop models, **or** that joint model funding be implemented as a more cost-effective approach. Typically, companies build their own proprietary models to seek competitive advantage, especially in newly developed areas where the models are used as part of the competitive bidding process. However, it is possible for one or more companies to pool resources to develop a joint model as a cost savings.

Second, Alpha Geoscience incorrectly contends that HCLLC recommended that every operator perform fracture modeling at every location, **including locations that have been thoroughly modeled and assessed.** Alpha Geoscience concluded that this would be extremely costly compared to the technical value. HCLLC did not recommend HVHF modeling be conducted at locations that have been "thoroughly modeled and assessed." Logically, if this work has already been completed, there is no reason to repeat it.

HCLLC did recommend that NYSDEC require operators to complete modeling prior to each fracture treatment to ensure that the fracture is properly designed and planned to be contained to the Marcellus Shale zone. This is not a significant amount of work per well for experienced operators, with working models. HCLLC also recommended that operators collect data during fracture treatments to further refine hydraulic fracture models. HCLLC pointed out that as NYS shale development is in its infancy, hydraulic fracture model work has not yet been completed, and therefore is needed.

Once a hydraulic fracture model is built and populated with data specific to the NYS Marcellus Shale, running a well-specific HVHF treatment scenario is an efficient process, and an important quality control and quality assurance measure. It does not appear that Alpha Geoscience is familiar with the reservoir simulators used for oil and gas work, because their recommendation to construct a hydraulic fracture model for the Marcellus Shale, and then use it only on the initial wells constructed, is inconsistent with industry practice. Model quality improves over time. As additional data is collected and the model is refined, it becomes an increasingly valuable tool to the operator. High-quality models are an essential tool for designing fracture treatments in challenging circumstances and locations.

In 2009, HCLLC explained that industry agrees there is a high level of uncertainty in NYS Marcellus Shale development; industry recommends engineering and geophysical data work to reduce that uncertainty. HCLLC's recommendations in 2009 stated:

***Marcellus Experience Very Limited:** Marcellus Shale gas development has a high level of uncertainty. Shales by nature are very heterogeneous.¹⁰⁸ Industry has limited experience exploiting the Marcellus Shale using horizontal wells and slickwater fracs. The first Appalachian Basin Marcellus Shale gas well stimulation using high-volume slickwater fracture treatments was only recently performed in Southwestern Pennsylvania in 2004.¹⁰⁹ Therefore, industry has less than five years of experience developing the Marcellus Shale using the techniques proposed in the dSGEIS.*

¹⁰⁸ Cipolla, C.L., Lolon, E.P., and Mayerhofer, M.J., Reservoir Modeling and Production Evaluation in Shale-Gas Reservoirs, International Petroleum Technology Conference, Paper 13185, December 2009.

¹⁰⁹ Fontaine, J., Johnson, N., and Schoen, D., Design, Execution, and Evaluation of a "Typical" Marcellus Shale Slickwater Stimulation: A Case History, Society of Petroleum Engineers Paper 117772, October 2008.

Even NYSDEC's consultants acknowledge that industry literature on and experience with the Marcellus Shale is so limited that most of their analysis was based on development of other shale gas reservoirs, such as the Barnett and Fayetteville. NYSDEC's consultant, ICF, states that:

“Drilling operations, and especially multi-horizontal wells, are relatively new in Marcellus Shale. While drilling operations are underway in neighboring states as evidenced by over 450 wells in Pennsylvania for example, **technical studies have yet to be published** that quantify actual drilling operations in Marcellus Shale. **For the most part, we have had to make assumptions, where technically appropriate, that drilling operations in other shale formations are representative of expected Marcellus operations** [emphasis added].¹¹⁰

Lack of Marcellus Shale experience increases the risk of fracturing out-of-zone, unless a conservative, step-wise approach is taken to better understand the Marcellus Shale before large scale development occurs in NYS.

NYS Marcellus Data Set Improvement Needed: Site-specific data, unique to the Marcellus Shale in NYS, must be collected to: better understand the reservoir heterogeneities; develop sophisticated three dimensional (3D) reservoir models to more accurately design fracture treatments; and examine actual fracture performance in the field. Reservoir simulation models are critical engineering design tools. The dSGEIS provides no indication that a model exists for the NYS Marcellus Shale.

Engineers use 3D models to predict fracture height, length, and orientation prior to actually performing the job at the well. The goal is to design a stimulation treatment that optimizes fracture networking and maximizes gas production, while confining fracture growth to within the gas shale target formation.¹¹¹

Engineers examine various parameters (e.g., volume, pressure, treatment placement) to optimize a fracture treatment. Without a high-quality 3D reservoir simulation model to design a fracture treatment, operators cannot demonstrate to NYSDEC that the fracture is predicted to stay in zone.

Typically an operator would start by collecting core analysis, well logs, and other subsurface data in the area it is interested in developing, to populate a site-specific 3D reservoir model. To collect this data, additional exploration and appraisal wells must be drilled (see recommendation No. 2). The limited amount of special core analysis and core data on the Marcellus Shale, as well as overlying intervals, is described in Chapter 4 of the DSGEIS, showing a need for additional data.

Test in Deepest, Thickest Zones First: NYSDEC is proposing to allow high-volume fracture treatments, without requiring the standard of care a petroleum engineer would typically use to collect data, and model, design, and monitor fracture treatments. NYSDEC should require that additional data be collected to support a model, and initially it should only allow a few, small fracture treatments that are conducted with intensive monitoring to verify that they are designed and implemented to stay within the

¹¹⁰ 2009 NYSDEC, DSGEIS, ICF Task 2 Report, Page 1.

¹¹¹ ALL Consulting, Hydraulic Fracturing Considerations for Natural Gas Wells of the Marcellus Shale, Presented at The Ground Water Protection Council 2008 Annual Forum, Cincinnati, Ohio, September 21-24, 2008.

Marcellus Shale. This data gathering and testing should be conducted in the deepest portions of the Marcellus Shale (below 4,000') and in the thickest section of the shale (over 150') to ensure there are adequate buffer zones to protect the environment during the data gathering and testing process. Operators should start with smaller fracture treatment sizes, collecting field data to better understand fracture performance, and use field data to calibrate that performance in the 3D model.

Over time, with careful analysis and a conservative, step-wise approach, larger fracture treatments can be tested and carefully monitored. Over time it may be possible to safely use the treatments on thinner reservoirs and shallower reservoirs, but certainly not as a first step. High-volume fracture treatments should not be conducted until there is a sophisticated data set, model, and monitoring program to verify pre-fracture and post-fracture reservoir properties.

Buffer Zones Needed: *Vertical fractures that extend above and below the shale zone will decrease gas recovery rates by allowing vertical migration into the overlying strata, or by allowing water influx from aquifers above or below the shale. NYS has a financial incentive to ensure fracture treatments are conducted correctly, because NYS will want to maximize its royalty share and tax revenue.*

To avoid fracturing out-of-zone, engineers typically design fracture treatments with a buffer zone (an un-fractured zone at the top of the shale layer and at the base of the shale). Buffer zone size should increase with geologic and technical uncertainty. Buffer zone size may decrease as industry gains experience and data quality/quantity improves. The DSGEIS does not contain sufficient information to demonstrate that NYSDEC and/or operators proposing high-volume fracture treatments have developed engineering tools capable of computing a safe buffer zone.

Third, Alpha Geoscience incorrectly contends that HCLLC recommended that every operator perform a minifrac treatment at every location, including locations that have been thoroughly modeled and assessed. HCLLC did not recommend that a minifrac be conducted at every well. Instead, HCLLC recommended that minifracs be conducted in a few different areas of NYS to further refine hydraulic fracture models. HCLLC's 2009 recommendations stated:

*Technology is available to assess actual fracture growth including: minifracs,¹¹² microseismic fracture mapping,¹¹³ tilt surveys, well logging (e.g., tracer and temperature surveys¹¹⁴), etc.¹¹⁵ These technologies can be used to provide more accurate assessments of the locations, geometry, and dimensions of a hydraulic fracture system.¹¹⁶ **This data***

¹¹² Minifracs are small fracture treatments conducted in the well to better understand fracture conductivity and flow geometry prior to implementing a large fracture treatment. Minifracs are typically used to optimize the fracture design and calibrate the fracture model. These tests involve periods of intermittent injection followed by intervals of shut-in and/or flowback. Pressure and rate are measured throughout a minifrac and recorded for subsequent analyses.

¹¹³ Microseismic monitoring is a method that measures the seismic wave generated during a fracture treatment to map the fracture extent, and it can be used to make "real-time" changes in the fracture design and implementation program.

¹¹⁴ After the fracture treatment is completed, an operator can run a temperature log in the well to measure the variation in reservoir temperature resulting from the treatment. The reservoir temperature is hotter than the fracture fluid and proppant. Cooler temperatures will be measured where frac fluid and proppant are placed. Temperature logs will provide insight into fracture location and growth outside the casing.

¹¹⁵ American Petroleum Institute (API) Guidance Document HF1, Hydraulic Fracturing Operations—Well Construction and Integrity Guidelines, October 2009.

¹¹⁶ Schlumberger, Microseismic Hydraulic Fracture Monitoring, <http://www.slb.com/content/services/stimulation/stimmap.asp>.

can be obtained in the Marcellus Shale in a few different areas of NYS to further refine the hydraulic fracture model. *Minifractures are particularly helpful in estimating fracture dimensions, fracture efficiency, closure pressure, and leakoff prior to implementing a high-volume, full-scale treatment. NYSDEC should require operators to conduct minifractures to better understand site-specific reservoir characteristics prior to conducting a high-volume fracture treatment [emphasis added].*

HCLLC's 2009 recommendations also noted that:

While NYSDEC's consultant, ICF¹¹⁷, documents a number of the engineering methods that can be used to model, monitor, and improve fracture treatments, NYSDEC does not require any of these methods in its existing regulations. Absent a regulatory requirement, there is no assurance these methods will be used [emphasis added].

Best practice for hydraulic fracture planning includes a detailed understanding of the in-situ conditions present in the reservoir (e.g., shale thickness, reservoir pressure, rock fracture characteristics, and special core analysis). In highly heterogeneous reservoirs, reservoir simulation is often coupled with stochastic methods (e.g. Monte Carlo analysis and geostatistical techniques) to improve the quality of the 3D reservoir model.¹¹⁸

Data collected on previous fracture treatments in the Marcellus Shale and drilling data will be useful to refine the fracture modeling. Actual fracture treatments must be carefully monitored and implemented to ensure fractures stay within zone. Data collected during each fracture treatment should be used to calibrate the 3D reservoir model to improve future fracture treatment design.

Peer-reviewed articles and technical data on Marcellus Shale vertical fracture growth characteristics are sparse. While fracture growth models exist at an industry level, and have been tuned for fracture treatments in the Barnett Shales and other gas reservoirs, considerable technical work is still needed to develop fracture growth models for NYS Marcellus Shale development.

A literature review was completed by the author [HCLLC] in search of a Marcellus Shale 3D reservoir model for NYS; none was found in the petroleum engineering published literature. It is not clear if the lack of a Marcellus Shale reservoir model for NYS indicates that one does not exist, or whether industry is holding models proprietary. Yet in other shale gas developments (e.g., Barnett and Fayetteville) there is extensive industry literature on: available reservoir simulation model; completion and fracture design; and performance assessment to compare predicted fracture growth with that achieved in the field. Lack of industry literature is usually a strong indication that additional data gathering and technology development is needed.

The data void for NYS' Marcellus Shale technical literature reinforces the need for NYSDEC to use a conservative, step-wise approach, rather than launching into a massive drilling and fracturing campaign without the data or tools in place to do a safe and effective job.

¹¹⁷ ICF International, Technical Assistance to NYS on DSGEIS, August 2009.

¹¹⁸ Schepers, K.C., Gonzalez, R.J., Koperna, G.J., and Oudinot, A.Y., Reservoir Modeling in Support of Shale Gas Exploration, Society of Petroleum Engineers, June 2009.

NYSDEC should require additional information be collected by industry to better understand the geological and geophysical properties of the Marcellus Shale zone and the overlying strata between the Marcellus and drinking water aquifers.

NYSDEC should require 3D reservoir simulation models be developed to accurately predict hydraulic fracture treatment performance, and to ensure the jobs are well engineered and designed with adequate safety factors to avoid fracturing out-of-zone.

The DSGEIS must assure the public that fractures can be contained to the Marcellus Shale zone. The DSGEIS does not provide data sufficient to meet this standard. The DSGEIS does not document the existence of 3D reservoir simulation models for NYS' Marcellus Shale, nor does NYSDEC require engineers to design fracture treatments using 3D models.

While Marcellus Shale development in Pennsylvania precedes development in NYS, data collected from the Pennsylvania wells is not applicable to the NYS Marcellus Shale because the depth of burial, thickness, organic content, permeability, and other reservoir properties in NYS differ. Industry experts warn that site-specific data is critical:

“By their nature, shales are extremely variable and regional differences in structure, mineralogy and other characteristics should always be considered in treatment design...The wide geographic range [of the Marcellus Shale] has led to numerous different completion schemes being utilized as with the geographic variation comes geologic variability within the formation itself. A primary topic of [industry] discussion has been determining the optimal size and type of stimulation treatment for a given area”¹¹⁹ *[emphasis added].*

Marcellus Shale thickness lessens substantially in western NYS to less than 75' for roughly one-third of the total anticipated development area.¹²⁰ HVHF treatments in thin shale zones increases the risk of fracturing out-of-zone, unless a very cautious approach is taken by tailoring the design to the geophysical properties of the shale, taking into account shale thickness, local stress conditions, compressibility, and rigidity.

NYSDEC's consultants point out that a gas operator has no incentive to fracture out of the Marcellus Shale zone, because doing so could result in a loss of gas reserves or an increase in produced water volumes. Yet, NYSDEC's consultant, ICF, also recognizes that fracture design is complicated and it is possible to inadvertently fracture out-of-zone. ICF examined the potential for fracture fluids to propagate vertically and contaminate overlying drinking water aquifers. ICF recommended a 1,000' vertical offset be used.

HCLLC agrees that the use of vertical and horizontal offsets (buffer zones) is a prudent approach. The next step is to determine the size of the offsets. Initially, in new areas, offsets should be large, and then may decrease over time, as field data is obtained and predictive capability is refined.

¹¹⁹ Fontaine, J., Johnson, N., and Schoen, D., Design, Execution, and Evaluation of a “Typical” Marcellus Shale Slickwater Stimulation: A Case History, Society of Petroleum Engineers Paper 117772, October 2008.

¹²⁰ 2009 NYSDEC, DSGEIS, Figure 4.9.

In 2009, HCLLC pointed out that the 1,000' vertical offset proposed by ICF is not technically supported, and a horizontal buffer zone is also needed. HCLLC recommended that vertical and horizontal offsets be based on actual field data, 3D reservoir simulation modeling, and a peer-reviewed hydrological assessment. HCLLC recommended these steps be taken to ensure aquifers are protected and nearby wellbore intersections are avoided.

The 2011 RDSGEIS still does not provide technical justification for the proposed minimum 1,000' vertical offset, nor does it make a recommendation for a horizontal offset from existing wells.

Instead, the 2011 RDSGEIS provides data that shows HVHF treatments in the Marcellus Shale have propagated vertical fractures up to 1500' in length, and horizontal fractures can extend hundreds to thousands of feet, as further explained below. These data do not support the proposed buffers.

The 2011 RDSGEIS: The 2011 RDSGEIS agrees that in new areas hydraulic fracture model development and design is important, citing recommendations from the Ground Water Protection Council and its consultant ICF; yet, incongruously the RDSGEIS concludes it is unnecessary for operators to be required do this work in NYS (as a SGEIS mitigation measure or a NYCRR requirement).

*Service companies design hydraulic fracturing procedures based on the rock properties of the prospective hydrocarbon reservoir. For any given area and formation, hydraulic fracturing design is an iterative process, i.e., it is continually improved and refined as development progresses and more data is collected. **In a new area, it may begin with computer modeling to simulate various fracturing designs and their effect on the height, length and orientation of the induced fractures. After the procedure is actually performed, the data gathered can be used to optimize future treatments. Data to define the extent and orientation of fracturing may be gathered during fracturing treatments by use of microseismic fracture mapping, tilt measurements, tracers, or proppant tagging. ICF International, under contract to NYSERDA to provide research assistance for this document, observed that fracture monitoring by these methods is not regularly used because of cost, but is commonly reserved for evaluating new techniques, determining the effectiveness of fracturing in newly developed areas, or calibrating hydraulic fracturing models [emphasis added].***¹²¹

NYSDEC's consultants (Alpha Geoscience and ICF), the Ground Water Protection Council, HCLLC, and industry all agree:


- There is a need for computer modeling on new gas shale play areas to simulate various fracturing designs and their effects on the height, length, and orientation of the induced fractures;
- After the HVHF treatment is actually performed, gathered data should be used to optimize future treatments; and
- There is technology available to further refine treatment design, including microseismic fracture mapping, tilt measurements, tracers, and proppant tagging.

However, these points of agreement are not reflected in the RDSGEIS, permit conditions, or NYCRR revisions. Remarkably, the 2011 RDSGEIS only has a few paragraphs in the entire 1,537 page document that discuss the importance of HVHF modeling and post-fracture assessment work (Chapter 5.8), and these recommendations are later disregarded in Chapter 7 proposed mitigation.

¹²¹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 5-88.

The use of 3D reservoir simulation to more accurately predict vertical and horizontal fracture growth is not new; reservoir simulation models have been used by petroleum engineers for decades. However, computational efficiency and model design have improved considerably, and more sophisticated simulation techniques are now available for shale gas reservoirs.

The basic engineering approach for populating a 3D reservoir simulation model is shown in the simplified flow diagram below, with geophysical data (seismic, well logs, core, samples, etc.) and existing nearby well data serving as the starting point. Once a model is built, it is used to design and optimize a safe and effective HVHF job. Data are gathered while the job is implemented, and those data are used to refine the model and improve future HVHF treatments.



There is abundant industry literature explaining the need for hydraulic fracture modeling and microseismic mapping, especially for new shale play developments, such as in NYS.

NYSDEC should recognize that the use of refined, site-specific models to optimize HVHF jobs is industry best practice. Quality operators with high standards routinely do this work. It should not be considered a burdensome practice, but rather a necessary requirement to protect groundwater and the environment.

Furthermore, it is economically attractive for an operator to use HVHF modeling. Models aid industry in making informed decisions, and prevents fracturing out-of-zone, which maximizes gas recovery rates.

Microseismic mapping has become a key tool for better understanding shale gas heterogeneities, identifying reservoir faults, and measuring actual fracture propagation orientation and length.

A 2010 industry paper¹²² written by Rex Energy Corporation and MicroSeismic Inc. explains the importance of microseismic mapping for shale gas engineering:

*By using microseismic source locations and mechanisms in conjunction with other geological and geophysical knowledge of an area, engineering and completion methods can be quickly corrected and enhanced. Induced fracture height, length, and placement influence the location, orientation and spacing of subsequent wells. **Microseismic monitoring allows for identification and characterization of unknown faults which intersect the wellbore and may significantly affect reservoir production and stimulations.** Formations with limited exploration with limited exploration data, such as the Marcellus shale, are ideal candidates for microseismic monitoring [emphasis added].*

*In this case study, we will show how the **microseismic monitoring of a hydraulic fracture treatment in the Marcellus Shale identified a pre-existing natural fault which intersected the wellbore** [emphasis added].*

A 2011 industry paper¹²³ written by Marquette Exploration (a Marcellus Shale operator) and Schlumberger (an industry contractor), titled “Integrating All Available Data to Improve Production in the Marcellus Shale,” emphasizes the importance of HVHF design and monitoring:

The operator featured in this paper is a small independent with Marcellus Shale areas of operation spanning across Belmont and Jefferson counties, eastern Ohio (Fig.2). This paper describes the methodology used by the operator to systematically gather the critical data during a pilot program to enhance the knowledge of their reservoir and develop optimized completion strategies and stimulation designs, thereby maximizing the true economic value of their asset.

To build realistic property models, input from team members from different disciplines is required; in this study, team members included a geophysicist, geologist, petrophysicist, and reservoir engineer. Once the 3D structural model was completed, individual log measurements and interpreted properties from petrophysical, geomechanical, and image logs were incorporated in the model.

Marquette Exploration’s paper concludes:

- *Delineating a reservoir early on in the play and gathering as much data as possible can improve the drilling and completion design of the initial horizontal wells in the field to reduce the time and cost for an operator to get up the learning curve.*
- *Using all available data can greatly enhance the understanding in a field which, in turn, can improve the lateral design. Core data are imperative to calibrate petrophysical and geomechanical logs to further refine log models in other wells in an area.*
- *Seismic data in conjunction with strategically placed vertical logs can be used to construct a detailed static 3D geological model.*

¹²² Hulse, B.J., and Cornette, B. (MicroSeismic Inc.), and Pratt, D. (Rex Energy Corporation), Surface Microseismic Mapping Reveals Details of the Marcellus Shale, Society of Petroleum Engineers, SPE Paper 138806, 2010, Page 1.

¹²³ Ejofodomi, E., Baihly, J., Malpani, R., Altman, R. (Schlumberger), and Huchton, T., Welch, D., and Zieche, J., (Marquette Exploration), Integrating All Available Data to Improve Production in the Marcellus Shale, Society of Petroleum Engineers Paper, SPE 144321, 2011.

- *The thickness, depth, and continuity for shale sub-layers can vary greatly over a small area, so a pilot hole can be imperative to calibrate the geologic model for lateral landing point determination.*
- *The geologic model showed that the reservoir properties varied across the area of interest.*
- *Stochastic modeling can be used to successfully propagate interpreted log properties from a few wells across a large acreage.*
- *A novel reservoir modeling technique, Microseismic Fracture Network (MFN), was developed using microseismic data to properly describe the created complex fracture network.*

A 2010 industry paper¹²⁴ written by El Paso Exploration and Production and StrataGen Engineering stresses the importance of HVHF design:

*...a primary conclusion is that as reservoir permeability decreases, proper well type selection and **effective hydraulic fracture stimulation design become much more crucial** [emphasis added].*

Additional modeling with specifics must be performed to evaluate well type, fracture design, and spacing requirement for a specific well or formation [emphasis added].

A 2011 industry paper¹²⁵ written by Schlumberger also stresses the importance of HVHF design and monitoring:

*The completion strategy and hydraulic fracture stimulation are the keys to economic success in unconventional reservoirs. **Therefore, reservoir engineering workflows in unconventional reservoirs need to focus on completion and stimulation optimization** as much as they do well placement and spacing. **This well-level focus requires the integration of hydraulic fracture modeling software and the ability to utilize measurements specific to unconventional reservoirs** [emphasis added].*

It is very important to properly model hydraulic fracture propagation and hydrocarbon production mechanisms in unconventional reservoirs, a significant departure from conventional reservoir simulation workflows. Seismic-to-simulation workflows in unconventional reservoirs require hydraulic fracture models that properly simulate complex fracture propagation which is common in many unconventional reservoirs, algorithms to automatically develop discrete reservoir simulation grids to rigorously model the hydrocarbon production from complex hydraulic fractures, and the ability to efficiently integrate microseismic measurements with geological and geophysical data. **The introduction of complex hydraulic fracture propagation models now allows these workflows to be implemented** [emphasis added].

A 2010 industry paper¹²⁶ written by StrataGen Engineering and CMG (industry consultants) again highlights the importance of HVHF design and monitoring:

¹²⁴ Shelley, R.F., Lolon, E., and Dzubin, B. (StrataGen Engineering), and Vennes, M. (El Paso Exploration and Production), Quantifying the Effects of Well Type and Hydraulic Fracture Selection on Recovery for Various Reservoir Permeability Using a Numerical Reservoir Simulator, Society of Petroleum Engineers Paper, SPE 133985, 2010, Pages 1 and 12.

¹²⁵ Cipolla, C.L., Fitzpatrick, T., Williams, M.J., and Ganguly, U.K., (Schlumberger), Seismic-to-Simulation for Unconventional Reservoir Development, Society of Petroleum Engineers Paper, SPE 146876, 2011, Page 1.

*The widespread application of microseismic mapping has significantly improved our understanding of hydraulic fracture growth in unconventional gas reservoirs (primarily shale) and led to better stimulation designs. However, the overall effectiveness of stimulation treatments is difficult to determine from microseismic mapping, as the location of proppant and distribution of conductivity in the fracture network cannot be measured (and are critical parameters that control well performance). Therefore **it is important to develop reservoir modeling approaches that properly characterize fluid flow in and the properties of a complex fracture network, tight matrix, and primary hydraulic fracture (if present) to evaluate well performance and understand critical parameters that affect gas recovery** [emphasis added].*

*Given the complex nature of hydraulic fracture growth and the very low permeability of the matrix rock in many shale-gas reservoirs combined with the predominance of horizontal completions, **reservoir simulation is commonly the preferred method to predict and evaluate well performance** [emphasis added].*

The most rigorous method to model shale-gas reservoirs is to discretely grid the entire reservoir, including the network fractures, hydraulic fracture, matrix blocks, and un-stimulated areas – but this increases computational time. However, with the continual advances in computing power, much more complex numerical models can be efficiently utilized.

In 2010, Atlas Energy Resources published a Society of Petroleum Engineering Paper that explained the importance of reservoir characterization, modeling, the use of minifrac, and the use of microseismic data. Atlas Energy Resources explained that the use of advanced technology is good business:

This paper describes a procedure to enhance production in the Marcellus shale while optimizing economics through integration of minifrac, fracture treatment, microseismic, and production data technologies.

Application of this integrated technology approach will help provide the operator with a systematic approach for designing, analyzing, and optimizing multi-stage/multi-cluster transverse hydraulic fractures in horizontal wellbores.¹²⁷

An engineering analysis and modeling prior to a HVHF treatment provides industry, regulators, and the public with confidence that the treatment has been thoroughly evaluated and designed to protect the environment. It is not sufficient for industry and NYSDEC to say this work is being done, while being unwilling to require it. If this work is being done, then creating a formal requirement in the SGEIS and NYCRR does not impose an incremental burden on the operator. Resistance to a formal requirement should signal to NYSDEC that industry best practice is not always followed.

While industry literature explains the need for hydraulic fracture modeling, this does not guarantee it will actually be implemented by all shale gas operators in NYS. Shale gas drilling has attracted numerous small, less experienced operators. Computational modeling requires personnel with expertise in building models, running them, and refining datasets. If the operator does not have sufficient in-house engineering and geophysical expertise, it should be required to hire experts to provide the necessary expertise.

¹²⁶ Cipolla, C.L., Lolon, E.P. (StrataGen Engineering), Erdle, J.C., and Rubin, B. (CMG), Reservoir Modeling in Shale-Gas Reservoirs, Society of Petroleum Engineers Paper, SPE 125530, 2009, Pages 1,3, and 4.

¹²⁷ Henry Jacot, R. (Atlas Energy Resources), Bazan, L.W. (Bazan Consulting, Inc.), Meyer, B.R. (Meyer & Associates Inc.), Technology Integration – A Methodology to Enhance Production and Maximize Economics in Horizontal Marcellus Shale Wells, Society of Petroleum Engineers Paper, SPE 135262, 2010, Page 1.

Recommendation No. 32: Best practices for HVHF design and monitoring should be included in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure, and codified in NYCRR as a minimum standard.

Additionally, Alpha Geoscience, ICF, Ground Water Protection Council, HCLLC, and industry all agree that additional technical work is needed to develop new shale gas play areas; yet the 2011 RDSGEIS does not require the operator to develop or maintain a hydraulic fracture model. Instead, the 2011 RDSGEIS only requires the operator to abide by a 1000' vertical offset from protected aquifers and collect data during the HVHF job to evaluate whether the job was implemented as planned.¹²⁸

Knowing whether a job was implemented as planned is only helpful if the initial design is protective of human health and environment. If the job is poorly planned, and is implemented as planned, that only proves that a poor job was actually implemented. This approach would not be in NYS' best interest.

Instead, NYS needs to first verify that the operator has engineered a HVHF treatment that is protective of human health and environment, and then, second, verify that the job was implemented to that protective standard. A rigorous engineering analysis is a critical design step. Proper design and monitoring of HVHF jobs is not only best practice from an environmental and human health perspective, it is also good business because it optimizes gas production and reduces hydraulic fracture treatment costs.

The 2011 RDSGEIS does not require a HVHF design plan.¹²⁹ The RDSGEIS does not require the operator to:

- (a) Estimate the vertical and horizontal fracture length;
- (b) Verify that the proposed HVHF design will not intersect protected groundwater or nearby wells;
- (c) Use a site-specific hydraulic fracture model, based on NYS specific shale characteristics and the operational design parameters of the planned HVHF job (volume, pressure, rate, etc.).

Recommendation No. 33: The SGEIS and NYCRR should require the operator to:

- (a) Estimate the maximum vertical and horizontal fracture propagation length for each well, and submit technical information (e.g. model output) with its application to support its computations.
- (b) Describe in its post-well completion report whether the predicted vertical and horizontal fracture propagation lengths were accurate, or note discrepancies.
- (c) Certify that the actual HVHF job was implemented safely, and fracture propagations did not intersect protected aquifers or nearby wells.

Additionally, NYS should reserve the right, and provide funding, to periodically review industry's models and computations to assess quality and verify this work is being completed.

¹²⁸ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 5-88.

¹²⁹ The operator is only required to verify that the vertical offset of 1000' is achieved and the shale is at least 2000' deep.

The 2011 RDSGEIS assumes that any HVHF job, no matter the volume, no matter the pressure, and no matter the shale thickness, will be safe, as long as it is conducted at a depth below 2,000'. The 2011 RDSGEIS recommends that site-specific SEQRA reviews be limited to wells shallower than 2000' and within 1000' of a protected aquifer.¹³⁰ The RDSGEIS lacks technical and scientific data to support the hypothesis that all HVHF treatments, regardless of design, at 2000' or deeper will be safe. Additionally, the RDSGEIS does not address safe horizontal fracture length.

NYSDEC does not provide data on HVHF treatments conducted between 2000' and 5000' deep; yet, NYS proposed to allow shale gas drilling at these depths. Instead, the RDSGEIS relies on limited data collected from Marcellus Shale fractures conducted in other states at depths below 5000'. However, even industry points out that data collected in one part of the Marcellus Shale cannot be applied to the entire shale.

For example, Guardian Exploration and Universal Well Services reports that optimal Marcellus Shale HVHF treatments are still being developed, and that a "one-size-fits-all approach should not be expected. They anticipate that industry will examine the use of higher rates and increased fluid volume and proppant mass in the future resulting in varied fracture lengths from current HVHF jobs:

Much work remains to be done in determining the optimal stimulation treatment for the Marcellus shale. Certainly given the extremely large geographic area encompassed by the Marcellus play, it should not be expected that one size will fit all. While the treatment discussed here has been considered successful, future projects will examine the effects of increased rate, increased volumes in terms of both overall fluid volume and proppant mass, the effects of varying the proppant mesh ratios and concentrations, and optimization of flowback/cleanup rates. The utilization of evaluation tools such as microseismic monitoring of fracture growth and horizontal drilling and completions to enhance reservoir development should also prove to be beneficial [emphasis added].¹³¹

As HVHF treatment methods continue to evolve, NYSDEC must either set a limit in the SGEIS and NYCRR for the upper bounds of a safe HVHF job, or it must have a process in place for industry to provide site-specific engineering to support each well application to ensure that new HVHF designs are safe.

NYSDEC assumes that 1000' vertical separation between the bottom of the protected groundwater zone and the top of the shale zone where HVHF will occur is sufficiently protective, regardless of shale thickness, HVHF job size, and other subsurface characteristics. However, this approach is not technically supported. The 2011 RDSGEIS concludes:

As explained in Section 6.1.5.2, the conclusion that harm from fracturing fluid migration up from the horizontal wellbore is not reasonably anticipated is contingent upon the presence of certain natural conditions, including 1,000 feet of vertical separation between the bottom of a potential aquifer and the top of the target fracture zone. The presence of 1,000 feet of low-permeability rocks between the fracture zone and a drinking water source serves as a natural or inherent mitigation measure that protects against groundwater contamination from hydraulic fracturing [emphasis added].¹³²

¹³⁰ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-59.

¹³¹ Fontaine, J., and Johnson, N. (Universal Well Services), and Schoen, D. (Guardian Exploration), Design, Execution, and Evaluation of a "Typical" Marcellus Shale Slickwater Stimulation: A Case History, Society of Petroleum Engineers Paper, SPE 117772, 2008, Page 11.

¹³² 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-59.

Neither the 2009 DSGEIS nor the 2011 RDSGEIS contain site-specific NYS Marcellus Shale hydraulic fracture model data to support NYSDEC's conclusion that a 1,000' vertical separation will be protective in all cases in NYS, especially where thinner, shallower shales are present. Furthermore, the 2011 RDSGEIS lacks data on vertical and horizontal fracture propagation in the Marcellus Shale at depths between 2000' and 5000' (depths that NYS proposes to permit).

The behavior of HVHF propagation in NYS is not currently well understood. HCLLC was unable to locate any NYS site-specific hydraulic fracture models for the Marcellus, Utica, or other low-permeability reservoirs. If these models exist, they should be described in the SGEIS, and NYSDEC should explain how it used the data from these models to inform its SGEIS.

Instead, the RDSGEIS currently relies on Marcellus Shale HVHF data from other states that may not be applicable to NYS. For example, NYSDEC points to data collected on 400 Marcellus hydraulic fractures conducted in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Ohio. This data was summarized in a three page article in the American Oil & Gas Reporter in July 2010:

*Four hundred Marcellus hydraulic fracturing stages in Pennsylvania, West Virginia and Ohio have been mapped with respect to vertical growth and distance to the deepest water wells in the corresponding areas. Although many of the hydraulic fracturing stages occurred at depths greater than the depths at which the Marcellus occurs in New York, the results across all depth ranges showed that induced fractures did not approach the depth of drinking water aquifers. In addition, as previously discussed, at the shallow end of the target depth range in New York, fracture growth orientation would change from vertical to horizontal.*¹³³

NYSDEC's conclusions rely heavily on the American Oil & Gas Reporter three-page article (Fisher, 2010); yet NYSDEC does not further investigate the origin of the data contained in this article or its implications for shale development in NYS. Fracture growth is a function of type of formations located above and below the Marcellus Shale. Subsurface geology will vary across states and the RDSGEIS does not explain how this data is applicable to NYS. For example, this article:

- Does not provide any information on the maximum HVHF job size (volumes, pressures, rates, etc.) to verify whether the fracture treatments conducted and analyzed are equivalent to the maximum HVHF job size anticipated in NYS;
- Does not provide any information on the Marcellus Shale thickness or geophysical properties present during the HVHF treatments;
- Shows that vertical fractures in excess of 1000' were observed (the plot, which is copied from the Fisher 2010 report and provided below, shows a 1500' vertical fracture propagated at 6300');
- Does not show what the vertical fracture growth height would be in the 2000-5000' Marcellus Shale depth interval that NYS proposes to develop; and,
- Does not show the horizontal distance that a fracture will propagate at the shallower shale depths NYS plans to develop.

¹³³ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 6-56.


A more in-depth technical paper written by Kevin Fisher (Halliburton) in 2011 appears to be the origin of the data cited in the American Oil & Gas Reporter article. Fisher’s 2011 paper¹³⁴ concludes that:

Fracture lengths can sometimes exceed a thousand feet when contained with a relatively homogeneous layer [emphasis added].

At depths deeper than about 2,000 ft, the vertical stress or overburden is generally the largest single stress so **the principal fracture orientation is expected to be vertical** on deeper wells [emphasis added].

At some point on shallow wells, the overburden stress will decrease to a point where it is less than the maximum horizontal stress and, at this point, one would expect the fracture growth to be horizontal and not vertical. As wells get shallower, and the overburden stress lessens, mapped fractures are typically observed exhibiting increasingly larger horizontal components. **All of the fractures do not necessarily turn horizontal; they might have significant vertical and horizontal components with more of a T-shaped geometry,** but the horizontal components can become significant and could thrive away enough fluid causing a blunting effect, limiting upward fracture-height growth [emphasis added].

The Marcellus fracture height figure shown in the American Oil & Gas Reporter is provided below; HCLLC annotated it to identify additional evaluation that is needed for NYS.



The use of vertical offset limits to separate hydrocarbon recovery operations from protected aquifers is a reasonable approach, but it must be scientifically and technical supported. While it is possible that a 1,000’ vertical offset may potentially be sufficiently protective; the 2011 RDSGEIS does not provide sufficient scientific data or technical examination to support this recommended threshold.

¹³⁴ Fisher, K. and Warpinski, N., Pinnacle- A Halliburton Service, Hydraulic Fracture-Height Growth: Real Data, Society of Petroleum Engineers Paper, SPE 145949, 2011, Pages 1-2 and 5.

In addition to understanding the maximum vertical fracture propagation height, horizontal fracture propagation distance is an important consideration, especially when developing shallower shale zones. Fractures in shallower formations will tend to propagate on the horizontal plane. HVHF treatments should be designed to prevent fractures from intersecting with existing improperly constructed and improperly abandoned wells, and transmissive faults and fractures, which can provide pollutants a direct pathway to protected groundwater resources.


For example, in 2010 the BC Oil & Gas Commission issued a safety advisory on the risks of fracture treatments intersecting adjacent wells. The advisory specifically notified industry that:

*A large kick was recently taken on a well being horizontally drilled for unconventional gas production in the Montney formation. **The kick was caused by a fracturing operation being conducted on an adjacent horizontal well. Fracture sand was circulated from the drilling wellbore, which was 670m [~2200'] from the wellbore undergoing the fracturing operation.** [emphasis added].¹³⁵*


Additionally, the advisory reported 18 known fracture communication incidents in B.C. and one in Western Alberta: five incidents of fracture stimulation communicating with an adjacent well; three incidents of drilling into a hydraulic fracture formed during a previous stimulation on an adjacent well and containing high pressure fluids; 10 incidents of fracture stimulations communicating into adjacent producing wells, and one incident of fracture stimulations communication into an adjacent leg on the same well for a multi-lateral well. Therefore fracture stimulations communication with adjacent wells is a known and reasonably foreseeable risk.

The 2011 RDSGEIS includes a wellbore schematic used in presentations given by the NYSDEC Commissioner. This wellbore schematic, shown below, depicts an example Marcellus Shale well. In the example the base of freshwater is at 500', the well is drilled to a depth of 4,000', and the horizontal length of the well is 4,000'.

¹³⁵ BC Oil & Gas Commission, Safety Advisory 2010-03, Communication During Fracture Stimulation, May 20, 2010.



The drawing does not represent the highest risk wells proposed in the 2011 RDSGEIS. The highest risk wells allowed under the 2011 RDSGEIS would be drilled into a thin section of the Marcellus Shale at a 2,000' depth, with protected water located above at 1,000'. Below is an annotated version of this wellbore schematic, prepared by HCLLC, showing the higher risk wells proposed under the RDSGEIS.



As explained in Chapter 9 of this report, if a HVHF treatment intersects with a nearby improperly abandoned well, the potential exists for the improperly abandoned well to become a vertical conduit, and therefore transfer hydraulic fluid and mobilized gas to protected aquifers. Additionally, the pollution risk posed by possible HVHF intersections is not limited to improperly abandoned wells; existing wells that were poorly designed and constructed could also pose a risk.

Physics dictate that fractures form perpendicular to the direction of the least amount of stress. Vertical fracture height will decrease with depth, and horizontal fracture length will increase.

NYSDEC proposes that operators identify wells within a mile radius around the surface location of a HVHF well, to identify wells that might be at risk of intersection with HVHF treatments.¹³⁶ However, NYSDEC does not provide technical data to support a mile radius. The 2011 RDSGEIS does not specify a maximum horizontal drilling length. Although NYSDEC's spacing rules may impose some limitation on this length, limitations are not clearly explained in the RDSGEIS.

The RDSGEIS should identify the maximum horizontal fracture propagation distance that could occur in a shallow well to ensure that HVHF treatments do not intersect existing wellbores. This should be included in the SGEIS. Limits on horizontal drilling section lengths and HVHF job size, including a safety zone around each HVHF well, should also be established.

Recommendation No. 34: The SGEIS should provide a basis for the maximum horizontal well drilling limit. The SGEIS should also explain how the operator will verify that the maximum horizontal well drilling limit, plus the maximum predicted horizontal fracture length, will avoid nearby well intersection.

The most logical way forward is to begin by limiting development to the deepest Marcellus Shale intervals, maximizing the vertical separation from drinking water aquifers. Once accurate, field-calibrated 3D reservoir simulation models are available for NYS, development can then move to shallower intervals, as long as technical data shows that treatments will remain in zone.

Recommendation No. 35: The SGEIS should technically justify vertical and horizontal HVHF treatment offsets. Proposed offsets should be supported by hydraulic fracture modeling. Modeling should reflect the maximum HVHF job designs allowed in NYS and shale reservoir characteristics. NYSDEC should provide public access to the scientific data and hydraulic fracture models it uses to develop vertical and horizontal offsets for the purposes of the SGEIS.

Drilling into the deepest, thickest Marcellus Shale intervals (e.g., below 4000') will maximize data collection, affording access to all overlying intervals. Core samples, well logs, and pressure transient data can be obtained, verifying whether there are continuous permeability barriers hydraulically separating the Marcellus Shale and the overlying drinking water aquifers, and geologic barriers that will limit fracture propagation. Initially, smaller fracture treatments should be used as tests. These treatments can be increased in size over time, if data support the conclusion that large fracture treatments can remain in zone. As data are collected, and 3D reservoir models are developed and refined, it may be possible to safely develop the Marcellus at shallower depths and in thinner intervals.

NYSDEC's recommendation to move forward with shale gas development, absent additional engineering data and hydraulic fracture models, is technically unsupported and in direct conflict with the information cited in its 2009 DSGEIS and 2011 RDSGEIS, as well as its own consultants' recommendations.

¹³⁶ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 6-56.

Recommendation No. 36: The SGEIS should include a more thorough examination of hydraulic fracture modeling. The SGEIS and NYCRR should require the operator to:

- (a) Collect additional geophysical and reservoir data to support a reservoir simulation model;
- (b) Develop a high-quality Marcellus Shale 3D reservoir model(s) to safely design fracture treatments;
- (c) Maintain and run hydraulic fracture modeling prior to each fracture treatment to ensure that the fracture is contained in zone;
- (d) Collect and carefully analyze data from HVHF treatments to optimize future HVHF treatments;
- (e) Initially complete HVHF treatments in the deepest, thickest sections of the Marcellus Shale to gain data and experience before proceeding to shallower zones (e.g. 4000' deep and 150' thick, progressively moving shallower as more NYS site-specific information is collected); and
- (f) Conduct post-fracture analysis, and provide that analysis to NYS to demonstrate that the HVHF treatment was safely implemented.

NYCRR Proposed Revisions: There are no proposed revisions in the NYCRR. As proposed, the NYCRR do not require operators to:

- (a) Submit a HVHF designs to NYS;
- (b) Estimate the vertical and horizontal fracture length;
- (c) Provide engineering analysis and run HVHF modeling;
- (d) Monitor HVHF performance to ensure that HVHF design and actual implementation in the field match; and
- (e) Notify NYSDEC if the actual vertical and/or horizontal fracture length greatly exceeds the job design, such that risk may be present to the environment.

11. Hydraulic Fracture Treatment Additive Limitations

Background: In 2009, HCLLC recommended that NYS regulations identify fracture treatment additives that are protective of human health and the environment. HCLLC also recommended that the NYCRR include a list of prohibited chemical additives.

2011 RDSGEIS: The 2011 RDSGEIS includes improvements in the handling and storage of HVHF chemicals by requiring chemicals to be stored in suitable containers placed in secondary containment. Additionally, NYSDEC encourages operators to select the lowest toxicity chemicals. However, neither the 2011 RDSGEIS nor the proposed NYCRR amendments establish a prohibited chemical list, nor do they **require** an operator to use the lowest toxicity chemicals. Instead, the 2011 RDSGEIS requires only that the operator evaluate alternative products. Ultimately, the operator is allowed to select the final chemicals used with no firm evaluation criteria listed in the NYCRR to rule out harmful chemicals.

NYCRR Proposed Revisions: Proposed regulations at 6 NYCRR § 560.3(c)(1)(v) require only that the operator provide:

Documentation that proposed chemical additives exhibit reduced aquatic toxicity and pose a lower potential risk to water resources and the environment than available alternatives; or documentation that available alternative products are not equally effective or feasible.

The proposed regulation requires the operator to examine chemicals that “exhibit reduced aquatic toxicity” and a “lower risk to water resources,” but the NYCRR does not provide specific criteria for determining what is an acceptable reduction in toxicity or an acceptable reduction in risk.

The 2011 RDSGEIS guides the operator to conduct a five-part analysis:

The evaluation criteria should include (1) impact to the environment caused by the additive product if it remains in the environment, (2) the toxicity and mobility of the available alternatives, (3) persistence in the environment, (4) effectiveness of the available alternative to achieve desired results in the engineered fluid system, and (5) feasibility of implementing the alternative.¹³⁷

However the 2011 RDSGEIS does not instruct the operator on what is required if any part of the five-part analysis has an unacceptable outcome, nor does the NYCRR. For example, if an operator proposes a chemical additive that is known to impact the environment and be persistent if it remains in the environment, but the operator proposes no other alternative, or states that this is the only chemical that will be effective for its planned job, neither the RDSGEIS or the NYCRR prohibit the operator from using this chemical even if it is harmful.

As proposed, the NYCRR would still allow the use of a highly toxic chemical, as long as it was slightly less toxic than the most toxic chemical available. This is not best practice. Best practice would be to use the chemical with the lowest impact and risk, not just a slightly improved risk. Best practice would also be for NYS to develop a list of prohibited chemicals that pose an unacceptable risk to human health and the environment.

¹³⁷ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 8-30.

The 2011 RDSGEIS concludes that it is not possible for hydraulic fracturing to contaminate groundwater, erroneously assuming that all wells will be flawlessly constructed and operated, and that no human error is possible that would put hydraulic fracturing additives in contact with groundwater, with the exception of a potential surface spill. The 2011 RDSGEIS concludes:

*The regulatory discussion in Section 8.4 concludes that adequate well design prevents contact between fracturing fluids and fresh ground water sources, and text in Chapter 6 along with Appendix 11 on subsurface fluid mobility explain why ground water contamination by migration of fracturing fluid is not a reasonably foreseeable impact.*¹³⁸

The 2011 RDSGEIS should be revised to clarify that groundwater contamination by hydraulic fracturing fluids is a reasonably foreseeable impact that requires mitigation. Well construction failures, engineering design flaws, human error, mechanical malfunctions, and chemical spills all are reasonably foreseeable events, and have occurred at Marcellus Shale operations in Pennsylvania.¹³⁹ Additionally, Dr. Myers identifies the potential long-term contaminant transport through conductive faults, natural fractures, and advective transport.¹⁴⁰

Groundwater contamination has been attributed to operational failures at various Marcellus Shale gas development operations in Pennsylvania, including operations by Cabot Oil & Gas Corporation, Catalyst Energy, Inc., and Chesapeake Energy Corporation.

For example, on February 27, 2009, the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP) issued a Notice of Violation to Cabot Oil & Gas Corporation for unpermitted discharge of polluting substances and failure to prevent gas from entering fresh groundwater, among other deficiencies, in connection with its drilling activities in Dimock Township.¹⁴¹ PADEP inspectors "...discovered that the well casings on some of Cabot's natural gas wells were cemented improperly or insufficiently, allowing natural gas to migrate to groundwater...DEP ordered Cabot to cease hydro fracking natural gas wells throughout Susquehanna County."¹⁴² In April 2010, under its consent order and agreement with PADEP, Cabot was required to plug three leaking wells that contaminated the groundwater and drinking water supplies of 14 homes in the region.¹⁴³

In 2011, PADEP issued a cease and desist order to Catalyst Energy, Inc. that prohibited the company from conducting drilling and hydraulic fracturing operations, after a PADEP investigation confirmed that private water supplies serving two homes had been contaminated by natural gas and elevated levels of iron and manganese from Catalyst's operations.¹⁴⁴

In May 2011, PADEP fined Chesapeake Energy Corporation \$1,088,000 for violations related to natural gas drilling activities that contaminated private water supplies in Bradford County. PADEP issued a news release reporting:

¹³⁸ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 8-29.

¹³⁹ DEP Investigating Lycoming County Fracking Fluid Spill at XTO Energy Marcellus Well, November 22, 2010, available at <http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/newsroom/14287?id=15315&typeid=1>

¹⁴⁰ Dr. Tom Myers, Comments Prepared for NRDC on 2011 RDSGEIS, 2012.

¹⁴¹ <http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/newsroom/14287?id=2418&typeid=1>.

¹⁴² <http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/newsroom/14287?id=2418&typeid=1>.

¹⁴³ <http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/newsroom/14287?id=10586&typeid=1>.

¹⁴⁴ DEP Orders Catalyst Energy to Stop Operations at Gas Wells in Forest County Village, available at <http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/newsroom/14287?id=16894&typeid=1>.

DEP determined that because of improper well casing and cementing in shallow zones, natural gas from non-shale shallow gas formations had experienced localized migration into groundwater and contaminated 16 families' drinking water supplies.¹⁴⁵

If HVHF treatments are conducted in poorly constructed wells, there exists a potential for groundwater contamination. Therefore, as NYSDEC recommends, well construction must be robust, and the use of safe HVHF treatment additives provides any extra layer of protection in the event that human error or mechanical malfunction create a pathway for such additives to reach groundwater. Reducing the toxicity of hydraulic fracturing additives by listing prohibited additives mitigates the impact of both surface and groundwater pollution if it occurs.

Recommendation No. 37: NYSDEC should develop a list of prohibited fracture treatment additives based on the known list of chemicals currently used in hydraulic fracturing. The list of prohibited fracture treatment additives should apply to all hydraulic fracture treatments, not just HVHF treatments. NYSDEC should also develop a process to evaluate newly proposed hydraulic fracturing chemical additives to determine whether they should be added to the prohibited list. No chemical should be used until NYSDEC and/or the NYSDOH has assessed whether it is protective of human health and the environment, and has determined whether or not it warrants inclusion on the list of prohibited hydraulic fracturing chemical additives for NYS. The burden of proof should be on industry to demonstrate, via scientific and technical data and analysis, and risk assessment work, that the chemical is safe. Fracture treatment additive prohibitions should be included in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure and codified in the NYCRR.

The 2009 DSGEIS Section 5.3¹⁴⁶ stated that NYSDEC collected compositional information from chemical suppliers and service companies on many of the additives proposed for use in shale fracture treatments. NYSDEC reported partial compositional data on 197 products and complete compositional data on 152 products. Tables 5.3-5.7 provided lists of chemicals proposed for use in fracture treatments, and Section 5.4.3.1 described the potential health impacts of categories of chemicals. Yet the 2009 DSGEIS did not arrive at any recommendation or conclusion about which fracture treatment additives are acceptable for use in NYS and which are not. This problem persists in the 2011 RDSGEIS.

Chapter 5 of the 2011 RDSGEIS explains that NYSDOH reviewed information on 322 unique chemicals present in 235 products proposed for hydraulic fracturing of shale formations in New York and categorized them into chemical classes, but did not develop any recommendations for prohibiting specific HF additives. The 2011 RDSGEIS merely concludes that the 322 unique chemicals studied did not identify any potential exposure situations that are qualitatively different from those addressed in the 1992 GEIS.¹⁴⁷ This conclusion has little significance, since the 1992 GEIS did not establish any criteria for limiting or prohibiting HF chemical additives (i.e., for mitigating potential significant adverse impacts from exposure to these additives). For example, Dr. Miller points out that acrylonitrile and acrylamide are listed, and known to be carcinogenic and quite toxic, but fairly short lived in an aqueous environment.¹⁴⁸ As proposed, NYSDEC would allow these carcinogenic, toxic chemicals to be used, unless industry proposes a less-harmful chemical. The appropriate step for NYS would be to add acrylonitrile and acrylamide, among other chemical that pose a risk to human health or the environment, to the list of prohibited chemicals in NYS.

¹⁴⁵ DEP Fines Chesapeake Energy More Than \$1 Million, available at <http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/newsroom/14287?id=17405&typeid=1>.

¹⁴⁶ 2009 NYSDEC, DSGEIS, Page 5-34.

¹⁴⁷ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 8-29.

¹⁴⁸ Dr. Glenn Miller, Comments Prepared for NRDC on 2011 RDSGEIS, 2012.

Although the percentage of hydraulic fracturing fluid that is composed of chemicals may be small—typically 0.5 to 2 percent of the total volume required for a Marcellus Shale hydraulic fracture stimulation—the absolute volume of chemicals used is very large. A typical Marcellus Shale well may require the use of more than five million gallons of freshwater for drilling and hydraulic fracturing. A five million gallon hydraulic fracture treatment would require approximately 25,000 to 100,000 gallons of hydraulic fracturing chemicals per well at a chemical additive dosage of 0.5 to 2 percent. Some of these chemicals are toxic, including known or possible human carcinogens, chemicals regulated under the Safe Drinking Water Act due to their risks to human health, and chemicals regulated under the Clean Air Act as hazardous air pollutants.¹⁴⁹

Recommendation No. 38: The SGEIS should do more than just list chemicals proposed by industry for HVHF operations and describe their toxicity; the SGEIS should identify chemicals that should be prohibited or used with limitations to protect human health and the environment.

Additionally, the 2011 RDSGEIS includes a process for reviewing chemicals proposed by industry that appears to have little value or scientific rigor.

For every well permit application the Department would require, as part of the EAF Addendum, identification of additive products, by product name and purpose/type, and proposed percent by weight of water, proppants and each additive. This would allow the Department to determine whether the proposed fracturing fluid is water-based and generally similar to the fluid represented by Figures 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5.¹⁵⁰

Figures 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5 in the 2011 RDSGEIS are merely pie charts showing example compositions from previous Fayetteville and Marcellus Shale HVHF jobs. The 2011 RDSGEIS does not include a scientific analysis of the proposed HVHF compositions to verify if these mixtures are optimal. Therefore, there is little scientific value in having NYSDEC staff compare an operator's proposed HVHF composition to these figures, because NYSDEC has not even completed the fundamental scientific analysis to verify whether these proposed treatment compositions are protective of human health and the environment and whether the figures are a suitable yardstick.

The 2011 RDSGEIS proposes to require industry to submit a Material Safety Data Sheet (MSDS) for every new product that is not currently listed by NYSDEC in Chapter 5 of the 2011 RDSGEIS. NYSDEC explains that the MSDS will provide it with more information on the proposed chemical, but does not institute a plan for taking action to limit or prohibit hazardous chemical use based on a review of that MSDS. Instead, the 2011 RDSGEIS appears to propose that NYSDEC will just collect MSDS information and take no action, other than to accept the chemicals selected by the operator and add the MSDS to NYSDEC's file system.

The Department would also require the submittal of an MSDS for every additive product proposed for use, unless the MSDS for a particular product is already on file as a result of the disclosure provided during the preparation process of this SGEIS (as discussed in Chapter 5) or during the application process for a previous well permit. Submittal of product MSDSs would provide the Department with the identities, properties and effects of the hazardous chemical constituents within each additive proposed for use.¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁹ United States House of Representatives, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Minority Staff, Chemicals Used in Hydraulic Fracturing, April 2011.

¹⁵⁰ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 8-30.

¹⁵¹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 8-30.

The 2011 RDSGEIS goes on to say that NYSDEC staff will verify, by reviewing the well completion form, that the chemicals proposed by industry in a permit application (with no limitations or prohibitions by NYSDEC) were actually the same chemicals used on the HVHF job.

In addition to the above requirements for well permit applications, the Department would continue its practice of requiring hydraulic fracturing information, including identification of materials and volumes of materials utilized, on the well completion report which is required, in accordance with 6 NYCRR §554.7, to be submitted to the Department within 30 days after the completion of any well. This requirement can be utilized by Department staff to verify that only those additive products proposed at the time of application, or subsequently proposed and approved prior to use, were utilized in a given high-volume hydraulic fracturing operation.¹⁵²

The proposed review process holds little scientific or audit value, since NYSDEC is not limiting chemicals in the initial application. It is insufficient to bind industry to use specific chemicals at the tail end of the permitting process, when industry can propose any chemical for use on the front-end.

However, the proposed chemical audit review process would have great value if NYSDEC limited or prohibited chemical use in the initial application. In that case, a post-HVHF review process would be valuable to verify that prohibited chemicals were not used.

There are several international models in place that NYSDEC could consider using to develop a prohibited chemical list, or to develop an approved list of chemical, or both. Below is a short summary of three models that could be considered: (1) the Oslo-Paris Convention (OSPAR) list of environmentally friendly chemicals (chemicals considered to Pose Little Or No Risk (PLONOR) for the oil and gas industry); (2) Canada-Newfoundland and Labrador Offshore Petroleum Board (C-NLOPB) Offshore Chemical Selection Guidelines for Drilling & Production Activities on Frontier Lands; and (3) the Norwegian Pollution Control Authority chemical coding system for the oil and gas industry. These governmental entities prohibit use of chemicals that have harmful characteristics, such as: low biodegradability; high bioaccumulation potential; high acute toxicity; and detrimental mutagenic or reproductive effects.

OSPAR PLONOR: Certain European governmental entities have developed a list of environmentally friendly chemicals. Under the Oslo-Paris Convention (OSPAR)¹⁵³ a list of chemicals that were considered to Pose Little Or No Risk (PLONOR) to the marine environment was developed for use in drilling and stimulation treatments. The PLONOR list was initially developed in early 2000 and has been amended several times to add and de-list chemicals. The PLONOR list has been very effective in reducing chemical pollution from offshore operations, and use of the PLONOR list has expanded to onshore oil and gas operations and to other industrial sectors. HCLCC is not recommending that NYS adopt the PLONOR list without review; instead, HCLCC is recommending that NYSDEC consider a process similar to OSPAR's system to develop a list of hydraulic fracturing treatment additives that would pose little or no risk to human health or the environment if the chemicals spilled, leaked, or were improperly disposed, or, in the alternative, consider developing a list of chemicals to be prohibited from use in hydraulic fracturing operations.

¹⁵² 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 8-31.

¹⁵³ The Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic (the "OSPAR Convention") was opened for signature at the Ministerial Meeting of the former Oslo and Paris Commissions in Paris on 22 September 1992. The Convention entered into force on 25 March 1998. It has been ratified by Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom and approved by the European Community and Spain.

The OSPAR process is straight forward: the establishment of criteria for inclusion of substances on the PLONOR list. Industry has the burden of proof to provide scientific and technical data to support listing of a chemical as PLONOR—i.e., industry must prove the chemical poses little or no risk. The OSPAR Commission reviews the data and makes the final listing determination. The Commission also can remove chemicals from the PLONOR list if new information comes to light warranting a de-listing. A current list of PLONOR chemicals can be found at the OSPAR website.¹⁵⁴

C-NLOPB Guidelines: The Canada-Newfoundland and Labrador Offshore Petroleum Board has developed guidelines that industry must follow to select less harmful chemicals used in their offshore oil and gas operations.¹⁵⁵ Industry operators must demonstrate that they have incorporated a chemical selection process in their management system that conforms to the guidelines, and the Board has the ability to audit industry compliance. The guidelines are reviewed at least once every five years to ensure that gains in scientific and technical knowledge are incorporated, and more frequent reviews may be initiated if significant risks are identified. The C-NLOPB Guidelines rely in part on the PLONOR list, but also establish specific requirements for hazard and risk assessment.

The Norwegian Pollution Control Authority has developed a chemical coding system to prohibit use of harmful and toxic chemicals in the Norwegian petroleum industry. The Norwegian Pollution Control Authority system categorizes chemicals by color, using the colors: black, red, yellow and green. Black chemicals are the most hazardous, followed by red, then yellow. Green chemicals are those listed on the PLONOR list.

Black: chemicals on the OSPAR List of Chemicals for Priority Action, chemicals on the Norwegian Pollution Control Authority prioritized list (White Paper No. 21 (2004-2005)), and chemicals in the following categories, characterized by certain ecotoxicological properties:

- Substances that have both a low biodegradability ($BOD_{28} < 20\%$) and a high bioaccumulation potential ($\log P_{ow} > 5$);
- Substances that have both a low biodegradability ($BOD_{28} < 20\%$) and a high acute toxicity (EC_{50} or $LC_{50} < 10 \text{ mg/l}$); and
- Substances that are detrimental in a mutagenic or reproductive way.

Red: chemicals in the following categories, characterized by certain ecotoxicological properties:

- Inorganic substances that are acutely toxic (EC_{50} or $LC_{50} < 1 \text{ mg/l}$);
- Organic substances with a low biodegradability ($BOD_{28} < 20\%$);
- Substances that meet two of the three following criteria:
 - Biodegradability equivalent to $BOD_{28} < 60\%$;
 - Bioaccumulation potential equivalent to $\log P_{ow} > 3$ and molecular weight < 700 ; or
 - Acute toxicity of EC_{50} or $LC_{50} < 10 \text{ mg/l}$.¹⁵⁶

¹⁵⁴ OSPAR Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic, OSPAR List of Substances/Preparations Used and Discharged Offshore Which Are Considered to Pose Little or No Risk to the Environment (PLONOR), Reference Number: 2004-10, 2008 Update, available at: <http://www.klif.no/arbeidsomr/petroleum/dokumenter/plonor2008.pdf>

¹⁵⁵ The Canada-Newfoundland and Labrador Offshore Petroleum Board, Offshore Chemical Selection Guidelines for Drilling & Production Activities on Frontier Lands, April 2009, available at http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2009/one-neb/NE23-151-2009E.pdf.

¹⁵⁶ Regulations Relating to Conduct of Activities in the Petroleum Activities (The Activities Regulations), § 56b. The latest update of this list can be found on OSPAR's website under the Offshore Oil and Gas Industry, Decisions, Recommendations and other Agreements.

Green: chemicals on the OSPAR PLONOR list (chemicals considered to Pose Little Or No Risk to the marine environment).

Yellow: chemicals that are not categorized as Green, Black or Red.

Recommendation No. 39: The SGEIS and the NYCRR should include a more rigorous technical and scientific review process to examine newly proposed fracture treatment additives to ensure they are protective of human health and the environment. In addition to a list of prohibited chemicals, NYSDEC should develop a list of recommended/approved fracture treatment additives that have been scientifically and technically reviewed by NYSDEC and NYSDOH and confirmed to pose little or no risk to human health or the environment. This list could be provided to industry for immediate use and would provide industry with a simplified list of chemicals that have already been determined to pose the least risk.

Any chemical not found on this list, or on the list of prohibited chemicals, could be proposed by industry for future use, but would be subject to an in-depth scientific and technical justification and risk assessment review process before being added to the approved chemical list for NYS.

No chemical should be used until NYSDEC and/or the NYSDOH has assessed whether it is protective of human health and the environment. Industry should bear the burden of proof of demonstrating to NYSDEC and NYSDOH that the chemical is safe. The technical and scientific review and approval process to examine newly proposed fracture treatment additives should be included in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure and codified in the NYCRR. This more rigorous technical and scientific review process should apply to all hydraulic fracture treatments, not just HVHF treatments.

12. Drilling Mud Composition and Disposal

Background: In 2009, HCLLC recommended that the NYCRR be revised to: acknowledge and mitigate drilling mud pollution impacts; minimize drilling waste generation; limit heavy metal and NORM content; and establish best practices for the collection, treatment and disposal of drilling waste.

NYCRR Proposed Revisions: NYSDEC proactively responded to scientific and technical information provided through the public input process, revising the NYCRR to recognize that drilling muds are polluting fluids. NYSDEC removed the existing sentence at 6 NYCRR § 554.1(c)(1) that says “drilling muds are not considered to be polluting fluids.” This is an important and positive change in the regulations.

However, additional work is still needed in the proposed amendments to the NYCRR to define what types of drilling muds should be used at various depths in constructing a well. NYCRR should also be amended to include best practices for how those drilling muds should be properly handled and disposed.

In January 2011, NYS consultant, Alpha Geoscience complimented HCLLC for its recommendations on drilling mud composition and disposal and agreed that additional mitigation was warranted. Alpha Geoscience wrote:¹⁵⁷

Harvey Consulting has commented on the need for regulation revisions to specifically address drilling mud and drilling waste. The report states “New York State regulations should be revised to acknowledge and mitigate drilling mud pollution impacts, minimize drilling waste generation, limit heavy metal and NORM (Naturally Occurring Radioactive Material) content, and establish best practices for collection, treatment and disposal of drilling waste.

Current NYS regulation 6 NYCRR §554.1(c)(1) states that drilling muds are not considered polluting fluids. The 1992 GEIS allows drill cuttings to be buried onsite, and the dSGEIS does not address the potential impact. Drilling muds commonly contain barite which contains mercury (1-10 ppm) (www.fossil.energy.gov) and may also contain cadmium. NYSDEC has not set limits on the heavy metal content of drilling mud, and New York State regulations do not address how to dispose of drill cuttings containing NORM.

Harvey Consulting’s recommended best management practice for most applications includes a combination of waste minimization, using low impact additives, collecting waste in a closed-loop system, pumping waste to a cuttings reinjection unit, and disposing the waste into a disposal well by deep well injection. Harvey Consulting suggests NYSDEC should thoroughly analyze each situation and location to develop the best site-specific best management practices.

Harvey Consulting’s comments concerning the composition and handling of drilling mud and drilling waste appear to have some merit. Per 6 NYCRR §554.1 (C)(1) drilling muds are not considered polluting fluids, however the presence of mercury and cadmium in barite composed drilling muds may be cause for concern given the quantity of drilling mud that would be required to drill each well.

¹⁵⁷ Alpha Geoscience, Review of the dSGEIS and Identification Best Technology and Best Practices Recommendations Harvey Consulting, LLC; December 28, 2009, prepared for NYSERDA, January 20, 2011, Pages 7-9.

NYSDEC regulations do not clearly define the treatment or disposal of drilling waste and any best management practices concerning their handling, and/or recycling are not clearly outlined in the dSGEIS as documented by Harvey Consulting. Section 5.13 of the dSGEIS covers waste disposal, however it is general in its scope and does not outline any best management practices concerning the recycling, treatment, or disposal of drilling waste.

*Harvey Consulting's review recommends that the dSGEIS include best management practices concerning the type and handling of drilling mud and the subsequent waste byproducts. It suggests that NYSDEC should determine which drilling fluid composition and disposal methods are best practices for various scenarios. **Alpha agrees that the proposed measures seem reasonable and would serve to protect the public, environment, and the drilling applicant** [emphasis added].*

2011 RDSGEIS: The 2011 RDSGEIS explains that drilling operators propose to drill through protected groundwater zones using compressed air or Water-Based Muds (WBM).

The vertical portion of each well, including the portion that is drilled through any fresh water aquifers, will typically be drilled using either compressed air or freshwater mud as the drilling fluid.¹⁵⁸

The use of compressed air and WBM for drilling through the protected groundwater zones is best practice, as long as NYCRR also sets limits on the type of additives that can be mixed in the WBM formulation. WBM additives used when drilling through the protected groundwater zones should be non-toxic.

The 2011 RDSGEIS' use of the term "typically" indicates that use of compressed air and WBM for drilling through the protected groundwater zones may only occur a portion of the time. This is a best practice that should be implemented each time a well is drilled through protected groundwater zones.

While the 2011 RDSGEIS documents industry's position that it "typically" will use compressed air and WBM for the protection of groundwater, NYSDEC should *require* that practice and ensure that the requirement is codified in NYCRR. The proposed amendments to the NYCRR do not limit the types of drilling muds that can be used while drilling through protected groundwater zones. NYCRR should be revised to clearly prohibit the use of Oil-Based Muds (OBM) and Synthetic-Based Muds (SBM) drilling through protected groundwater zones and to limit additives used in the WBM to those that are non-toxic.

OBM contain diesel fuel or other hydrocarbons. SBM use synthetic oil. SBM are less harmful than OBM, but still contain materials that are toxic, bio-accumulate when discharged into water, and do not bio-degrade. For example, European nations prohibit the discharge of SBM to offshore waters, and prohibit their use when drilling through protected waters.¹⁵⁹ SBM are not approved by USEPA or Department of Energy for discharge offshore because they exceed USEPA's effluent limit guidelines.¹⁶⁰ The 2011 RDSGEIS incorrectly describes SBM as "food-grade" and "environmentally friendly."¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁸ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 5-32.

¹⁵⁹ Jonathan Wills, M.A., Ph.D., M.Inst.Pet., for Ekologicheskaya Vahkta Sakhalina, Muddied Waters A Survey of Offshore Oilfield Drilling Wastes and Disposal Techniques to Reduce the Ecological Impact of Sea Dumping, May 25, 2000.

¹⁶⁰ <http://web.ead.anl.gov/dwm/techdesc/discharge/index.cfm>.

¹⁶¹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 5-32.

Recommendation No. 40: 6 NYCRR § 554.1(c)(1) should be revised to limit the types of drilling muds that can be used while drilling through subsurface formations that contain protected groundwater. Drilling muds should be limited to Water-Based Muds (WBM) or drilling with air. Any additives required for safe drilling through the protected groundwater interval with WBM should be limited to additives that are bio-degradable, are non-toxic, and do not bio-accumulate. The SGEIS should also include this requirement as a mitigating measure.

Neither the 2011 RDSGEIS nor the proposed amendments to the NYCRR instruct the operator on how to properly dispose of drilling fluids. NYCRR requires a disposal plan and that drilling fluids be removed from the drillsite within 45 days; however, 6 NYCRR § 554.1(c)(1) does not provide specific instructions or criteria for acceptable drilling mud disposal plans. This problem was identified by HCLLC in 2009, and is still unresolved.

This problem is magnified in light of new language in the 2011 RDSGEIS that appears to contemplate allowing drilling muds to be spread on non-active agricultural fields and other soils. The 2011 RDSGEIS includes a discussion on proposed Agricultural District requirements. One of the requirements discussed is for “spent drilling muds to be removed from active agricultural fields.”¹⁶² The RDSGEIS is silent on provisions for non-active agricultural fields and other soils, and it is unclear what NYSDEC has planned for drilling mud disposal. NYSDEC should clarify its intentions in regards to spreading drilling muds.

The 2011 RDSGEIS correctly notes that drilling mud can be reconditioned and used at more than one well,¹⁶³ but it must eventually be disposed. Drilling muds may contain mercury, metals, NORM, oils, and other contaminants. This is especially true for Marcellus Shale operations where naturally occurring radioactive material is present in the shale drill cuttings and mud mixture. Therefore, drilling muds require proper handling and disposal.¹⁶⁴

Solid waste management regulations at 6 NYCRR Chapter IV, Subchapter B (Solid Waste) provide the authority by which the state (through the Division of Solid and Hazardous Materials) establishes standards and criteria for solid waste management operations, including landfills and land application. However, the RDSGEIS is unclear on what NYSDEC has deemed to be the best management practices for handling drilling waste. A recent U.S. Department of Energy review of NYSDEC’s drilling waste disposal regulations concluded:

“The [NYS] DEC has developed no regulations, policies, or guidelines governing slurry injection, subsurface injection, or annular disposal of drilling wastes and reserve-pit wastes [emphasis added].”¹⁶⁵

NYSDEC has not established regulations to minimize the generation of drilling waste (e.g. reuse, recycle), or established limits on the heavy metal content of drilling mud additives.

Regulations at 6 NYCRR § 554.1(c)(1) should be revised to provide specific instructions on drilling fluid handling and disposal. Questions that need to be addressed include: Where will drilling waste be taken for treatment and disposal? What tests will be run to characterize the waste stream for proper handling,

¹⁶² 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-145.

¹⁶³ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 5-32.

¹⁶⁴ As explained in HCLLC’s 2009 report, the mercury content in drilling mud for a Marcellus Shale well drilled to a depth of 5,000’ could contain 0.5- 5.0 lbs of mercury per well, depending on barite quality, and drilling muds may also contain the heavy metal cadmium.

¹⁶⁵ U.S. Department of Energy, Drilling Waste Management Information System, <http://web.ead.anl.gov/dwm/regs/state/newyork/index.cfm>.

treatment, and disposal? Does the treatment capacity exist to handle this incremental waste in NYS? If so, where are the treatment facilities located? What types of treatments will be completed? What is the ultimate disposal location for the treatment byproducts?

Recommendation No. 41: 6 NYCRR § 554.1(c)(1) should be revised to provide specific instructions on the best practices for drilling mud handling and disposal. The SGEIS should also provide specific instructions on the best practices for drilling mud handling and disposal as a mitigating measure. See Chapter 13 of this report for additional recommended disposal solutions.

13. Reserve Pit Use & Drill Cuttings Disposal

Background: In 2009, HCLLC recommended that NYSDEC adopt regulations requiring closed-loop tank systems as best practice, instead of the use of temporary reserve pits to handle and store drill muds and cuttings, unless the operator demonstrates that closed-loop tank systems are not technically feasible. Additionally, HCLLC recommended that if temporary reserve pits are used, NYSDEC should adopt regulations that: require impermeable, chemical resistant liner material; limit the types of chemicals stored to those compatible with the liner material; require wildlife protection design standards; and establish firm removal and restoration requirements when drilling was completed. HCLLC recommended that cuttings not be buried onsite, and that waste be removed from the drilling location and properly disposed at an approved waste disposal facility capable of handling the quantity and type of waste generated.

HCLLC recommended that NYS consider the use of grind-and-inject technology to convert drill cuttings into a slurry that can be injected into a properly designed, approved subsurface disposal well. Additionally, HCLLC recommended that if reserve pits are determined to be the only technically feasible option for temporary waste storage, that storage of drilling waste be limited to un-contaminated drill cuttings, drilled using compressed air or water based-muds with non-toxic additives.

2011 RDSGEIS: The 2011 RDSGEIS recommends closed-loop tank systems as best practice in some circumstances, but in other circumstances defaults to the use of reserve pits, without demonstrating that reserve pits are environmentally preferable.

The RDSGEIS requires a closed-loop tank system for horizontal drilling operations in the Marcellus Shale that do not have an acceptable acid rock drainage (ARD) mitigation plan¹⁶⁶ for on-site cuttings burial; and drill cuttings that are coated with Synthetic-Based Muds (SBM) and Oil-Based Muds (OBM). In all other cases, the RDSGEIS proposes the use of reserve pits.

The revised draft SGEIS proposes to require, pursuant to permit conditions and/or regulation, that a closed-loop tank system be used instead of a reserve pit to manage drilling fluids and cuttings for:

- *Horizontal drilling in the Marcellus Shale without an acceptable acid rock drainage (ARD) mitigation plan for on-site cuttings burial; and*
- *cuttings that, because of the drilling fluid composition used must be disposed off-site, including at a landfill.*¹⁶⁷

Appendix 10, Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF, Condition No. 56 requires the operator to provide NYSDEC with an acid rock drainage mitigation plan if NYSDEC requests the plan. However, there is no specific criteria established to define what constitutes an acceptable acid rock drainage mitigation plan.

¹⁶⁶ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-67.

¹⁶⁷ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 1-13.

Yet, the USGS recommends against onsite disposal because of the potential risk posed:

*Onsite burial of drill cuttings at shale-gas development sites, which is allowable under the dSGEIS if oil-based drilling mud is not used, should be carefully considered. According to Lash and Engelder (2008), pyrite is abundant in the high-TOC basal intervals of the Marcellus Shale. Oxidation and leaching of pyritic shale produces and acidic, metals-rich discharge commonly referred to as AMD (Acid Mine Discharge). A multi-horizontal well site will generate 100 to 500 times the volume of AMD-producing pyritic shale cutting than that generated at a single-vertical well site. **If these pyritic shale drill cuttings are left onsite, the potential for future surface-water and groundwater contamination is significant – removal and disposal of all cuttings at an approved landfill would be the preferred approach** [emphasis added].¹⁶⁸*

The RDSGEIS proposal to use reserve pits is internally inconsistent with the RDSGEIS' conclusion that closed-loop tank systems are environmentally preferable for the following reasons:

Depending on the configuration and design of a closed-loop tank system use of such a system can offer the following advantages:

- *Eliminates the time and expense associated with reserve pit construction and reclamation;*
- *Reduces the surface disturbance associated with the well pad;*
- *Reduces the amount of water and mud additives required as a result of re-circulation of drilling mud;*
- *Lowers mud replacement costs by capturing and re-circulating drilling mud;*
- *Reduces the wastes associated with drilling by separating additional drilling mud from the cuttings; and*
- *Reduces expenses and truck traffic associated with transporting drilling waste due to the reduced volume of the waste.¹⁶⁹*

Additionally, the 2011 RDSGEIS explains the environmental risks of reserve pits:

Pit leakage or failure could also involve well fluids. *These issues are discussed in Chapters 8 and 9 of the 1992 GEIS, but are acknowledged here with respect to unique aspects of the proposed multi-well development method. The conclusions regarding pit construction standards and liner specifications presented in the 1992 GEIS were largely based upon the short duration of a pit's use. **The greater intensity and duration of surface activities associated with well pads with multiple wells increases the potential for an accidental spill, pit leak or pit failure if engineering controls and other mitigation measures are not sufficient.** Concerns are heightened if on-site pits for*

¹⁶⁸ Testimony of John H. Williams, Ground-Water Specialist, U.S. Geological Survey, The Council of the City of New York Committee on Environmental Protection, Public Hearing, Draft Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement Relating to Drilling for Natural Gas in New York State Using Horizontal Drilling and High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing, October 23, 2009, Page 2.

¹⁶⁹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 5-39.

*handling drilling fluids are located in primary and principal aquifer areas, or are constructed on the filled portion of a cut-and-filled well pad [emphasis added].*¹⁷⁰

*As explained in Chapter 5, the total volume of drill cuttings produced from drilling a horizontal well may be about 40% greater than that for a conventional, vertical well to the same target depth. For multi-well pads, cuttings volume would be multiplied by the number of wells on the pad. **The potential water resources impact associated with the greater volume of drill cuttings from multiple horizontal well drilling operations would arise from the retention of cuttings during drilling, necessitating a larger reserve pit that may be present for a longer period of time, unless the cuttings are directed into tanks as part of a closed-loop tank system**[emphasis added].*¹⁷¹

The use of close-loop drilling waste handling system is a best practice. For example, New Mexico requires the use of closed-loop drilling systems.¹⁷²

Recommendation No. 42: The SGEIS and NYCRR should be revised to prohibit reserve pit use for Marcellus Shale drilling operations, and instead require closed-loop tank systems to collect drill cuttings and transport them to waste disposal facilities. NYCRR should make reserve pit use the exception, allowing it only in cases where closed-loop tank systems are determined to be technically infeasible. If reserve pits are determined to be the only technically feasible option, storage of drilling waste should be limited to un-contaminated drill cuttings from the section of the well drilled using compressed air or water based-muds with non-toxic additives. These best practices for drilling waste management should be included in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure and codified in the NYCRR.

Of even greater concern is the RDSGEIS' proposal to allow drill cuttings to be buried onsite in some cases. Marcellus Shale cuttings contain Naturally Occurring Radioactive Materials (NORM) and are coated with drilling muds, including Water-Based Mud (WBM). The Marcellus Shale is considered a "highly radioactive" shale,¹⁷³ and its drill cuttings may require special hazardous waste handling and treatment. While the RDSGEIS proposes to allow on-site burial only of drill cuttings that were created by air drilling or WBM drilling operations, WBM may contain mercury, metals, and other contaminants.¹⁷⁴

*The Department has determined that drill cuttings are solid wastes, specifically construction and demolition debris, under the State's regulatory system. Therefore, **the Department would allow disposal of cuttings from drilling processes which utilize only air and/or water on-site, at construction and demolition (C&D) debris landfills, or at municipal solid waste (MSW) landfills, while cuttings from processes which utilize any oil-based or polymer-based products could only be disposed of at MSW landfills** [emphasis added].*¹⁷⁵

¹⁷⁰ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 6-16.

¹⁷¹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 6-65.

¹⁷² New Mexico, Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department, Oil Conservation Division, Regulations at Title 19, Chapter 15, Part 17.

¹⁷³ Hill, D.G., Lombardi, T.E. and Martin, J.P., Fractured Shale Gas Potential in New York, 2002, p.8.

¹⁷⁴ As explained in HCLLC's 2009 report, the mercury content in drilling mud for a Marcellus Shale well drilled to a depth of 5,000' could contain 0.5- 5.0 lbs of mercury per well, depending on barite quality, and drilling muds may also contain the heavy metal cadmium.

¹⁷⁵ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 1-13.

The proposed revisions to NYCRR would require the reserve pit liner to be ripped and perforated as part of the onsite burial process (6 NYCRR § 560.7(c)); therefore, contaminated drill cuttings would be in direct contact with soils and surface waters.

While the RDSGEIS generally takes the position that WBM-coated cuttings can be stored in reserve pits and buried onsite, in some cases it waives. It is not clear what additional limitations may be applied to WBM-coated drill-cuttings disposal. NYSDEC recognizes that onsite burial of chemical additives included in WBM may not be prudent. However, the RDSGEIS does not spell out criteria for determining what types of WBM-coated cuttings may and may not be stored and buried in reserve pits. The RDSGEIS proposes this decision be left to a later NYSDEC consultation process.

An example of how the RDSGEIS deviates from its general position that WBM-coated cuttings can be stored in reserve pits and buried onsite is as follows:

*Supplementary permit conditions pertaining to the management of drill cuttings from high-volume hydraulic fracturing **require consultation with the Department's Division of Materials Management for the disposal of any cuttings associated with water-based mud-drilling and any pit liner associated with water-based or brine-based mud-drilling where the water-based or brine-based mud contains chemical additives.** Supplemental permit conditions also dictate that any cuttings required to be disposed of off-site, including at a landfill, be managed on-site within a closed-loop tank system rather than a reserve pit [emphasis added].¹⁷⁶*

This uncertain position about what to do with WBM-coated drill cuttings is perpetuated in the proposed revisions to NYCRR at 6 NYCRR § 560.7(c):

Consultation with the department's Division of Materials Management (DMM) is required prior to disposal of any cuttings associated with water-based mud-drilling and pit liner associated with water-based mud-drilling where the water-based mud contains chemical additives.

All WBM contains chemical additives. NYCRR must be clear on which chemical additives would trigger the use of closed-loop tanks and prohibit drill cuttings burial onsite.

Recommendation No. 43: The SGEIS and NYCRR should be clear about how WBM-coated drill cuttings will be handled and should not leave this unresolved. The standards for handling WBM-coated drill cuttings should be included in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure and codified in the NYCRR.

Additionally, it is inefficient from a logistics and energy use standpoint to construct a reserve pit for the temporary storage of drill cuttings, and then remove this pit at a later time. It is substantially more efficient to use a closed-loop tank system to collect the drill cuttings, because the cuttings can be directly transported to a waste handling facility. The RDSGEIS agrees with the efficiencies gained through closed-loop tank systems, but incongruously does not recommend them in all cases.

¹⁷⁶ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-67.

*The 1992 GEIS discusses the use of reserve pits and tanks, either alone or in conjunction with one another, to contain the cuttings and fluids associated with the drilling process. Both systems result in complete capture of the fluids and cuttings; however the use of tanks in **closed-loop tank systems facilitates off-site disposal of wastes while more efficiently utilizing drilling fluid and providing additional insurance against environmental releases** [emphasis added].¹⁷⁷*

The design and configuration of closed-loop tank systems will vary from operator to operator, but all such systems contain drilling fluids and cuttings in a series of containers, thereby eliminating the need for a reserve pit....the objective is to fully contain the cuttings and fluids in such a manner as to prevent direct contact with the ground surface or the need to construct a lined reserve pit.¹⁷⁸

NYSDEC's proposal for onsite burial of contaminated drill cuttings becomes even more paradoxical when the RDSGEIS concludes that operators have not proposed onsite burial of drill cuttings.

Operators have not proposed on-site burial of mud-drilled cuttings, which would be equivalent to burial or direct ground discharge of the drilling mud itself. Contaminants in the mud or in contact with the liner if buried on-site could adversely impact soil or leach into shallow groundwater [emphasis added].¹⁷⁹

A portion of the well drilled will generate cuttings that do not contain NORM. However, as identified in the RDSGEIS, the Marcellus contains NORM and cuttings drilled during this section of the well would require special handling and disposal.

Recommendation No. 44: The SGEIS and NYCRR should prohibit the onsite burial of drill cuttings. If onsite burial is permitted, it should be limited to cuttings that do not have any NORM and are not coated with drill muds containing mercury, heavy metals, and other chemical additives.

Cuttings Reinjection (CRI) Technology, also referred to as “grind-and-inject technology” is commonly used by industry as a best practice to avoid the need for long-term onsite burial of drill cuttings. CRI technology converts drill cuttings into a slurry that can be injected into a subsurface disposal well. CRI also provides a waste disposal method for used drilling mud, because mud can be used in the slurry formulation to reduce supplemental water needs. Currently, NYS does not have sufficient waste disposal wells to handle the anticipated Marcellus Shale drilling waste volume. Either NYS would need to rely on permitted waste handling capacity at wells out of state, or would need to permit and drill wells to meet that need if there are geologically, hydrologically, and otherwise appropriate locations for such wells in NYS.

For example, CRI is commonly used in Alaska as a best practice to avoid use of long-term reserve pit use and surface burial of contaminated drill cuttings. Waste is collected, ground into a slurry, and injected into a subsurface disposal well.¹⁸⁰ If an injection well is not available at a well location, operators have

¹⁷⁷ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 5-37.

¹⁷⁸ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 5-37.

¹⁷⁹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 6-66.

¹⁸⁰ BP Exploration (Alaska), Inc., ARCO Alaska, Inc. and ConocoPhillips, Inc. have published numerous technical papers on grind and injection technology, and the success of disposal wells as a pollution prevention measure in the SPE trade journals, and at industry conferences.

collected wastes and transported them back to an injection well location. Operators that do not have their own waste handling facilities or disposal wells typically negotiate an agreement with another operator or a service provider to use its disposal facilities. As a result of this best practice implementation in Alaska, DOE reports there are 58 active Class II-D (disposal) wells and six Class I wells in Alaska.¹⁸¹

NYS would need to permit construction of a sufficient number of Class I and Class II injection wells to ensure that there was sufficient capacity for the types and amounts of waste generated.

In addition to the environmental mitigation benefit, CRI technology reduces future liability for industry operators, and has been determined to be an environmentally-appropriate method for handling drilling waste containing NORM by both Shell and Chevron.¹⁸²

Halliburton, an industry service provider, agrees that CRI technology makes business and environmental sense as compared to long-term drilling waste burial at the surface.

*While it is true that new technology comes with a price tag, and much of the technology used in drilling waste management has been introduced in the last 10 years, many technologies now available to operators **are clearly cost effective when the entire well construction cost is evaluated.***

The cost of making a mistake and having either an expensive remediation project or a potential liability nearly always significantly outweighs the cost of a good preventative drilling waste management program. Further, compliance with current environmental regulations does not always guarantee immunity in the future...

Numerous examples exist of industries having to clean up sites that were fully compliant with all regulations at the time the waste was generated and disposed of....

The paper demonstrates that the correct application of these technologies combined with a holistic approach to drilling waste management and drilling fluid operations results in a net reduction in well construction costs and a reduction in the potential for environmental liability...

... environmental compliance (whether internally or externally driven) is not the only reason to utilize these types of technologies and services [emphasis added].¹⁸³

International operators report favorable economics for eliminating exploration and production waste by deep well injection. For example, a 2001 Advantek International Corp. report concludes:

*Downhole disposal of mud and cuttings waste through hydraulic fracturing provides a zero discharge solution and eliminates future cleanup liabilities... This downhole disposal technology has shown success **in both onshore and offshore drilling operations** and is*

¹⁸¹ Puder, M.G., Bryson, B., Veil, J.A, Argonne National Laboratory, "Compendium of Regulatory Requirements Governing Underground Injection of Drilling Wastes," Prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy, February 2003, Page 17.

¹⁸² Okorodudu, A., Akinbodunse, A., Linden, L., Chevron Nigeria Ltd, Anwuri, L., Shell Petroleum Development Co. Nigeria Ltd., Irrechukwu, D.O., Zagi, M.M., Nigeria Department of Petroleum Resources, Guerrero, H., M-I Swaco, "Feasibility Study of Cuttings-Injection Operation: A Case Study of the Niger Delta Basin," SPE Paper 98640, presented at the SPE International Conference on Health, Safety and Environment in Oil and Gas Exploration and Production in Abu Dhabi, U.A.E., April 2006, Page 2.

¹⁸³ Browning, K., Seaton, S., Halliburton Fluid Systems, "Drilling Waste Management: Case Histories Demonstrate that Effective Drilling Waste Management Can Reduce Overall Well-Construction Costs," SPE Paper 96775, presented at the 2005 SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition in Dallas Texas, October 2005, Pages 1, 3, & 4

*becoming a routine disposal option...It also offers favorable economics [emphasis added].*¹⁸⁴

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) also advocates CRI technology:

*Because wastes are injected deep into the earth below drinking water zones, proper slurry injection operations should pose lower environmental and health risks than more conventional surface disposal methods.*¹⁸⁵

In 1990, the United States passed the Pollution Prevention Act, establishing a national policy that places priority on pollution prevention and specifies that disposal into the environment should only be allowed as a **last resort**:

*The Congress hereby declares it to be the national policy of the United States that pollution should be prevented or reduced at the source whenever feasible; pollution that cannot be prevented should be recycled in an environmentally safe manner, whenever feasible; pollution that cannot be prevented or recycled should be treated in an environmentally safe manner whenever feasible; and **disposal or other release into the environment should be employed only as a last resort** and should be conducted in an environmentally safe manner[emphasis added].*¹⁸⁶

Additionally, the amount of drill-cutting waste generated can be significant. If CRI technology is not used to dispose of this waste by deep well injection, than surface waste disposal sites will need to be utilized to handle this waste. The RDSGEIS estimates the amount of waste generated for each well:

*For example, a vertical well with surface, intermediate and production casing drilled to a total depth of 7,000 feet produces approximately 154 cubic yards of cuttings, while a horizontally drilled well with the same casing program to the same target depth with an example 4,000-foot lateral section produces a total volume of approximately 217 cubic yards of cuttings (i.e., about 40% more). A multi-well site would produce approximately that volume of cuttings from each well.*¹⁸⁷

Recommendation No. 45: NYS should consider the use of grind-and-inject technology to convert drill cuttings into a slurry that can be injected into a subsurface disposal well, and work with industry to permit a sufficient number of drilling waste disposal wells to safely meet this need. The use of Cuttings Reinjection (CRI) technology for drilling waste management should be included in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure and codified in the NYCRR, as an environmentally preferable option to onsite-disposal of drilling waste.

¹⁸⁴ Abou-Sayed, A., SPE, Advantek International, Guo, Q., SPE, Advantek International, "Design Considerations in Drill Cuttings Re-Injection Through Downhole Fracturing," IADC/SPE Paper 72308, Presented at the IADC/SPE Middle East Drilling Technology Meeting in Bahrain, October 2001, Page 1.

¹⁸⁵ Argonne National Laboratory, "An Introduction to Slurry Injection Technology for Disposal of Drilling Wastes," Publication prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy, September 2003, Page 2.

¹⁸⁶ Pollution Prevention Act of 1990, U.S. Code, Title 42, Public Health and Welfare, Chapter 133, Pollution Prevention.

¹⁸⁷ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 5-34.

14. HVHF Flowback Surface Impoundments at Drillsite

Background: In 2009, HCLLC recommended that the NYCRR require fracture fluid flowback be routed to onsite treatment systems for fracture fluid recycling and/or collected in closed-loop tanks for transportation to offsite treatment systems. Surface impoundments should not be used for fracture fluid flowback.

2011 RDSGEIS: The 2011 RDSGEIS made excellent revisions that address public concerns and are protective of human health and the environment by clearly prohibiting HVHF flowback waste impoundments at drillsites. The 2011 RDSGEIS recommends the use of closed-loop tank systems at the drillsites for collecting waste before transporting it to a treatment location, or recycling it for use on another well:

Flowback water stored on-site must use covered watertight tanks within secondary containment and the fluid contained in the tanks must be removed from the site within certain time periods.¹⁸⁸

The Department proposes to require that operators storing flowback water on-site would be required to use watertight tanks located within secondary containment, and remove the fluid from the wellpad within specified time frames.¹⁸⁹

NYCRR Proposed Revisions: Proposed regulations at 6 NYCRR § 560.6(c)(27) specifically prohibit HVHF flowback from being directed to or stored in any on-site pit, and require covered watertight tanks to handle flowback at the drillsite. Furthermore, 6 NYCRR § 750-3.4(b) prohibits the issuance of a State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) permit without prior certification that HVHF flowback fluids will be not be directed to or stored in a pit or impoundment. Proposed regulations at 6 NYCRR § 560.3(a)(10)-(11) also require an operator to provide a description of the closed-loop tank system it will use and the number of receiving tanks it will employ for flowback water.

No further recommendations. The RDSGEIS includes the use of closed-loop tank systems, which is best available technology.

¹⁸⁸ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Executive Summary, Page 25.

¹⁸⁹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 1-12.

15. HVHF Flowback Centralized Surface Impoundments Off-Drillsite

Background: In 2009, HCLLC recommended that the NYCRR prohibit the use of centralized surface impoundments for HVHF flowback. This recommendation was made because it is best technology to eliminate the use of surface impoundments altogether, rather than gathering HVHF flowback into tanks at the drillsite and then moving it by pipeline or truck to be pumped into a larger open impoundment at a centralized location away from drillsites. If flowback is recycled, it should be trucked or piped from tank-to-tank to another drillsite or used at the same drillsite in a different well.

Eliminating use of centralized surface impoundments prevents: large scale surface disturbance that requires multi-year rehabilitation¹⁹⁰; the potential for leakage to occur through or around the liner, impacting ground water; and the potential to generate substantial amounts of hazardous air pollution.

A centralized surface impoundment photograph in Pennsylvania is shown below.



Bednarski Centralized Waste Impoundment, Pennsylvania, Site Permit PADEP, 798407

The most serious concern with the use of centralized surface impoundments for HVHF flowback is the amount of hazardous air pollution predicted for these centralized surface impoundments. In 2009, NYSDEC estimated that each centralized impoundment would be a major source of hazardous air pollution, emitting more than 32.5 tons of air toxics per year, and it was unclear if NYSDEC's estimate was even a worst-case estimate:

¹⁹⁰ Surface disturbance is less for temporary tanks than impoundments. Impoundments require surface soil excavation and multi-year rehabilitation. Temporary tanks used at the drillsite use existing gravel space already in place for drilling operations rather than impacting new and additional surface terrain away from the drillsite.

*Based on an assumed installation of ten wells per wellsite in a given year, an annual methanol air emission [estimate] of **32.5 tons** (i.e., “**major**” **quantity of HAP**) is theoretically possible at a central impoundment¹⁹¹ [emphasis added].*

USEPA classifies a major source of hazardous air pollution as a source that emits more than 25 tons per year. These centralized impoundments have been sited nearby residential homes and community facilities in other states, increasing the amount of hazardous air pollution exposure to nearby humans, including increased exposure to benzene, a known human carcinogen.

In January 2011, NYS’ consultant, Alpha Geoscience, complimented HCLLC for its recommendations on flowback impoundments, and supported improved mitigation:

Harvey Consulting has thoroughly documented their discussion of surface flowback impoundments and hazardous air pollutants, citing a professional journal article, technical guidance documents, consultant reports, and NYSDEC documents.¹⁹²

2011 RDSGEIS: The 2011 RDSGEIS states that centralized flowback impoundments are “not contemplated” by industry.¹⁹³

***The Department was informed in September 2010 that operators would not routinely propose to store flowback water either in reserve pits on the wellpad or in centralized impoundments.** Therefore, these practices are not addressed in this revised draft SGEIS and such impoundments would not be approved without site-specific environmental review [emphasis added].¹⁹⁴*

This industry representation is inconsistent with the actual practice of operators in Pennsylvania. Moreover, neither the RDSGEIS nor the proposed NYCRR amendments prohibit the use of centralized flowback impoundments. This leaves the door open for centralized flowback impoundments to be approved if a site-specific environmental review is conducted.

NYSDEC’s requirement to use closed-loop HVHF flowback collection tanks at each drillsite is an efficient collection method, because fluid can be easily transferred to a treatment and disposal location, or taken to another well for reuse. It would not be efficient, or environmentally sound, to collect HVHF waste in a closed-loop flowback tank at the drillsite, and then transfer that waste by temporary piping or truck to a large centralized surface impoundment off of the drillsite location.

Recommendation No. 46: The SGEIS and NYCRR should prohibit the use of centralized surface impoundments for HVHF flowback based on the known impacts examined in the SGEIS process. HVHF flowback waste should be collected at the wellhead and recycled or directly routed to disposal. This prohibition should be described in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure and codified in the NYCRR.

¹⁹¹ 2009, NYSDEC, DSGEIS, Page 6-56.

¹⁹² Alpha Geoscience, Review of the dSGEIS and Identification Best Technology and Best Practices Recommendations, Harvey Consulting, LLC; December 28, 2009, prepared for NYSERDA, January 20, 2011, Page 31.

¹⁹³ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Executive Summary, Page 15.

¹⁹⁴ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSEGIS, Page 1-2.

If NYSDEC does not prohibit the use of centralized impoundments, the SGEIS should analyze the impacts and propose mitigation to protect public health and the environment. The decision to allow centralized flowback impoundments should not be segmented from the SGEIS just because it is known to create significant impacts. Prohibiting the use of centralized impoundments mitigates that known risk.

16. Repeat HVHF Treatment Life Cycle Impacts

Background: In 2009, HCLLC recommended that the DSGEIS disclose how many times a well may be fracture treated over its life, and provide a worst case scenario for water use and waste disposal requirements based on this scenario. HCLLC pointed out that the 2009 DSGEIS estimated water use and waste volumes based on a single initial fracture treatment and that this approach does not consider the fact that most shale gas wells require multiple fracture treatments.

2011 RDSGEIS: The 2011 RDSGEIS indicates there may be a potential for repeated HVHF treatments over the life of the well.¹⁹⁵ However, the 2011 RDSGEIS does not quantify the number of HVHF treatments possible per well, nor does it estimate the peak or cumulative impact of these HVHF treatments. Therefore the RDSGEIS under-predicts both the peak and cumulative impacts by not examining the reasonably foreseeable likelihood that Marcellus, Utica, and other low-permeability shale reservoirs will require more than one HVHF treatment, most likely two or three, over a several decade long lifecycle.

NYSDEC does acknowledge that, when Marcellus repeat HVHF treatments are conducted, the impact will be equivalent to the initial treatment. However, its impact assessment does not examine the peak or cumulative impacts that may occur:

*Regardless of how often it occurs, **if the high-volume hydraulic fracturing procedure is repeated it will entail the same type and duration of surface activity at the well pad as the initial procedure** [emphasis added].¹⁹⁶*

For example, NYSDEC estimates 1,600 or more wells to be drilled and completed per year,¹⁹⁷ estimating a 30 year development life cycle,¹⁹⁸ for a total of 48,000 wells. NYSDEC estimates each HVHF treatment to use an average 4,200,000 gallons per well,¹⁹⁹ and that approximately 9-35% of HVHF treatment returns to the well and is produced as waste that requires handling, treatment and/or disposal.²⁰⁰ A single HVHF treatment in each well, over a thirty year period, could yield a total waste load of 18-71 billion gallons. That waste volume could double or triple if two or three fracture treatments are conducted on each well over a several decade period. Assuming at least two fracture treatments, and possibly three may be implemented, the waste volumes would increase substantially, possibly exceeding 200 billion gallons.

NYSDEC acknowledges the fact that repeated HVHF treatments have been required in the Barnett shale, typically within 5 years from the initial HVHF.²⁰¹ However, NYSDEC notes:

Marcellus operators with whom the Department has discussed this question have stated their expectation that refracturing will be a rare event.²⁰²

¹⁹⁵ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 6-275.

¹⁹⁶ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 5-99.

¹⁹⁷ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 2-1.

¹⁹⁸ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 6-6.

¹⁹⁹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 6-10.

²⁰⁰ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 5-99.

²⁰¹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 5-98.

²⁰² 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 5-98.

The information NYDEC gathered from a few Marcellus operators, that concludes Marcellus shale re-fracturing will be “rare”, is inconsistent with industry literature.

For example, in 2010 Range Resource published a Society of Petroleum Engineering technical paper that describes two successful horizontal shale re-fracture re-stimulations and explains that Marcellus re-fracture stimulations will be used:

*Based on the success of horizontal re-fracs in other shale plays, re-fracture stimulations in the Marcellus will be an excellent option to maximize fracture complexity and increase the total effective fracture network. ...These re-fracs can be utilized to soften overall field decline in future years...*²⁰³

In 2006, Schlumberger, an Oil & Gas Service Company, published a Society of Petroleum Engineering technical paper describing the benefits of re-fracture re-stimulations to increase hydrocarbon production in wells that were initially fractured and where hydrocarbon production had declined to a point that it was economically attractive to repeat the fracture stimulation procedure in that same well:

*A successful refracturing treatment is one that creates a fracture having higher fracture conductivity and/or penetrating an area of higher pore pressure than the previous fracture.*²⁰⁴

Schlumberger explains that re-fracture re-stimulations are likely in wells that have the following characteristics: low productivity relative to other wells with comparable pay; remaining reserves in place; need for fracture reorientation to improve hydrocarbon production; poorly placed initial fracture treatment (e.g. proppant crushing, or proppant flowback, use of incompatible fluids); and reservoir complexity leading to poor hydrocarbon recovery.

A 2010 Apache Corporation, Society of Petroleum Engineering paper, agrees that re-fracture re-stimulations will play an important role in shale stimulation for some time to come. Apache Corporation explains that re-fracture re-stimulations are being used in shale wells to increase gas production, and to make good wells even better gas producers:

*Refracs of even good wells increased the recovery and re-established near initial production rate. Increasing stimulated reservoir volume should increase both the IP²⁰⁵ and EUR²⁰⁶. When new areas of the shale are exposed in a refrac, there should also be a gain in reserves (Warpinski, 2008). Increases in stimulated reservoir volume could be accomplished by opening many of the micro-cracks and laminations within the undisturbed matrix blocks in the initial drainage [area] that were left unstimulated by previous fracturing attempts. Re-opening of natural and hydraulic fractures that had closed due to overburden and confining stress created by depletion would re-establish matrix area contact.*²⁰⁷

²⁰³ Curry, M., and Maloney, T., Range Resources Corp., Woodroof, R., and Leonard, R. ProTechnics Division of Core Laboratories, Less Sand May Not Be Enough, Society of Petroleum Engineers Technical Paper, SPE 131783, 2010. Page 12.

²⁰⁴ Moore, L.P., Ramakrishnan, H., Schlumberger, Restimulation: Candidate Selection Methodologies and Treatment Optimization, Society of Petroleum Engineers Technical Paper, SPE 102681, 2006. Page 1.

²⁰⁵ IP= Initial Production.

²⁰⁶ EUR= Expected Ultimate Recovery.

²⁰⁷ King, G.E., Apache Corporation, Thirty Years of Gas Shale Fracturing: What Have We Learned?, Society of Petroleum Engineers Technical Paper, SPE 133456, 2010. Page 24.

Re-fracture re-stimulation has been used widely in the Barnett Shale. Many technical papers report successful re-fracture re-stimulations in the Barnett Shale where improved HVHF slickwater fractures were used as a second treatment after the initial cross-linked gel fracture treatment. While the Marcellus and Utica Shales in NYS will start with improved HVHF slickwater fracture treatments, these treatment methods will continue to improve over time, and like the Barnett, repeat fracture treatments will be required to improve hydrocarbon performance as new and improved fracture treatment design supplants existing technology. Apache Corporation explains:

*Fracturing technology for shales is constantly improving and refracs may slowly fade from common use as the frac designs for shale wells are optimized. **Until optimal fracs are achieved and production engineering is optimized, however, refracs will have a place in shale stimulation** [emphasis added].²⁰⁸*

Additionally, NYSDEC acknowledges the benefits of re-fracture treatment:

Several other reasons may develop to repeat the fracturing procedure at a given well. Fracture conductivity may decline due to proppant embedment into the fracture walls, proppant crushing, closure of fractures under increased effective stress as the pore pressure declines, clogging from fines migration, and capillary entrapment of liquid at the fracture and formation boundary. Refracturing can restore the original fracture height and length, and can often extend the fracture length beyond the original fracture dimensions.²⁰⁹

Recommendation No. 47: The SGEIS should quantify how many times a well may be fracture treated over its life, and provide a worst case scenario for water use and waste disposal requirements based on this scenario. Additionally, the SGEIS should examine the peak and cumulative impacts of multiple HVHF treatments over a well's life and propose mitigation to offset those reasonably foreseeable impacts.

²⁰⁸ King, G.E., Apache Corporation, Thirty Years of Gas Shale Fracturing: What Have We Learned?, Society of Petroleum Engineers Technical Paper, SPE 133456, 2010. Page 24.

²⁰⁹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 5-98.

17. Air Pollution Control and Monitoring

Air Quality Impact Assessment Modeling Analysis:

In 2009, AKRF's comments on the 2009 DSGEIS (prepared for NRDC) identified a number of shortcomings in the air quality impact assessment modeling analysis. Notably, that emissions from 10 wells per year and simultaneously operating equipment would produce emission impacts that exceed the NAAQS.

The 2011 RDSGEIS: The 2011 RDSGEIS includes a substantial amount of new modeling work and a number of operational restrictions and limitations to ensure that NAAQS are not violated. While the RDSGEIS has been significantly improved in this area, some problems with the analysis persist, and some new problems have developed.

The following assumptions used in the air quality impact assessment modeling analysis warrant further review and justification:

- The modeling analysis assumes that a maximum of four wells per drillsite will be drilled each year.²¹⁰ However, NYS ECL § 23-0501 requires development of all infill drilling within three years of the first well drilled, and the RDSGEIS envisions the Marcellus Shale gas reservoir will be developed from a multi-well pad for a 640-acre spacing unit, with 40-acre spacing. At 40-acre spacing density, 16 wells would need to be drilled in three years to fill a 640-acre unit, meaning that a maximum of 5-6 wells could possibly be drilled per year. This conflicts with the 4 wells per year (12 wells for three years) assumption and would generate more significant air quality impacts than contemplated by the RDSGEIS.
- Gas compositional data used in the modeling analysis was based on Marcellus Shale gas only. There was no analysis of Utica Shale gas or gas from any other low-permeability gas reservoir.²¹¹ Modeling should be based on a reasonable worst case scenario that includes analysis of all shale formations with development potential, not just the Marcellus Shale, if the SGEIS proposes to cover more reservoirs.
- The modeling analysis assumed that there will be no emissions of criteria pollutants from venting. However, the RDSGEIS proposes to allow gas venting of up to 5 MMscf during any consecutive 12-month period, including sour gas, as long as it is vented at least 30 feet in the air. This allowance undermines the assumption that no criteria pollutants would be emitted during venting.
- The modeling analysis assumes only three days of gas flaring per well. However, the RDSGEIS states that flaring can occur for up to a month in some cases.²¹² Therefore, the modeling understates the potential emissions from flaring.

²¹⁰ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 6-104.

²¹¹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 6-115.

²¹² 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Table 5.29 on Page 5-136 shows that well cleanup and testing can take 12 hours to 30 days. Modeling on Page 6-192 only assumes 3 days of flaring.

- The supplemental 24-hour PM_{2.5} model impacts analysis did not evaluate simultaneous operation of equipment operating on the pad. However, other short-term impact assessment assumed simultaneous operation of one well drilling, one well completion and one well flaring, along with operation of the on-site line heater and off-site compressor for the gas production phase for previously-completed wells.²¹³ Therefore, the 24-hour PM_{2.5} impact modeling is based on inconsistent assumptions.
- To account for the possibility of simultaneous well operations at nearby pads, a simplified sensitivity analysis was performed in the RDSGEIS to determine the potential contribution of an adjacent pad to the modeled impacts.²¹⁴ This modeling assumed a single adjacent pad, located one kilometer away (0.62 miles), with identical equipment and emissions as the modeling target pad.

The RDSGEIS model only examined the potential for two multi-well drillsites, drilling horizontal wells to be located near each other at a distance of 0.62 miles apart. The modeling analysis assumed that only two drillsites would be operating nearby each other, and that drillsite development in an area would occur in a sequential fashion,²¹⁵ which is not always the case (especially when there are multiple operators developing an area).

The modeling analysis did not evaluate the possibility of more than two multi-well drillsite drilling and completion operations adjacent to each other, nor did it evaluate the possibility of multi-well drillsites operating nearby several single well drilling and completion operations drilled on 40 acre spacing. Nor did the analysis examine the possibility that the surface location of multi-well drillsites could be positioned closer than 0.62 miles apart.

NYS does not require drillsites to be located over the drilling unit, as long as surface siting approval is authorized. Therefore there is a possibility for drillsites to be located closer than 0.62 miles, a possibility of simultaneous operation of more than two drillsites at a time, and a possibility that more significant overlapping ambient air pollution impacts may occur than modeled. Therefore, the RDSGEIS did not consider the reasonable worst case scenario air impacts resulting from simultaneous operations of spatially proximate well sites. NYSDEC wither needs to examine all possible concurrent operation impacts, or prohibit the possibility.

- Mobile source impact assessment under-predicts the number of miles that will be driven by heavy equipment to transport supplies to and haul wastes away from drillsites, especially wastewater that is hauled out of state to treatment and disposal facilities. Modeling for mobile source air impacts resulting from wastewater transport must be consistent with reasonable worst case scenario forecasts of wastewater volume (which impacts the number of truck trips needed per well site) as well as forecasted in and out of state disposal options (which impacts distance traveled per disposal).

The RDSGEIS assumes that both light and heavy duty trucks will only travel 20-25 miles²¹⁶ one way, yet out-of-state treatment and disposal facilities may be located several hundred miles away. For rural operations, it is unlikely that supplies, equipment, specialty contractors, lodging, and other support equipment and personnel will be located within 20-25 miles of the drillsite.

²¹³ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 6-124.

²¹⁴ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 6-127.

²¹⁵ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 6-136.

²¹⁶ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 6-176.

- The modeling analysis assumes that there will be no simultaneous operations of well drilling and completion equipment on a drillsite. There is a permit requirement prohibiting simultaneous operations;²¹⁷ however, this requirement is not codified in the proposed revisions to NYCRR.²¹⁸

Recommendation No. 48: The RDSGEIS air quality impact assessment modeling analysis assumptions warrant additional review and justification. Limitations used in the modeling assumption must all be translated into SGEIS as mitigation measures and codified in the NYCRR to ensure the assumed impacts will not be exceeded. This was done in some cases, but not all. In the cases where modeling assumptions used cannot be justified, modeling revisions will be needed to examine impacts and identify required mitigation, or operational limits set.

Air Quality Monitoring Program:

In 2009, AKRF recommended improved air dispersion modeling and a region-wide emissions analysis. In response, NYSDEC completed a significant amount of additional work on the air quality section of the RDSGEIS. A major conclusion from this work was that there is insufficient information to understand the consequences of increased regional NO_x and VOC emissions on the resultant levels of ozone and PM_{2.5}. As a result of this lack of data, these impacts were not fully quantified by modeling alone. Furthermore, NYSDEC concluded that ambient air quality monitoring program is needed.

While implementation of a ambient air quality monitoring program, is an important improvement in the RDSGEIS, the proposed program needs further definition, a funding commitment, and a formal industry compliance obligation.

The 2011 RDSGEIS: The 2011 RDSGEIS includes a commitment to implement local and regional air quality monitoring:²¹⁹

***The Department also developed an air monitoring program to fully address potential for adverse air quality impacts beyond those analyzed in the dSGEIS, which are either not fully known at this time or not verifiable by the assessments to date.** The air monitoring plan would help determine and distinguish both the background and drilling related concentrations of pertinent pollutants in the ambient air [emphasis added].²²⁰*

*The dSGEIS identifies additional mitigation measures designed to ensure that emissions associated with high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations do not result in the exceedance of any NAAQS. In addition, **the Department has committed to implement local and regional level air quality monitoring at well pads and surrounding areas** [emphasis added].²²¹*

²¹⁷ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 10, Attachment A, Condition 2.

²¹⁸ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 6-115.

²¹⁹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Executive Summary, Page 23.

²²⁰ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Executive Summary, Page 16.

²²¹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Executive Summary, Page 23.

Although Section 6.5.4 of the RDSGEIS proposes alternative methods for implementing air quality monitoring, it does not settle on a recommended solution.²²² The RDSGEIS proposes two alternatives: (1) industry-led monitoring with NYSDEC oversight, or (2) NYSDEC monitoring with industry funding. The RDSGEIS identifies NYSDEC monitoring with industry funding as the preferred alternative without making clear how this goal will actually be funded and implemented.

Table 6.24 proposes to: add a single air monitoring trailer and mobile laboratory to monitor ozone, particulate matter, oxides of nitrogen and air toxics; use infrared cameras to monitor gas leaks; and conduct summa canister sampling for BTEX and other VOCs. However, the RDSGEIS does not explain how the addition of a single mobile trailer and lab along with some other intermittent sampling will provide sufficient information to understand the consequences of increased regional NO_x and VOC emissions on the resultant levels of ozone and PM_{2.5}.

The RDSGEIS did not evaluate the possibility of installing permanent monitoring locations at numerous locations in NYS, with priority in existing non-attainment areas, and areas that will be heavily impacted by shale gas development. Instead, the RDSGEIS only proposes to examine “regional level” monitoring by collecting data at two sites in NYS.²²³ This proposal is insufficient because monitoring regional ambient air quality is not possible with the limited data provided by a two-site program, proposed for an unspecified time period.

More information is needed to understand the scope and duration of NYSDEC’s proposed air monitoring program. A more rigorous monitoring program proposal is needed that identifies: the scope of the monitoring program; the location of the monitoring sites; the amount of equipment and personnel needed to run each site; the duration of monitoring proposed at each site; along with the cost. It is anticipated that a program used to assess both regional and local impacts will require long term monitoring stations placed in key locations, not just infrequent and unrepresentative sampling.

The obligation to fund the air quality monitoring program needs to be clearly tied to a permit condition requirement—for example, the permit to flare or spud a well should require a contribution to an air quality monitoring fund; such a requirement is not set forth in either Appendix 6 or Appendix 10.

Recommendation No. 49: The SGEIS should include a more rigorous air monitoring program to achieve NYSDEC’s goal of regional and local air pollutant impact monitoring. The proposed program should identify: the scope of the monitoring program; the location of the monitoring sites; the amount of equipment and personnel needed to run each site; the duration of monitoring proposed at each site; along with the cost. The SGEIS should require the monitoring program to commence prior to Marcellus Shale gas development to verify background levels and continue until NYSDEC can scientifically justify that data collection is no longer warranted, in consultation with EPA. The obligation to fund the air monitoring program needs to be clearly tied to a permit condition requirement.

The RDSGEIS acknowledges that air monitoring may identify peak or cumulative air pollution impacts that warrant additional emission controls. For example, NYSDEC has identified that:

...the consequences of the increased regional NO_x and VOC emissions on the resultant levels of ozone and PM_{2.5} cannot be fully addressed by only modeling at this stage due to the lack of detail on the distribution of the wells and compressor stations. In addition, any potential emissions of certain VOCs at the well sites due to fugitive emissions,

²²² 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 6-180 through 6-184.

²²³ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 6-181.

including possible endogenous level, and from the drilling and gas processing equipment at the compressor station (e.g. glycol dehydrators) are not fully quantifiable.²²⁴

However, the RDSGEIS does not explain NYSDEC's plan to collect data, identify the potential for air pollutants to exceed the federal, state or local air pollution control standards, or require these additional emission controls in a timely manner before adverse impacts are realized by humans or the surrounding ecosystem.

Recommendation No. 50: The SGEIS should explain NYSDEC's plan to collect data, identify the potential for pollution problems to exceed the federal, state or local air pollution control standards, and the timely installation of additional emission controls, in order to protect against exceedances of pollution control standards, should be required as an SGEIS mitigation measure and codified in the NYCRR.

GHG Impacts Mitigation Plan:

In 2009, HCLLC and AKRF recommended further analysis of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) impacts and mitigation. In response, NYSDEC acknowledged the potential for GHG emissions impacts and the need for mitigation. While such acknowledgement represents a substantial improvement from the 2009 draft, the proposed mitigation needs improvement to ensure the requirements are clear, measureable and enforceable.

The 2011 RDSGEIS: The 2011 RDSGEIS requires a GHG Impacts Mitigation Plan.²²⁵

The Plan must include: a list of best management practices for GHG emission sources for implementation at the permitted well site; a leak detection and repair program; use of EPA's Natural Gas Star best management practices for any pertinent equipment; use of reduced emission completions that provide for the recovery of methane instead of flaring whenever a gas sales line and interconnecting gathering line are available; and a statement that the operator would provide the Department with a copy of the report filed with EPA to meet the GHG Reporting Rule.²²⁶

The GHG Impacts Mitigation Plan requires the operator to implement a Leak Detection and Repair Program,²²⁷ use Reduced Emission Completions,²²⁸ use EPA Natural Gas STAR program recommendations, and identify other best management practices.

The requirement that a GHG Impacts Mitigation Plan be prepared and include the use of best management practices for GHG control is a step in the right direction; however, given the variety of best management practices under EPA's voluntary Natural Gas STAR program, NYSDEC should require that well operators select and install the controls that will achieve the greatest emissions reductions possible. In addition, such emissions reductions should be made enforceable, as permit conditions or in the NYCRR.

²²⁴ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 6-181.

²²⁵ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Executive Summary, Page 24.

²²⁶ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Executive Summary, Page 24.

²²⁷ See also HCLLC recommendations on LDAR Program in this section of the report.

²²⁸ See also HCLLC recommendations on Reduced Emission Completions in this section of the report.

For example, the Natural Gas STAR Program data shows that it is both technically feasible and economically attractive to use “low-bleed” or “no-bleed pneumatic controllers and plunger lift systems;”²²⁹ however, it is not clear whether an operator would be required under the GHG Impacts Mitigation Plan to use this technology, or how NYSDEC would enforce its use if an operator chose not to select it.

NYSDEC should require operators to use Natural Gas STAR Program best management technologies and practices that will optimize emissions reductions.

The RDSGEIS does not make clear whether or how new technologies or practices would be required (e.g. technologies or practices identified by the Natural Gas STAR Program after drillsite construction has been completed). It is not clear if an operator will be required to implement GHG emission controls only at the time of construction, or if there will be an ongoing obligation to implement additional controls as they are identified by the Natural Gas STAR Program and developed.

The plan should include a list of emission controls that will be installed at the time of construction and best management practices, and a process for periodically reviewing new technologies and installing them as new control solutions are developed over time.

Recommendation No. 51: NYSDEC should require a GHG Mitigation Plan that provides for measureable emissions reductions and includes enforceable requirements. The GHG Impacts Mitigation Plan should list all Natural Gas STAR Program best management technologies and practices that have been determined by EPA to be technically and economically feasible, and operators should select and use the emission control(s) that will achieve the greatest emissions reductions.

The GHG Impacts Mitigation Plan should be submitted and approved prior to drillsite construction, GHG controls should be installed at the time of well construction, and NYSDEC should conduct periodic reviews to ensure that GHG Impacts Mitigation Plans include state of the art emission control technologies. Further, the extent of compliance with adopted emission mitigation control plans should be documented throughout the well’s potential to emit GHGs.

The GHG Impacts Mitigation Plan requirement should be included in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure and codified in the NYCRR. This requirement should apply to all natural gas operations, not just HVHF operations.

Flare and Venting of Gas Emissions:

In 2009, HCLLC recommended that flaring and venting be limited to the lowest level technically feasible and safe. Reducing gas flaring and venting is widely considered best practice. Both federal and state governments have taken steps over the past two decades to enact regulations that limit flaring and venting of natural gas.²³⁰ Initially the motive was to conserve hydrocarbon resources to maximize federal and

²²⁹ Older gas wells stop flowing when liquids (water and condensate) accumulate inside the wellbore creating backpressure on the hydrocarbon formation. This will be a future problem in NYS, as gas wells age. Methane gas is emitted when companies open wells to vent gas to the atmosphere to unload wellbore liquids (water and condensate that accumulate in the bottom of the well) in order to resume gas flow. The industry typically refers to this process as “blowing down the well” or a “well blowdown.” Eventually, even a well’s own gas pressure becomes insufficient to flow accumulated liquids to the surface and the well is either shut-in as uneconomic, or some form of artificial lift (e.g. plunger lifts) is installed to transport the liquids to the surface.

²³⁰ Global Gas Flaring Reduction Partnership (GGFR), Guidance on Upstream Flaring and Venting Policy and Regulation, Washington D.C., March 2009.

state revenue and gas supply. More recently, focus on GHG, VOC and HAPs emission reduction has prompted additional innovation to further reduce flaring and venting.

Flares may be used during well drilling, completion, and testing to combust hydrocarbon gases that cannot be collected because gas processing and pipeline systems have not been installed. If gas processing equipment and pipeline systems are in place, gas flaring can be avoided in all cases except in the event of equipment malfunction. During the drilling and completion phase of the first well on a well pad, a gas pipeline might not be installed. Gas pipelines are typically not installed until it is confirmed that an economic gas supply has been found. Therefore, gas from the first well is often flared or vented during drilling and completion activities because there is not a pipeline to which it can be routed. The RDSGEIS proposes to require Reduced Emission Completions for all wells where a pipeline is installed, which will reduce the need to flare or vent gas.

During production operations, high pressure gas buildup may require gas venting via a pressure release valve, or gas may need to be routed to a flare during an equipment malfunction. At natural gas facilities, continuous flaring or venting may be associated with the disposal of waste streams²³¹ and gaseous by-product streams²³² that are uneconomical to conserve. Venting or flaring may also occur during manual or instrumented depressurization events, compressor engine starts, equipment maintenance and inspection, pipeline tie-ins, pigging, sampling activities, and pipeline repair.²³³

Best practices for planned²³⁴ flaring and venting during gas production should limit flaring and venting to the smallest amount possible and only for purposes of for safety. Gas should be collected for sale, and used as fuel unless it is proven to be technically and economically unfeasible.

The 2011 RDSGEIS: The 2011 RDSGEIS limits planned gas flaring to flowback operations for wells where a gas sales line has not been installed which is a significant improvement.²³⁵

However, when flaring or venting does occur, there is the potential for relatively high short-term VOC and CO emission impacts that need to be considered.²³⁶ The RDSGEIS states that industry only plans to flare for a maximum of three days, and NYSDEC only modeled a 3-day impact; yet, the RDSGEIS states that flaring can occur for up to a month (30 days) in some cases.²³⁷

***A flaring period of 3 days was considered for this analysis** for the vertical and horizontal wells respectively although **the actual period could be** either shorter or **longer** [emphasis added].²³⁸*

Modeling needs to represent a reasonable worst case scenario. Because only a three day flaring period was considered in the RDSGEIS modeling, planned flaring should be limited to no more than three days.

²³¹ For example, acid gas from the gas sweetening process and still-column overheads from glycol dehydrators.

²³² For example: instrument vent gas; stabilizer overheads and process flash gas.

²³³ The Global Gas Flaring Reduction partnership (GGFR) and the World Bank, Guidelines on Flare and Vent Measurement, September 2008.

²³⁴ There is a difference between planned flaring and emergency flaring. Emergency flaring is conducted to safely route combustible and potentially toxic (e.g. hydrogen sulfide gas) and in most cases cannot be avoided. Planned flaring can be avoided in most cases.

²³⁵ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 5-135.

²³⁶ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 6-103.

²³⁷ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Table 5.29 on Page 5-136 shows that well cleanup and testing can take 12 hours to 30 days. Modeling on Page 6-192 only assumes 3 days of flaring.

²³⁸ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 6-197.

Alternatively, modeling analysis should be based on the maximum time period that flaring would be allowed.

Recommendation No. 52: Planned flaring should be limited to no more than three days. In all other cases flaring should be limited to safety purposes only. If NYSDEC finds there is an operational necessity to flare an exploration well for more than a three-day period, the SGEIS impact analysis should evaluate the air pollutant impact, particularly the potential for relatively high short-term emission impacts, from longer flaring events, before approving such operations. Flaring restrictions should be included in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure and codified in the NYCRR. This requirement should apply to all natural gas operations, not just HVHF operations.

In 2009, HCLLC recommended that NYSDEC should require operators to flare gas as a preferred method over venting. Gas flaring is environmentally preferable over venting because flaring reduces HAP, VOC, and GHG emissions.²³⁹ Proposed revisions to 6 NYCRR § 560.6(c)(28) would require that gas be flared whenever technically feasible instead of vented,²⁴⁰ which is a significant improvement.

The RDSGEIS limits the amount of flaring and venting that is allowed at a drillsite during any consecutive 12-month period; however, it is unclear how the venting (5 MMscf) or flaring (120 MMscf) thresholds were developed, and such thresholds are not listed in the proposed revisions to the NYCRR.

- *During the flowback phase, the **venting of gas** from each well pad will be limited to a maximum of **5 MMscf** during any consecutive 12-month period. If “sour” gas is encountered with detected hydrogen sulfide emissions, the height at which the gas will be vented will be a minimum of 30 feet (9.1m);*
- *During the flowback phase, **flaring of gas** at each well pad will be limited to a maximum of **120 MMscf** during any consecutive 12-month period [emphasis added].²⁴¹*

Recommendation No. 53: The SGEIS should provide justification for allowing a maximum of 5 MMscf of vented gas and 120 MMscf of flared gas at a drillsite during any consecutive 12-month period. The RDSGEIS does not contain information to show that these limits are equivalent to the lowest levels of venting and flaring that can be achieved through use of best practices, and it is unclear if these rates were used in the modeling assessment. Flaring and venting limits, once justified, should be included in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure, codified in the NYCRR, and should apply to all natural gas operations, not just HVHF operations.

In 2009, HCLLC recommended that NYSDEC require that well operators follow best practices for construction and operation of flares used for safety. The RDSGEIS requires self-igniting flares,²⁴² which is an improvement; however, the RDSGEIS does not require that:

- Flare pilot blowout risk be minimized by installing a reliable flare system;
- Low/intermittent velocity flare streams have sufficient exit velocity or wind guards;
- A reliable ignition system is used;

²³⁹ Fugitive and Vented methane has 21 times the global warming potential as combusted methane gas. Methanemarkets.org, epa.gov/gasstar.

²⁴⁰ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-117.

²⁴¹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-108.

²⁴² 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-117.

- Liquid carry over and entrainment in the gas flare stream is minimized by ensuring a suitable liquid separation system is in place; or
- Combustion efficiency is maximized by proper control and optimization of flare fuel/air/steam flow rates.

Recommendation No. 54: The SGEIS should require flare systems to be designed in a manner that optimizes reliability, safety, and combustion efficiency, including requirements to: minimize the risk of flare pilot blowout by installing a reliable flare system; ensure sufficient exit velocity or provide wind guards for low/intermittent velocity flare streams; ensure use of a reliable ignition system; minimize liquid carry over and entrainment in the gas flare stream by ensuring a suitable liquid separation system is in place; and maximize combustion efficiency by proper control and optimization of flare fuel/air/steam flow rates. Flare design requirements should be included in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure and codified in the NYCRR. These requirements should apply to all natural gas operations, not just HVHF operations.

Reduced Emission Completions:

In 2009, HCLLC recommended the use of Reduced Emission Completions (RECs, also known as “green completions”) to control methane and other greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions following HVHF operations. RECs also reduce nitrogen oxide (NO_x) pollution, which otherwise would be generated by flaring gas wells, and hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) emissions, which otherwise would be released when gas is vented directly into the atmosphere.

EPA estimates that, on average, an REC can capture 7,700 Mcf/well workover for an unconventional gas well. If, for example, 2,000 wells are exempted during the first few years of Marcellus Shale gas development in NYS before pipeline infrastructure is more broadly developed, that could result in 15.3 Bcf (6.2 MMTCO₂e) of methane gas vented to the atmosphere.

To put the significance of 15.3 Bcf of methane gas (6.2 MMTCO₂e) into perspective, it is equivalent to the GHG emissions from:

- Over 1,100,000 passenger vehicles; or
- The electric use of approximately 700,000 homes for one year; or
- 13,000,000 barrels of oil consumed.²⁴³

The 2011 RDSGEIS requires RECs where an existing gathering line is located near the well in question, which allows the gas to be collected and routed for sale. While the addition of this requirement represents a substantial improvement that protects air quality and increases the efficiency and productivity of well-sites, NYSDEC should consider expanding its REC requirements to more categories of wells—i.e., wells that are drilled prior to construction of gathering lines. Under the current proposal, a large number of wells could be exempt from the REC requirement, resulting in the flaring or venting of a significant amount of gas that could, instead, be captured for sale.

Furthermore, NYSDEC proposes to postpone making a decision on the number of wells that can be drilled on a pad without the use of RECs until two years after the first HVHF permit is issued.

²⁴³ EPA Greenhouse Gas Equivalencies Calculator, <http://www.epa.gov/cleanenergy/energy-resources/calculator.html#results>

*Reduced Emissions Completion (REC) would be required whenever a gathering line is already constructed. In addition, **two years after issuance of the first permit for high volume hydraulic fracturing, the Department would evaluate whether the number of wells that can be drilled on a pad without REC should be limited** [emphasis added].²⁴⁴*

NYSDEC should not defer the implementation of this known best practice, because it could result in the exemption of several thousand wells from this control technology requirement, leading to unmitigated air quality impacts from uncontrolled venting. HCLLC agrees that RECs are not an option for single exploration wells with no offset wells or pipeline infrastructure nearby. In addition, RECs may not be possible if well pressure is too low. Regulations should make exceptions only for these situations in which emission control is truly infeasible. However, RECs should be required in all other circumstances.

Once an exploration well is drilled and hydrocarbons are located, additional drilling and well completion operations on that same drillsite should be coordinated with gas line installation, enabling RECs for all subsequent wells. High-volume hydraulic fracturing can be completed at any time after a well is drilled and gas is found. The well can be temporarily suspended, and the HVHF be conducted once a gas line is in place. In a newly explored area, it may be reasonable to drill an exploration well, and conduct a HVHF treatment to test gas productivity before drilling additional production wells. However, once a commercial source of gas is identified and tested with that initial exploration well, there is no reason to vent or flare gas using the HVHF flowback process and test wells prior to a gas line installation.

In natural gas fields, gas from the first well is often flared or vented during drilling and completion activities, because natural gas pipelines are typically not installed until it is confirmed that an economical gas supply has been found. However, once a pipeline is installed, subsequent wells drilled on that same pad would be in a position to implement REC techniques.

Operators often point to the lack of pipeline infrastructure as a primary reason REC may not be possible. However, there are also alternatives to piping methane, such as using it onsite to generate power, re-injecting it to improve well performance, or providing it to local residents as an affordable power supply. Therefore, RECs do not need to rely solely on the installation of a nearby pipeline.

RECs are technically feasible and economically attractive, and are a commercially available emission control option. Appendix 25 of the RDSGEIS, Reduced Emission Completions Executive Summary, summarizes the economic benefits, making a clear case for requiring this technology on all NYS wells, with few exceptions. RECs provide an immediate revenue stream by routing gas (methane and gas condensates) to a gas sales line that would otherwise be vented into the atmosphere or flared.. Alternatively, captured gas can be used for fuel, offsetting operating costs, or re-injected to improve well performance. Industry has demonstrated that RECs are both an environmental best practice and profitable.

In addition to being economically attractive for the operator, there are a number of other benefits of RECs:

- The collection of potentially explosive gas vapors, rather than venting them to the atmosphere. This improves well site safety, reduces worker exposure to harmful vapors, and limits overall corporate liability.
- The reduction in emissions, noises, odors, and citizen complaints associated with venting or flaring.
- The reduction in disposal costs, as a result of gas and condensate capture and sale.

²⁴⁴ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 1-116.

- The elimination of the need to secure flare permits and provide flaring notifications.²⁴⁵
- The reduction of VOCs and HAPs. Unprocessed natural gas contains VOCs and HAPs, along with methane. Flaring, an alternative control device, can reduce VOCs and HAPs. However, flaring generates NO_x and particulate matter (PM), as well as other combustible byproducts. Many areas with significant oil and gas development have challenges achieving ozone and regional haze standards. Therefore, REC technology is a preferred alternative.
- Wells flow back to portable separation units for longer periods than would be allowed with direct venting into the atmosphere or flaring, providing improved well cleanup and enhanced well productivity.
- Fewer wells are drilled as more methane is kept in the system and sent to market, thereby reducing a range of environmental impacts.

While some operators report the voluntary use of RECs, many wells in the United States are still drilled without REC. And, even for companies that have announced the use of RECs, it is not clear how extensively RECs are implemented. Thus, many states have put REC requirements into effect.

The commercial availability of REC equipment has become so widespread that it is now required in several states. For instance, Colorado requires RECs on all oil and gas wells unless they are not technically and economically feasible.²⁴⁶ Fort Worth, Texas requires RECs.²⁴⁷ Wyoming has required RECs in the Jonah-Pinedale Anticline Development Area (JPAD) since 2007, and more recently, Wyoming has expanded this requirement to all Concentrated Development Areas (CDAs) of oil and gas in the state.²⁴⁸

In 2005, EPA estimated that an average of 7,000 Mcf of natural gas can be recovered during each REC.²⁴⁹ In 2011, EPA increased the emission recovery estimate and created two distinct categories of wells that are major contributors to methane emissions: Unconventional Gas Wells (7,700 Mcf/well workover) and Low Pressure Gas Well Cleanup (1,400 Mcf/well/year). For each unconventional gas well completion, there is an opportunity to generate about \$31,000 in gross revenue, creating a very short payout period if the operator invests in its own equipment.²⁵⁰

Investment in REC equipment is extremely profitable, with a conservative average investment cost of \$10,000 per REC.²⁵¹ The payout occurs quickly if a contractor is hired and the operator only pays a per well REC equipment rental charge. As long as the gas that is captured and sold exceeds the equipment rental charge, the payout is immediate.

Oil and gas operators that have a sufficient number of wells to amortize the cost of REC equipment are finding it more economically attractive to invest in their own technology. Most of the companies that have gone this route report a one- to two-year payout, and substantial profitability thereafter, depending on the gas and condensate recovery rate.²⁵² For smaller operators, it is possible, and maybe more

²⁴⁵ Flaring is not always practicable near populated areas or areas of high forest fire risk.

²⁴⁶ Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission, Rule § 805(b)(3)

²⁴⁷ Fort Worth Texas, Ordinance No. 18449-02-2009.

²⁴⁸ Wyoming Oil and Gas Production Facilities, Chapter 6, Section 2, Permitting Guidance, March 2010.

²⁴⁹ United States Environmental Protection Agency, Cost-Effective Methane Emissions Reductions for Small and Midsize Natural Gas Producers, Journal of Petroleum Technology, June 2005.

²⁵⁰ (7,700 Mcf)(\$4/Mcf)= \$30,800

²⁵¹ EPA's Green Completion PRO FACT Sheet No.703 estimates the cost between \$1K and \$10K; a \$10K per completion cost estimate is conservative.

²⁵² EPA Natural Gas STAR, Green Completions, PRO Fact Sheet No. 703, September 2004.

financially feasible, to rent REC equipment from a contractor. The profitability math is simple. In 2005, the EPA estimated that, on average, 7,000 Mcf/well of natural gas could be captured, yielding a profit of \$14K per well, with a payback of less than one year.²⁵³ However, it is important to note that EPA's 2005 profitability calculations were based on lower gas prices (\$3/Mcf) than the current market rate (\$4+/Mcf). Using the EPA's new 2011 estimate of 7,700 Mcf/well and a gas price of \$4/Mcf, each well, on average, has the potential to generate \$31,000 in gross revenue. A portion of that revenue stream must be allocated to purchasing or renting the required REC equipment, but unless that cost is greater than \$31,000 per well, a REC is a profitable endeavor. Profitability will vary based on the market price for gas and the cost of carrying out the REC.

The EPA has found that RECs are a major contributor to methane reductions on a national scale. In 2008, 50 percent of the EPA's Natural Gas STAR Program's annual total reductions for the oil and gas production sector was attributed to RECs.²⁵⁴ Therefore, requiring this technology will be very important to NYS' and EPA's GHG emission reduction goals.

Recommendation No. 55: Drilling and well completion operations should be coordinated with gas line installation, enabling RECs for all wells drilled subsequent to the initial exploration well. Alternatively, methane gas should be used onsite to generate power, re-injected to improve well performance, or provided to local residents as an affordable fuel supply. NYSDEC should not defer the decision to implement RECs for two more years. The requirement to use RECs in all practicable situations should be included in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure and codified in the NYCRR. This requirement should apply to all natural gas operations, not just HVHF operations.

Wastewater Impoundments:

In 2009, HCLLC pointed out that centralized wastewater impoundments have the potential to be a major source of HAPs—EPA lists facilities that release 10 tons of a single HAP per year as major sources. The 2009 DSGEIS estimated 32.5 tons of methanol²⁵⁵ per year—more than three times the HAP major source threshold—could be emitted from centralized wastewater impoundments.²⁵⁶ This large amount of hazardous air pollution was identified as an unmitigated significant impact.

In 2009, HCLLC recommended the use of closed loop collection and tank systems, rather than wastewater impoundments, as a best practice. The 2011 RDSGEIS prohibits the use of wastewater impoundments at the drillsite, requiring closed loop collection and tank systems. This is a substantial improvement. However, the RDSGEIS does not prohibit centralized flowback impoundments at locations

²⁵³ EPA Natural Gas STAR, Cost-Effective Methane Emission Reductions for Small and Mid-Size Natural Gas Producers, Corpus Christi, Texas, November 1, 2005.

²⁵⁴ 2009 EPA Natural Gas STAR Program Accomplishments, available online at http://www.epa.gov/gasstar/documents/ngstar_accomplishments_2009.pdf. Total sector reductions (2008) = 89.3 Bcf of which 50 percent are the result of RECs (50% of 89.3 Bcf = 45 Bcf).

²⁵⁵ EPA lists methanol as a hazardous air pollutant, but has not yet classified it with respect to carcinogenicity. The reproductive and developmental effect of methanol on humans is not yet understood. <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/hlthef/methanol.html>. Testing in rats has yielded skeletal, cardiovascular, urinary system, and central nervous system malformations. American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists (ACGIH), TLVs and BEIs, Threshold Limit Values for Chemical Substances and Physical Agents, Biological Exposure Indices, Cincinnati, OH, 1999. In humans, chronic inhalation or oral exposure may result in headaches, dizziness, giddiness, insomnia, nausea, gastric disturbances, conjunctivitis, blurred vision, and blindness. Neurological damage, specifically permanent motor dysfunction, may also be a result. The Merck Index. An Encyclopedia of Chemicals, Drugs, and Biologicals. 11th ed. Ed. S. Budavari. Merck and Co. Inc., Rahway, NJ. 1989.

²⁵⁶ 2009 NYSDEC, DSGEIS, Page 6-57.

away from the drillsite and fails to analyze the impacts of such centralization. This represents impermissible segmentation. It is recommended that centralized flowback impoundments be prohibited, however, if this recommendation is not adopted a new draft should be prepared analyzing the potential impacts posed by the reliance on centralized impoundments to store and treat HVHF wastewater and made available for public comment; such a significant analysis cannot be deferred until future site-specific review.

Despite the RDSGEIS's reliance on representations by industry that centralized flowback impoundments are not contemplated at this time, recent experience in Pennsylvania, and other states, reveals that industry's use of centralized flowback impoundments has become common practice. The RDSGEIS either needs to clearly prohibit the use of centralized flowback impoundments in NYS or analyze the potential environmental impacts, including human health impacts, posed by such use and develop ways to avoid or mitigate such impacts.

While industry may not presently intend to build centralized flowback impoundments in NYS, that could change in the future. Based on the use of centralized flowback impoundments as a common industry practice, this is a reasonably foreseeable impact, and unless prohibited is an unmitigated significant impact.

As proposed, there would be no limitations in place for these types of impoundments:

Since September 2009 industry has provided information that: (1) simultaneous drilling and completion operations at a single pad would not occur; (2) the maximum number of wells to be drilled at a pad in a year would be four in a 12-month period; and (3) centralized flowback impoundments, which are large volume, lined ponds that function as fluid collection points for multiple wells, are not contemplated [emphasis added].²⁵⁷

Recommendation No. 56: The use of centralized impoundments to collect waste should be prohibited because these impoundments are a major source of air pollution. This prohibition should be included in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure and codified in the NYCRR.

If centralized flowback impoundments are not prohibited, the potential adverse impacts to human health and the environment must be analyzed fully by NYSDEC. Given that the RDSGEIS includes no analysis whatsoever of the impacts of centralized flowback impoundments, a new draft must be prepared and made available for public comment in order to satisfy the requirements of SEQRA; deferring such analysis for later review would constitute impermissible segmentation. Moreover, mitigation measures to address the potential significant impacts must be included in the SGEIS and codified in the NYCRR.

Gas Dehydrators:

In 2009, HCLLC pointed out that gas dehydration units can emit significant amounts of HAPs and VOCs, and it is best practice to use control devices with gas dehydration units to mitigate HAP and VOC emissions.

²⁵⁷ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Executive Summary, Page 15-16, and Page 6-111.

Dehydrator units remove water moisture from the gas stream. Dehydrator units typically use triethylene glycol (TEG) to remove the water; the TEG absorbs methane, VOCs, and HAPs. These gases are vented to atmosphere unless pollution controls are installed. Best technology for dehydration units includes the installation of flash-tank separators to recover gas pollutants. Alternatively, pollutants can be routed to a vapor collection/destruction unit, or desiccant dehydrators can be used. Desiccant dehydrators have shown to cost less than flash-tank separators, have lower operating and maintenance costs, and control 99% of HAPs.²⁵⁸

The 2011 RDSGEIS requires emissions modeling, using the EPA approved and industry standard model GRI-GlyCalc, and the installation of emission controls for dehydrator units emitting more than one ton per year of benzene. This is an important and substantial improvement.

Appendix 10, Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF, requires:

*The emissions of benzene at any glycol dehydrator to be used at the well pad will be limited to one ton/year as determined by calculations with the GRI-GlyCalc program. If wet gas is encountered, the dehydrator will have a minimum stack height of 30 feet (9.1m) and will be equipped with a control device to limit the benzene emissions to one ton/year;*²⁵⁹

The 2011 RDSGEIS also requires a GHG impacts mitigation plan²⁶⁰ that includes an evaluation of EPA Natural Gas STAR Best Practices for methane and other GHG emissions. However, it does not make GHG emission controls for gas dehydrators mandatory.

NYSDEC's requirement to control emissions from all dehydrators emitting more than one ton per year of benzene will result in emission control on a number of NYS dehydration units. However, smaller dehydration units that do not fall under this requirement may still have economical methane emission control opportunities.

In 2011, the EPA estimated that approximately 8 Bcf of methane is emitted from gas dehydration systems annually. Most of this methane is emitted from smaller glycol dehydration units currently fall below federal regulatory thresholds for emission control. That methane could instead be captured for sale or use as fuel.²⁶¹ While the EPA requires a number of large glycol dehydrators to install emission controls, under the federal Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT) standards at 40 CFR Part 63, Subpart HH, small glycol dehydrators are typically exempt. Many small operating glycol dehydrator units do not have flash tank separators, condensers, electric pumps, or vapor recovery installed.

There are four straightforward solutions readily available to control methane emissions from TEG dehydrator units, including: installing a flash tank separator; optimizing the glycol circulation rate; rerouting the skimmer gas; and installing an electric pump to replace the natural gas driven energy exchange pump.

A typical glycol dehydration system includes the following components:

- **Glycol Contactor:** Wet gas enters the glycol contactor. Glycol removes moisture from the gas by the process of physical absorption. Along with removing moisture, the glycol also absorbs methane,

²⁵⁸ Fernandez, R., Petrusak, R., Robinson, D., Zavadil, D., Cost-Effective Methane Emissions Reductions for Small and Midsize Natural Gas Producers, Journal of Petroleum Technology, June 2005.

²⁵⁹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-108 and 7-109, and Appendix 10, Attachment A.

²⁶⁰ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Executive Summary, Page 24.

²⁶¹ USEPA, Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks; (1990-2009), April 15, 2011.

VOCs, and HAPs. Dry gas exits the glycol contactor absorption column and is either routed to a pipeline or a gas plant.

The glycol contactor unit plays the primary role in dehydrating gas to pipeline specifications; the rest of the glycol dehydration system is required to convert the now moisture rich glycol back into a lean product that can be re-used to dehydrate more incoming gas. Therefore, the next step in the process is to route the moisture rich glycol to “regenerator” and “reboiler” units.

- **Glycol Regenerator & Reboiler:** Glycol loaded with moisture, methane, VOCs, and HAPs (“rich glycol”) exits the bottom of the glycol contactor unit and is routed to the glycol regenerator and reboiler units, where the absorbed components are removed and “lean” glycol is created. If emission controls are not installed, methane, VOCs, HAPs, and water are boiled off and vented to atmosphere from the regenerator and reboiler units.

One way to limit the amount of methane, VOCs, and HAPs emitted to the atmosphere from the regenerator and reboiler units is to install a flash tank separator.

- **Flash Tank Separator:** The installation of a flash tank separator between the glycol contactor and the glycol regenerator/reboiler units creates a pressure drop in the system, allowing methane and some VOCs and HAPs to flash out of (separate from) the glycol. The amount of pressure drop that can be created is a function of the fuel gas system pressure or compressor suction pressure, because methane gas flashed-off at the flash tank separator is then sent to be used as fuel in the TEG reboiler or compressor engine. Simply put, the pressure can only be dropped to a pressure that still exceeds the fuel gas pressure, allowing the collected methane gas to flow into the fuel system. Flash tank separators typically recover 90 percent of the total methane and approximately 10 to 40 percent of the total VOCs that would otherwise be vented to atmosphere. Methane emissions can also be controlled by taking the simple step of adjusting the rate that glycol is circulated in the system.

In 2005, the EPA estimated that the installation of a flash tank separator, on average, resulted in 10 Mcfd (3,650 Mcf/yr) of methane gas captured for sale or use as fuel for each TEG dehydrator (typically a 90 percent reduction in methane emissions). And in 2009, the EPA reported that flash tank separators are installed on *only*: 15 percent of the dehydration units processing less than 1 MMcfd; 40 percent of units processing 1 to 5 MMcfd; and between 65 and 70 percent of units processing more than 5 MMcfd.²⁶² Therefore, an emission control target still exists, especially for small dehydration units.

The installation of a flash tank separator also improves the efficiency of downstream components (e.g. condensers) and reduces fuel costs by providing a fuel source to the TEG reboiler or compressor engine.²⁶³

- **Glycol Recirculation Pump:** Methane emissions are directly proportional to the glycol circulation rate. Circulating glycol at a rate that exceeds the operational need for removing water content from gas unnecessarily increases methane emissions. Glycol circulation rates are typically set at the maximum to account for peak throughput. Gas pressure and flow rate decline over time, requiring the glycol circulation rate to be adjusted to meet operational need. Optimizing the glycol circulation merely requires an engineering assessment and a field operating adjustment. If the glycol dehydration unit includes a condenser, methane emissions can be collected and used for fuel or destroyed, rather than being vented to atmosphere.

In 2005, the EPA estimated that optimizing the glycol circulation rate could result in a wide range of methane capture from 1 to 100Mcfd (18,250 Mcf/yr using a median estimate of 50 Mcfd).²⁶⁴

²⁶² USEPA Natural Gas STAR, Optimize Glycol Circulation and Install Flash Tank Separators in Glycol Dehydrators, 2009.

²⁶³ USEPA Natural Gas STAR, Optimize Glycol Circulation and Install Flash Tank Separators in Glycol Dehydrators, 2009.

- **Condensers:** Some glycol reboilers have condensers to recover natural gas liquids and reduce VOCs and HAPs. However, condensers do not capture methane (because it is a non-condensable gas); therefore, the addition of a condenser does not reduce methane emissions. When condensers are installed, methane gas is typically vented to atmosphere. Alternatively, this methane gas (called “skimmer gas”) can be routed to the reboiler firebox or other low-pressure fuel gas systems.²⁶⁵ In 2005, the EPA estimated that rerouting glycol skimmer gas could result in an average methane capture of 21 Mcfd (7,665 Mcf/yr).²⁶⁶
- **Electric Pump vs. Energy-Exchange Pumps:** Historically, gas-assisted glycol pumps have been used. Where there is an electric supply, the gas-assisted glycol pumps can be replaced with an electric pump. Gas-assisted pumps are driven by the expansion of the high-pressure gas entrained in the rich glycol that leaves the contactor, supplemented by the addition of untreated high-pressure wet (methane rich) natural gas. The high-pressure gas drives pneumatic pumps. Much like pneumatically operated valves, pneumatically operated pumps vent methane.

In 2007, the EPA estimated that between 360 and 36,000 Mcf/yr in methane emission reductions could be achieved by installing an electric pump to replace the natural gas driven glycol energy exchange pump; the wide range in methane emission reductions is a function of the large variation in equipment sizes.²⁶⁷

In 2007, EPA estimated the total potential emission reductions at any given glycol dehydration unit is a function of how many emission control solutions are installed. The total may range from 3,700-35,000 Mcf/year (\$14.8K-\$140K worth of gas leakage). In 2011, EPA estimated 38,000 Mcf/year (\$152K).²⁶⁸ Therefore, controlling methane emissions and other GHG emissions from dehydration units is good business.

However, despite the clear environmental and financial benefits, not all members of the oil and gas industry voluntarily invest in methane control options. Therefore, it is recommended that NYSDEC require operators to evaluate the technical and economic feasibility of installing methane emission controls on gas dehydrators; installation should be mandatory unless an infeasibility determination is made.

Recommendation No. 57: Natural gas operators should be required to evaluate the technical and economic feasibility of installing methane emission controls on gas dehydrators; installation should be mandatory unless an infeasibility determination is made. This requirement should be included in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure and codified in the NYCRR. This requirement should apply to all natural gas operations, not just HVHF operations.

²⁶⁴ The wide range in methane capture opportunity is a function of the dehydrator size, and how efficiently the operator previously optimized the glycol circulation rate.

²⁶⁵ USEPA Natural Gas STAR, Reroute Glycol Skimmer Gas, PRO Fact Sheet No. 201, 2004.

²⁶⁶ EPA Natural Gas STAR, Cost-Effective Methane Emission Reductions for Small and Mid-Size Natural Gas Producers, Corpus Christi, Texas, November 1, 2005.

²⁶⁷ EPA Natural Gas STAR, Natural Gas Dehydration, Producers Technology Transfer Workshop, Durango Colorado, September 13, 2007.

²⁶⁸ USEPA, Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks; (1990-2009), April 15, 2011.

Diesel Engine Emission Control:

In 2009 AKRF recommended that diesel engines should be Tier 2 or higher. AKRF pointed out that “Tier 0” engines could be used, unless NYSDEC limited engines by certification type. Uncertified engines have extremely high emission rates for criteria pollutants such as particulate matter.

Additionally, AKRF recommended that diesel particle filters be installed on diesel engines to reduce particulate matter that has shown to aggravate respiratory systems and is known to be carcinogenic. More specifically AKRF recommended that all engines with a power output of 50 horsepower or greater be equipped with a diesel particle filter, either by the original engine manufacturer or by retrofit.

The 2011 RDSGEIS, Appendix 10 Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF, addressed most of AKRF’s recommendations, by prohibiting Tier 0 engines, requiring Tier 2 engines in most cases, and requiring both Tier 1 and Tier 2 engines to install emission controls. NYSDEC proposes that:

- ***No uncertified (i.e., EPA Tier 0) drilling or hydraulic fracturing engines will be used for any activity at the well sites;***
- ***The drilling engines and drilling air compressors will be limited to EPA Tier 2 or newer equipment. If Tier 1 drilling equipment is to be used, these will be equipped with both particulate traps (CRDPF [Continuously Regenerating Diesel Particulate Filters]) and SCR [Selective Catalytic Reduction] controls. During operations, this equipment will be positioned as close to the center of the well pad as practicable. If industry deviates from the control requirements or proposes alternate mitigation and/or control measures to demonstrate ambient standard compliance, site specific information will be provided to the Department for review and concurrence; and***
- ***The completion equipment engines will be limited to EPA Tier 2 or newer equipment. Particulate traps will be required for all Tier 2 engines. SCR control will be required on all completion equipment engines regardless of the emission Tier. During operations, this equipment will be positioned as close to the center of the well pad as practicable. If industry deviates from this requirement or proposes mitigation and/or alternate control measures to demonstrate ambient standard compliance, site specific information will be provided to the Department for review and concurrence [emphasis added].²⁶⁹***

NYSDEC estimates that 25% of the engines may be Tier 1 engines, and to ensure compliance with National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) it requires the engine to be equipped with both CRDPFs and Selective Catalytic Reduction controls.

While NYSDEC has proposed a number of improvements for diesel engine emission control, the RDSGEIS did not assess whether Tier 1 engines could be eliminated altogether.

Recommendation No. 58: The SGEIS should examine whether it is possible to eliminate Tier 1 engine use. Further examination of AKRF’s recommendation to prohibit Tier 1 engine use is warranted.

²⁶⁹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-108 and 7-109 and Appendix 10, Attachment A, Condition 9-11.

Leak Detection & Repair Program:

In 2009 HCLLC recommended that NYSDEC require Leak Detection and Repair (LDAR) programs including acoustic detectors and infrared technology to detect odorless and colorless leaks. Unmitigated gas leaks pose a risk of fire and explosion, and contribute to GHG, VOC, and HAP emissions, that could otherwise be avoided by routine detection and repair programs.

Methane gas leaks can occur from numerous locations at gas facilities—valves, drains, pumps, threaded and flanged connections, pressure relief devices, open-ended valves and lines, and sample points—as gas moves through equipment under pressure. These leaks are called “fugitive emissions.”

Fugitive emissions from equipment leaks are unintentional losses of methane gas that may occur due to normal wear and tear, improper or incomplete assembly of components, inadequate material specifications, manufacturing defects, damage during installation or use, corrosion, or fouling.²⁷⁰

Because methane is a colorless, odorless gas, leaks often go unnoticed. Historically, leak checks were only performed on equipment components when they were first installed, using a soap bubble test or hand held sensor, to ensure the installation was leak tight. After installation leaks were not typically monitored or repaired unless they became a significant safety hazard. For example, a significant gas leak would be repaired if area, building, or employee monitors set off alarms or if olfactory, audible, or visual indicators observed by facility employees identified the leak. Under these circumstances, the leaks had usually become an obvious safety concern. As a result, methane leaks at outdoor facilities and unmanned facilities often went undetected for long periods of time.

Fugitive emission control is a two-part process that includes: (1) a monitoring program to identify leaks and (2) a repair program to fix the leak. Monitoring program type and frequency is a function of the type of component, and how the component is put to use. In most cases, monitoring programs can be intermittently scheduled at a certain frequency (e.g. monthly or quarterly) to identify leaking equipment. However, permanent leak sensors may be required to detect chronic leakers.²⁷¹

There are many different monitoring tools that can be used to identify leaks, including electronic gas detectors, acoustic detectors, ultrasound detectors, flame ionization detectors, calibrated bagging, high volume sampler, end-of-pipe flow measurement, and infrared leak detection. Once leaks are identified, the operator can evaluate what is causing the leak and develop a replacement or repair program to mitigate the leak.

For example, a hand held infrared camera can be used as a screening tool to detect emissions that are not visible to the naked eye. An infrared camera produces images of gas leaks in real-time.²⁷² It is capable of identifying methane leaks, but cannot quantify the amount of the leak. Infrared cameras produce photos that show methane gas leaks.

Once a leak is identified, and a more quantitative leak flow rate determination is needed, other measurement devices such as Hi-Flow Samplers, Vent-Bag Methods, and Anemometers may be used.²⁷³ Hi-Flow Samplers capture the entire leak, measuring the leak rate directly for leaks up to 10 cubic feet per

²⁷⁰ USEPA, Methane’s Role in Promoting Sustainable Development in the Oil and Natural Gas Industry, 2009.

²⁷¹ Squarek, J. (Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers), Layer, M. (Environment Canada) and Picard, D. (Clearstone Engineering Ltd.), Development of a Best Management Practice in Canada for Controlling Fugitive Emissions at Upstream Oil and Gas Facilities, 2005.

²⁷² Snider, P., Advanced Well Completion Technology to Reduce Methane Emissions and Use of Infrared Cameras for Leak Detection, Global Forum on Flaring and Venting Reduction and Natural Gas Utilisation, 2008.

²⁷³ Heath, M.W., Leak Detection and Quantification of Fugitive Methane Emissions at Natural Gas Facilities, 2009.

minute (cfm), providing leak flow rate and concentration data.²⁷⁴ Toxic Vapor Analyzers and acoustic leak detection systems are other methods to identify methane leaks.²⁷⁵

Fugitive emissions management is an ongoing commitment, not a one-time initiative. The potential for fugitive equipment leaks will increase as facilities age. Successful fugitive emission control plans require trained personnel, emissions testing equipment, and performance tracking systems.

In 2009, the EPA examined the profitability of repairing equipment leaks at oil and gas facilities and found that leak repair is not only an important air pollution control and safety measure, but also is a profitable investment.²⁷⁶ EPA reports that fugitive emissions control provides numerous benefits including: reduced maintenance costs and downtime, improved process efficiency, a safer work environment, a cleaner environment, and resource conservation.

The 2011 RDSGEIS acknowledges the potential impact of gas leaks, and requires a Leak Detection and Repair Program to be included in the operator's GHG Mitigation Plan.

*Because the production phase is the greatest contributor of GHGs and in an effort to mitigate VOC and methane leaks during this phase, the **Department proposes to require, via permit condition and/or regulation, a Leak Detection and Repair Program would include as part of the operator's greenhouse gas emissions impacts mitigation plan which is required for any well subject to permit issuance under the SGEIS** [emphasis added].²⁷⁷*

The 2011 RDSGEIS specifies the minimum requirements for a Leak Detection and Repair Program.

The Leak Detection and Repair Program within the greenhouse gas emissions impacts mitigation plan would contain the following minimum requirements.

- *There would be an ongoing site inspection for readily detected leaks by sight and sound whenever company personnel or other personnel under the direction of the company are on site. Anytime a leak is detected by sight or sound, an attempt at repair should be made. If the leak is associated with mandated worker safety concerns, it should be so noted in follow-up reports;*
- *Within 30 days of a well being placed into production and at least annually thereafter, all wellhead and production equipment, surface lines and metering devices at each well and/or well pad including and from the wellhead leading up to the onsite separator's outlet would be inspected for VOC, methane and other gaseous or liquid leaks. Leak detection would be conducted by visible and audible inspection and through the use of at least one of the following: 1) electronic instrument such as a forward looking infrared camera, 2) toxic vapor analyzer, 3) organic vapor analyzer, or 4) other instrument approved by the department;*
- *All components noted above that are possible sources of leaks would be included in the inspection and repair program. These components include but are not limited to: line heaters, separators, dehydrators, meters, instruments, pressure relief valves,*

²⁷⁴ http://www.heathus.com/_hc/index.cfm/about-us/vision

²⁷⁵ Methane to Markets, Reducing Methane Emissions through Directed Inspection and Maintenance (DI&M), Oil & Gas Subcommittee Technology Transfer Workshop, 2009.

²⁷⁶ Methane to Markets, Reducing Methane Emissions Through Directed Inspection and Maintenance (DI&M), Oil & Gas Subcommittee Technology Transfer Workshop, 2009.

²⁷⁷ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-114 .

vents, connectors, flanges, open-ended lines, pumps and valves from and including the wellhead up to the onsite separator's outlet;

- *For each detected leak, if practical and safe an initial attempt at repair would be made at the time of the inspection, however, any leak that is not able to be repaired during the inspection may be repaired at any time up to 15 days from the date of detection provided it does not pose a threat to on-site personnel or public safety. All leaking components which cannot be repaired at detection would be identified for such repair by tagging. All repaired components would be re-inspected within 15 days from the date of the initial repair and/or re-repair to confirm, using one of the approved leak detection instruments, the adequacy of the repair and to check for leaks. The department may extend the period allowed for the repair(s) based on site-specific circumstances or it may require early well or well pad shutdown to make the repair(s) or other appropriate action based on the number and severity of tagged leaks awaiting repair; and*
- *Site inspection records would be maintained for a minimum period of 5 years. These records would include the date and location of the inspection, identification of each leaking component, the date of the initial attempt at repair, the date(s) and result(s) of any re-inspection and the date of the successful repair if different from initial attempt [emphasis added].²⁷⁸*

The RDSGEIS proposal to require an LDAR Program is a substantial improvement; however, a few changes to the proposed program are recommended:

- An LDAR inspection should be conducted at well/drillsite start-up, not 30 days after. It is best practice to construct and install equipment and test for leaks prior to operation. Equipment should not be operated for 30 days without completing this minimum standard of care.
- Quarterly testing with an infrared camera (as a screening method) should be required, instead of annual testing, as a minimum standard. If the infrared camera screening indicates a leak, the leak location, if clearly pin pointed, should be repaired. Or additional testing should be conducted using more sophisticated tools (described above) to pin-point the leak location, followed by a repair.
- Testing should include all equipment located on the drillsite. As proposed, the RSGEIS suggests the LDAR Program end at the separator's outlet. Equipment will be located downstream of the separator outlet, and prior to the connection the gas transit line that could potentially leak gas. Therefore, it is recommended that the LDAR Program be implemented for all equipment on the drillsite up to and including the gas meter outlet which is connected to the pipeline inlet.

Recommendation No. 59: The proposed LDAR Program should be revised to require: a drillsite LDAR inspection at start-up; quarterly testing with an infrared camera with additional follow-up testing and repair if a leak is indicated; testing of all equipment located on the drillsite up to and including the gas meter outlet which is connected to the pipeline inlet. These requirements should be included in the SGEIS as mitigation measures and codified in the NYCRR, and be required for all natural gas operations, not just HVHF operations.

²⁷⁸ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-115 and 7-116.

Cleaner Power and Fuel Supply Options:

In 2009, HCLLC and AKRF recommended that the SGEIS evaluate the use of cleaner engines and fuels.

In suburban and urban areas of NYS, where a connection to the electric power grid is available, electric engines should be used in lieu of diesel wherever practicable, thus eliminating local diesel exhaust. This alternative would be particularly beneficial where operations are planned near sensitive receptors and in areas that already suffer from high air pollutant loading. Electric engines have the added benefit of quieter operation and less noise impact in urban and suburban settings.

In rural areas, where high-line power is not readily available, an operator should be required to evaluate whether there is a natural gas supply that could be used as fuel. Natural gas fired engines produce less air pollution than diesel engines. A natural gas supply should be available for all wells drilled on a multi-well drillsite, except the first well. Once the first well is drilled using diesel, subsequent wells can be drilled using the natural gas produced by that well to generate power. Smaller temporary gas processing units are available to process wellhead gas to the quality required for equipment use. The use of dual fuel engines would enable switching from diesel to natural gas once it is available.

The use of electric and natural gas engines would result in reduced local pollutant emissions and overall GHG emissions (both grid power and natural gas have a lower carbon footprint than diesel) and generally would have associated cost savings given the reduced fuel transportation and storage needs (e.g. double-wall tanks) and the reduced risk of tank leakage and cleanup associated with the use of fuel gas produced on-site or electric power.

The 2011 RDSGEIS: The 2011 RDSGEIS did not examine cleaner power and fuel supply options. The RDSGEIS only briefly mentioned that electric engines and cleaner fuel options were recommended²⁷⁹ but disregarded the recommendations as “unlikely to be practically implemented to any extent” due to the remote nature of the drillsites. This analysis is incomplete and fails to consider viable alternatives for mitigating air pollution.

Foremost, electric power is available in all suburban and urban areas of NYS, and is currently located in many rural areas as well to supply power to homes, farms and businesses.

Secondly, the use of natural gas-fired engines on a multi-well drillsite is a commonly used mitigation measure. While diesel engines are often used as the prime mover of power supply for rotary well drilling, natural gas or dual fuel (diesel/gas) engines are available to take advantage of cleaner fuel supplies.²⁸⁰ EnCana, a gas producer, reports that natural gas-fired rigs reduce air pollution by 90% compared to diesel fired rigs.²⁸¹ Power can also be supplied to the drilling rig by a natural gas-powered reciprocating turbine that can generate electricity on site.

²⁷⁹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 6-144.

²⁸⁰ www.naturalgas.org.

²⁸¹ EnCana 2005 Annual Report.

Recommendation No. 60: In suburban and urban areas of NYS, where a connection to the electric power grid is available, electric engines should be used in lieu of diesel wherever practicable, eliminating the local diesel exhaust from those engines. In rural areas, where high-line power is not readily available, an operator should be required to evaluate whether there is a natural gas supply that could be used as fuel; if so, use of the natural gas supply should be mandatory to the extent practicable. Cleaner power and fuel selection requirements should be included in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure and codified in the NYCRR. These requirements should apply to all natural gas operations, not just HVHF operations.

18. Surface Setbacks from Sensitive Receptors

Background: The 2009 DSGEIS did not propose sufficient safety or quality-of-life surface setbacks from sensitive human and environment resource receptors. This problem persists in the 2011 RDSGEIS. Noise, traffic, odor, air, and water pollution impacts to sensitive receptors will be significant if the small setbacks proposed in the RDSGEIS are adopted.

Surface setbacks should be increased to mitigate significant impacts and to create a safe environment for the affected public. For example:

- Blowouts can eject drilling mud, hydrocarbons, and/or formation water from a well onto adjacent waters and lands. Depending on reservoir pressure, blowout circumstances, and wind speed, these pollutants can be distributed hundreds to thousands of feet away from a well. These pollutants can then be further transported in the subsurface or on the surface, creating a large area of contamination in a very short amount of time.
- Chemicals, fuels, and explosive charges (e.g. perforating guns) may be located at the drillsite and may pose hazards to the public, in addition to the flammable, explosive, and hazardous gases (e.g. hydrogen sulfide gas, benzene) that are produced from the well and associated equipment.
- The potential radius of impact for explosions, fire, and other industrial hazards should be considered. For example, the city of Fort Worth, Texas uses the International Fire Code as the basis for its minimum 600' setback from Barnett shale gas drilling operations.²⁸² Whereas, NYCRR only provides for a 100' setback from a home. 6 NYCRR § 553.2.
- High pressure hose leaks can spray industrial fluids off the drilling pad and onto surrounding properties or waters. The radius of contamination will depend on system pressure, shut-down reaction timing, wind speed, and other factors.

For example, in September 2009, 1,300 gallons of well chemicals were leaked during a hydraulic fracture treatment at the Cabot Heitsman 4H well located in Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania, and flowed into the nearby Steven's Creek located more than 100 feet away, despite protections in place under the operator's required Pennsylvania PPC plan.²⁸³

Recommendation No. 61: The SGEIS should provide scientific and technical justification for each setback distance proposed to demonstrate how that distance is protective of the nearby sensitive receptor. A hazard identification analysis should be completed to assess the safe distance from human and sensitive environmental receptors to proposed shale gas drilling and HVHF operations. The analysis should assess blowout radius, spill trajectory, explosion hazards, other industrial hazards, fire code compliance, human health, agricultural health, and quality-of-life factors. Improved setbacks as a result of this analysis should be included in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure and codified in the NYCRR.

While statewide minimum setbacks to protect human health, provide safe buffers, and protect the environment should be established, both the RDSGEIS and NYCRR should include a provision to allow local communities to establish more protective setbacks than statewide regulations to address unique and site-specific local concerns and community characteristics.

²⁸² Fort Worth Gas Drilling Regulations Presentation, Barnett Shale EXPO, March 11, 2009.

²⁸³ Cabot Oil & Gas Corporation, Engineering Study, for submittal to PADEP, In Response to Order dated September 24, 2009, prepared by URS Corporation for Cabot, October 9, 2009.

Recommendation No. 62: The SGEIS and NYCRR should allow local zoning authorities to establish more protective setbacks than statewide regulations to address unique and site-specific local concerns and community characteristics. The ability to improve local setbacks should be included in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure and codified in the NYCRR.

The 2011 RDSGEIS: The 2011 RDSGEIS proposes additional setbacks from aquifers, wells, and water bodies for HVHF operations, but does not establish additional setbacks from homes or public buildings.

NYSDEC does not provide scientific or technical justification in the RDSGEIS for the setback distances it has selected. Setbacks ranging from 150' to 2,000' are included in the RDSGEIS without justification for how or why those particular distances were selected or determined to be adequate to protect water resources.

The 2011 RDSGEIS proposes the following setbacks:

- **500' setback from primary and principal aquifers.** However, for principal aquifers, drilling and HVHF operations can occur within that 500' buffer with additional review, and for both primary and principal aquifers the setback distance will be reconsidered in two years in a yet to be determined process.

Well pads for high-volume hydraulic fracturing would be prohibited within 500 feet of primary aquifers (subject to reconsideration 2 years after issuance of the first permit for high-volume hydraulic fracturing).²⁸⁴

For at least two years from issuance of the first permit for high-volume hydraulic fracturing, proposals for high-volume hydraulic fracturing at any well pad within 500 feet of principal aquifers, would require (1) site-specific SEQRA determinations of significance and (2) individual State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) permits for stormwater discharges. The Department would re-evaluate the necessity of this approach after two years of experience issuing permits in areas outside of the 500-foot boundary.²⁸⁵

- **2,000' setback from a public water supply,** unless a shale gas well is located within 1000' of a subsurface water supply designated by the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP). However, these setbacks will be reconsidered in three years in a yet to be determined process.

The Department will not issue well permits for high-volume hydraulic fracturing at the following locations...any proposed well pad within 2,000 feet of public water supply wells, river or stream intakes and reservoirs (subject to reconsideration 3 years after issuance of the first permit for high-volume hydraulic fracturing).²⁸⁶

The Department proposes that site-specific environmental assessments and SEQRA determinations of significance be required for ... any proposed well location determined by NYCDEP to be within 1,000 feet of its subsurface water supply infrastructure.²⁸⁷

²⁸⁴ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 1-17.

²⁸⁵ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 1-18.

²⁸⁶ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 3-15.

²⁸⁶ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 3-16.

²⁸⁷ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 3-15.

Recommendation No. 63: The process for revising the 500' setback from primary and principal aquifers and the 2,000' setback from a public water supply in two and three years, respectfully, is unclear. NYSDEC should clarify the review process, including an explanation of its plans for public review and comment. NYSDEC should revise its regulations at 6 NYCRR § 617.4(b) to provide that the siting of any oil or gas well within 500' of a primary aquifer or within 2,000' of a public water supply is a Type I action.

- **500' setback from a private water well.**

The Department will not issue well permits for high-volume hydraulic fracturing at the following locations...any proposed well pad within 500 feet of private drinking water wells or domestic uses springs, unless waived by the owner.²⁸⁸

The RDSGEIS provides no rationale as to why a public water supply would be afforded a 2,000' setback, while a private water well would only be afforded at 500' setback.

Recommendation No. 64: The SGEIS should examine whether waivers to the 500' private water well setback comport with federal law and the requirement to protect Underground Sources of Drinking Water (USDWs). The SGEIS should provide technical justification for any reduction in this setback, and should not allow a private well owner to reduce the setback such that it poses a risk to its water supply, as well as other user in the area. Private land owners should not be allowed to waive setbacks from private water wells and adversely affect the water quality of neighboring wells.

- **150' setback from a stream, storm drain, lake, or pond.**

Based on the above information and mitigating factors, the Department proposes that site specific SEQRA review be required for projects involving any proposed well pad where the closest edge is located within 150 feet of a perennial or intermittent stream, storm drain, lake or pond.²⁸⁹

The 150' setback language conflicts with the 2,000' setback language above, because it allows a closer setback from lakes, rivers and streams than from a public water supply. It is not clear which lakes, rivers, and streams would be protected by the 150' setback, and which would be protected by a 2,000' setback.

On October 3, 2011 Pennsylvania Governor Corbett announced plans to implement the Marcellus Shale Advisory Commission recommendation to increase the setback distance for wells near streams, rivers, ponds and other bodies of water to at least 300'.²⁹⁰ An increased set back to at least 300' should also be considered by NYS.

²⁸⁸ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-76.

²⁸⁹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-76.

²⁹⁰ Pennsylvania Office of the Governor, News Release, Governor Corbett Announces Plans to Implement Key Recommendations of Marcellus Shale Advisory Commission, October 3, 2011.

Recommendation No. 65: The conflicting language between the 150' setback requirement and 2,000' setback requirement for lakes, rivers, and streams needs to be resolved in both the SGEIS and the NYCRR. As drafted, neither the RDSGEIS nor the NYCRR are clear which lakes, rivers, and streams would be protected by the 150' setback, and which would be protected by a 2,000' setback. NYSDEC should indicate whether it intends to apply the 150' setback only to surface water resources that are not actual or potential public drinking water supplies. NYSDEC should also explain whether the 150' set back is sufficient to protect those water resources, or whether this setback should be increased. Improved setbacks as a result of this analysis should be included in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure and codified in the NYCRR.

- **4,000' setback from NYC and Syracuse watersheds.**

Accordingly, the Department recommends that regulations be adopted to prohibit high-volume hydraulic fracturing in both the NYC and Skaneateles Lake watersheds, as well as in a 4,000 -foot buffer area surrounding these watersheds, to provide an adequate margin of safety from the full range of operations related to high-volume hydraulic fracturing that extend away from the well pad. The Department also is presenting this proposal based on its consistency with the principles of source water protection and the "multi-barrier" approach to systematically assuring drinking water quality.²⁹¹

Recommendation No. 66: The 4,000' setback from NYC and Syracuse watersheds should be added to the proposed regulatory revisions for operations associated with HVHF at 6 NYCRR § 560.4. The SGEIS and NYCRR should also clarify if activities associated with HVHF drilling and completions will be prohibited underneath the watershed as well as on the surface.

NYSDEC has not provided engineering or scientific justification for the setback distances it has selected, other than a brief assessment of the setbacks that are allowed in other states. NYSDEC ultimately selected setbacks that are not as protective as those identified by the agency's consultants. For example, the RDSGEIS, states:

The required setbacks from surface water supplies in other states reviewed by Alpha vary between 100 and 350 feet.²⁹²

NYSDEC's consultants collected information that shows a more protective 350' setback is in use in other states; however, NYSDEC concludes that only a 150' setback will be required. This is less than half the distance of the most protective standard found by NYSDEC's consultants, and the 150' setback can be further reduced at NYSDEC's discretion based on a site-specific SEQRA review:

Based on the above information and mitigating factors, the Department proposes that site specific SEQRA review be required for projects involving any proposed well pad where the closest edge is located within 150 feet of a perennial or intermittent stream, storm drain, lake or pond.²⁹³

²⁹¹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-56.

²⁹² 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-76.

²⁹³ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-76.

Of note, the RDSGEIS does not address setbacks from homes or public buildings. The RDSGEIS merely requires the operator to document the distance from the proposed drilling and HVHF operations to "...any residences, occupied structures or places of assembly within 1,320 feet."²⁹⁴ However, no new setback is established for homes or public buildings, other than required by current regulations.

NYCRR Proposed Revisions: The new setbacks proposed in the RDSGEIS are codified in regulation at 6 NYCRR §560.4. These setbacks would apply only to wells that undergo HVHF. NYSDEC does not explain why these setbacks would not apply to all oil and gas well drilling in NYS, despite the fact that 6 NYCRR § 553.2 (Well Surface Restrictions) applies to all NYS oil and gas wells. NYSDEC has not justified its limiting of new setback increases to HVHF wells only.

Recommendation No. 67: The setback increases proposed in the RDSGEIS should apply to all oil and gas drilling in NYS and should be codified at 6 NYCRR § 553.2.

The existing NYCRR allows drilling, HVHF operations, and production equipment to be located within 100' from an inhabited private dwelling and within 150' from a public building or area that may be used as a place of "resort, assembly, education, entertainment, lodging, trade, manufacture, repair, storage, traffic or occupancy by the public." The existing NYCRR also allows drilling, HVHF operations, and production equipment to be located within 50' from a public stream, river, or other body of water. There is no required setback from buildings or structures used for agriculture. 6 NYCRR § 553.2.

The proposed revisions to the NYCRR include 500' setbacks from primary aquifers, 2,000' setbacks from public water supplies, and 500' setbacks from private wells. Proposed 6 NYCRR § 560.4. However, these setbacks apply only to wells that undergo HVHF, and do not apply to all wells that undergo hydraulic fracturing operations in NYS.

NYSDEC's setback analysis does not take into account that directional drilling technology enables wells to be drilled to a bottom-hole location at 3-5 miles²⁹⁵ away from a wellhead. In directional drilling, it is now common for the horizontal displacement of the bottom hole location to be several times the total vertical depth (TVD) of the well. For example, a well with a vertical depth of 5,000' could have a bottom hole horizontal displacement of 10,000-15,000' from the drill site, or more. A well with a vertical depth of 7,000' could have a bottom hole horizontal displacement of 14,000-21,000' from the drill site, or more. For example, in 1997, BP drilled a well to approximately 5,300' achieving a 33,182' horizontal displacement, meaning the wellhead was located over 6 miles away from the hydrocarbon target.²⁹⁶ In 1997, a 6-mile horizontal displacement was a great feat; now, extended reach drilling (ERD) is commonplace in the industry, and wells are routinely drilled to hydrocarbon targets miles away from the wellhead.

Given the flexibility afforded by the fact that 640-acre spacing units may vary in shape, from square to rectangular, and that surface drillsites need not be located over the spacing unit, well operators utilizing directional drilling technology have a greater ability to select surface drillsite locations that optimize distance from sensitive public and private resources.


As shown in the figure below, the setbacks currently proposed in the RDSGEIS and in the NYCRR are inadequate. Shale drilling and HVHF operations within 100'-150' of homes and public buildings pose a direct safety risk, not to mention the health and quality of life impacts presented. NYSDEC is proposing

²⁹⁴ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 3-10.

²⁹⁵ Well step-out distance that can be achieved will depend on well depth.

²⁹⁶ BP, Extended-Reach Drilling: Breaking the 10-km Barrier, 1997.

to allow shale drilling and HVHF operations to run 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, which will result in significant impacts to human health and quality of life—disrupting sleep, work, schooling, and recreational patterns for nearby residents.



By comparison, the local zoning setback requirements for Barnett Shale development implemented in the urban area of Fort Worth, Texas are substantially larger than those proposed for NYS.²⁹⁷ As shown in the figure below, the required setback from a home is six times larger at 600', as compared to NYS' 100' setback. Additionally, Fort Worth, Texas has implemented setbacks of at least 300' from public buildings and 600' from schools, which is more than double what is proposed by NYSDEC.²⁹⁸

At a state level, Wyoming requires a minimum setback of 350' from “water supplies, residences, schools, hospitals, and other structures where people are known to congregate.”²⁹⁹ The below photograph shows the proximity of homes to a well pad in Pennsylvania, where a 200' minimum setback from homes is required.³⁰⁰

²⁹⁷ Fort Worth Gas Drilling Regulations Presentation, Barnett Shale EXPO, March 11, 2009; the Code of Ordinances of the City of Fort Worth § 15-36(A).


²⁹⁸ The Code of Ordinances of the City of Fort Worth § 15-34(N)(7), § 15-36(A).

²⁹⁹ Wyo. Admin. Code OIL GEN Ch. 3 § 22(b).

³⁰⁰ Governor’s Marcellus Shale Advisory Commission Report, Prepared for Governor Corbett of Pennsylvania, July 22, 2011.



The photo above shows homes within close proximity to shale drilling operations in Hopewell Township, Washington County, PA.



Recommendation No. 68: Improved setbacks should be included in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure and codified in the NYCRR. Specifically, the SGEIS and NYCRR should be revised at 6 NYCRR § 553.2 to include the following minimum setbacks: homes, public buildings, and schools (1,320'; ¼ mile); private and public wells, primary aquifers, and other sensitive water resources (4,000'); and other water resources (660'; 1/8 mile). Additionally, NYSDEC should clarify the authority of local zoning authorities to establish minimum setbacks that are more protective than NYS' minimum standards in order for localities to address unique and site-specific local concerns and community characteristics.

In addition to the inadequate minimum setback requirements, the NYCRR allows an operator to move its surface location by 75' without obtaining a permit amendment. 6 NYCRR § 552.3(b). Absent NYSDEC and public review, a 75' adjustment is very significant, especially when setbacks as low as 50' to 150' are used. The regulations at 6 NYCRR § 552.3 explain that a 75' surface location adjustment is allowed, without any permit amendment process, to account for surface obstructions or topography. However, if an operator's due diligence and site planning during the original permit process include an examination of surface obstructions and topography, later adjustments should not be necessary.

Recommendation No. 69: The NYCRR should be revised at 6 NYCRR § 552.3 to allow the well location to be adjusted by 75' without a permit amendment only if all the statewide and local setback requirements are still preserved.

The proposed regulations that govern HVHF SPDES permits also suffer from inadequate minimum setback requirements. The revisions proposed to 6 NYCRR § 750-3.3 include: a 4,000' setback from an unfiltered water supply; a 500' setback from a primary aquifer; no operations within a 100-year floodplain; and a 2,000' setback from a public water supply, including wells, natural lakes, man-made impoundments, rivers and streams. However, neither the existing regulations nor the proposed revisions to 6 NYCRR § 750-3.3 include setbacks from streams, rivers, or other bodies of water that are not specifically designated as public water supplies. Thus, HVHF operations potentially could be as close as 50' to streams, rivers, or other bodies of water, based on 6 NYCRR § 553.2. Also, the proposed regulations do not require a minimum setback of HVHF operations from private wells.

Further inconsistency is introduced in the proposed revisions to 6 NYCRR § 750-3.21, which prohibit HVHF operations within 100' of a wetland. While this setback requirement is recognized in the RDSGEIS,³⁰¹ the proposed revisions to 6 NYCRR § 553.2 and 6 NYCRR § 560.4 do not include a parallel requirement. These sections of the regulations should be revised to include a wetland setback.

Recommendation No. 70: The NYCRR should be revised at 6 NYCRR § 553.2 to include a wetland setback of at least 100' as described in the RDSGEIS.

The proposed revisions to 6 NYCRR § 750-3.21(f)(3) do not authorize the issuance of a SPDES permit for HVHF operations within 150' of storm drains, lakes, ponds, and perennial or intermittent streams, which conflicts with the 50' setback established at 6 NYCRR § 553.2. There remains confusion about which setbacks would be applied to lakes, ponds, and perennial or intermittent streams and rivers.

Recommendation No. 71: The NYCRR should be revised at 6 NYCRR § 750-3.3, 6 NYCRR § 750-3.2, 6 NYCRR § 553.2, and 6 NYCRR § 560.4 to provide consistent setback requirements that are protective of water sources, including rivers, streams, lakes, and private water supplies.

NYCRR should be clear that the intent, as stated in the RDSGEIS, is to measure setbacks from the edge of the drillsite, and to attempt to center wells on the drillsite to maximize the distance from the well to the drillsite edge.

Recommendation No. 72: NYCRR and the SGEIS should clarify that setbacks are measured from the edge of the drillsite. Wells should be centered on the well pad and should be set back at least 100' from the pad edge, to maximize well setbacks from sensitive receptors.

³⁰¹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 2-34.

19. Disposal of Drilling & Production Waste and Equipment Containing Naturally Occurring Radioactive Material (NORM)

Background: In 2009, HCLLC made recommendations to NYSDEC on best practices for disposal of drilling and production waste and equipment containing Naturally Occurring Radioactive Materials (NORM). NORM includes uranium, thorium, radium, and lead-210 and their decay products.³⁰² Additionally, radon, a component of natural gas, decays into radioactive polonium.

NORM can be brought to the surface in a number of ways during drilling, completion, and production operations:

- **Drilling:** Drill cuttings containing NORM are circulated to the surface.
- **Completion:** Wells stimulated using hydraulic fracture treatments inject water; a portion of that water flows back to the surface (“flowback”) and can be contaminated by radioactive materials picked up during subsurface transport.
- **Production:** Subsurface water located in natural gas reservoirs, produced as a waste byproduct, may contain radioactive materials picked up by contact with gas or formations containing NORM (this water is called “produced water”). Equipment used in hydrocarbon production and processing can concentrate radioactive materials in the form of scale and sludge.

In January 2011, NYSDEC’s consultant, Alpha Geoscience, agreed that the disposal of waste containing NORM is an important issue that should be addressed in the SGEIS. Alpha Geoscience’s review of HCLLC’s recommendations on NORM concluded that:

Harvey Consulting’s recommendation to analyze practices for NORM testing, NORM treatment, and NORM disposal appears to be complete and well-researched. The review presents a concise analysis of practices involving the testing for and the treatment and disposal of NORM.

Harvey Consulting’s review of the dSGEIS’s content regarding NORM is supported by a range of reliable sources. References include the EPA’s website, USGS fact sheets, Texas Railroad Commission regulations, and a publication by Argonne National Laboratory.³⁰³

Alpha Geoscience recommended that the SGEIS include a detailed analysis of NORM testing, treatment, transportation, and disposal methods:

*Alpha suggests that **it may be useful to operators if the SGEIS includes NYSDEC’s detailed analyses of NORM testing, treatment, transportation, and disposal.** This information may prove useful to the operator for developing handling and disposal plans [emphasis added].³⁰⁴*

³⁰² USEPA Oil and Gas Production Wastes, NORM, <http://www.epa.gov/radiation/tenorm/oilandgas.html>.

³⁰³ Alpha Geoscience, Review of the dSGEIS and Identification Best Technology and Best Practices Recommendations, Harvey Consulting, LLC; December 28, 2009, prepared for NYSERDA, January 20, 2011, Pages 9-11.

³⁰⁴ Alpha Geoscience, Review of the dSGEIS and Identification Best Technology and Best Practices Recommendations, Harvey Consulting, LLC; December 28, 2009, prepared for NYSERDA, January 20, 2011, Page 12.

Yet, Alpha Geoscience recommended against adopting specific regulations to formalize NORM testing, treatment, transportation, and disposal requirements in NYS; instead, Alpha Geoscience recommended that NYSDEC “consider” having “temporary guidelines.”

Alpha suggests that NYSDEC consider having temporary guidelines regarding NORM in place, to clarify expectations and requirements for operators prior to the commencement of operations. This also would be helpful to operators for the design of handling and disposal plans [emphasis added].³⁰⁵

HCLLC disagrees with Alpha Geoscience’s recommendation for temporary NORM disposal guidelines. The requirements for testing, treatment, transportation, and disposal of NORM should be formalized in NYCRR. The rules should be clear to industry and the public, and enforceable by NYSDEC.

The 2009 DSGEIS acknowledged that drilling and production waste and equipment may contain NORM. NYSDEC reports that the Marcellus Shale contains Uranium-238 and Radium-226, and this NORM may be present in drill cuttings, produced water, and stimulation treatment waste.³⁰⁶ NYSDEC identified Radium-226 as the most significant NORM of concern, because it is water soluble and has a half-life of 1,600 years.³⁰⁷ Radiation pathways can include external gamma radiation, ingestion, inhalation of particulates, and radon gas.³⁰⁸

In 2009, HCLLC recommended that the SGEIS address the potential for equipment scale and sludge to contain high concentrations of NORM. HCLLC explained that equipment (water lines, flow lines, injection wellheads, vapor recovery units, water storage tanks, heaters/treaters, and separators)³⁰⁹ used to process natural gas and produced water containing NORM can become coated with radium scale and sludge deposits.³¹⁰ Scale precipitates from produced water when it is brought to the surface, cooled to lower temperatures, and subject to lower pressures.³¹¹ The most common form of scale is barium sulfate, which readily incorporates radium in its structure. HCLLC noted that, because E&P waste is exempt from the federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA),³¹² it is critical that states establish clear best practice requirements for handling E&P waste, especially for NORM found in equipment scale and sludge. HCLLC pointed out that other oil and gas states, such as Texas and Louisiana, have adopted stringent NORM regulations, including: occupational dose control, surveys; testing and monitoring; record keeping; signs and labeling; and treatment and disposal methods.³¹³

³⁰⁵ Alpha Geoscience, Review of the dSGEIS and Identification Best Technology and Best Practices Recommendations, Harvey Consulting, LLC; December 28, 2009, prepared for NYSERDA, January 20, 2011, Page 11.

³⁰⁶ 2009 NYSDEC, DSGEIS, Page 4-36.

³⁰⁷ 2009 NYSDEC, DSGEIS, Page 6-129.

³⁰⁸ US Department of Interior, Naturally Occurring Radioactive Materials (NORM) in Produced Water and Oil-Field Equipment—an Issue for the Energy Industry, USGS Fact Sheet FS-142-99.

³⁰⁹ Argonne National Laboratory, Radiological Dose Assessment Related to Management of Naturally Occurring Radioactive Materials Generated by the Petroleum Industry, Publication ANL/EAD-2, 1996.

³¹⁰ US Department of Interior, Naturally Occurring Radioactive Materials (NORM) in Produced Water and Oil-Field Equipment—an Issue for the Energy Industry, USGS Fact Sheet FS-142-99.

³¹¹ US Department of Interior, Naturally Occurring Radioactive Materials (NORM) in Produced Water and Oil-Field Equipment—an Issue for the Energy Industry, USGS Fact Sheet FS-142-99.

³¹² Environmental Protection Agency, Exemption of Oil and Gas Exploration and Production Wastes from Federal Hazardous Waste Regulations, EPA530-K-01-004, October 2002.

³¹³ 2009 NYSDEC, DSGEIS, Page 7-101.

The 2011 RDSGEIS: The 2011 RDSGEIS provided some improved data and acknowledged the risk of significant impacts from improperly disposed waste containing NORM. The RDSGEIS concluded that the NORM dataset is limited and there can be significant variability in NORM content. The 2011 RDSGEIS based its conclusions on data collected in other states; this data examined Marcellus Shale cuttings, produced water, and HVHF flowback.

However, the 2011 RDSGEIS still does not establish clear cradle-to-grave collection, testing, transportation, treatment, and disposal requirements for all waste containing NORM. The RDSGEIS is improved in that it establishes radioactive limitations and testing in some cases, but testing is still not required in all cases (even when data uncertainty exists). Long-term treatment and disposal requirements are not robust for all waste types. Nor is there a process in place to provide the public with information on NORM handling over the project life. For example:

- Radioactivity treatment and disposal threshold levels are established (e.g. for produced water and equipment); however, it is unclear if there is sufficient treatment and disposal capacity in NYS to handle the volume and amount of radioactive waste that may be generated;
- NYSDEC assumes that some waste will not contain significant amounts of radioactivity; yet, this assumption is based on a very limited dataset;
- There is no testing requirement to verify NORM content in drill cuttings before they are sent directly to a landfill; and
- Road spreading of waste is not prohibited; it is deferred to a yet-to-be determined future process outside the SGEIS review.

Recommendation No. 73: Detailed collection, testing, transportation, treatment, and disposal methods for each type of drilling and production waste and equipment containing NORM should be included in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure and codified in the NYCRR. Where data uncertainty exists, additional testing should be required. The radioactive content of waste should be verified to ensure appropriate transportation, treatment, and disposal methods are selected, and the testing results should be disclosed to the public.

Equipment Containing NORM: The 2011 RDSGEIS contains substantially improved requirements for equipment containing NORM, including a new radiation testing requirement and a treatment and disposal threshold limit. The RDSGEIS concludes that pipe scale and sludge (NORM buildup in equipment) can result in NORM concentrations that may have a significant adverse impact.

The 2011 RDSGEIS clarifies that NYSDOH will require the well operator to obtain a radioactive materials license for its facility when exposure rate measurements associated with scale accumulation in or on piping, drilling, and brine storage equipment exceeds 50 microR/hr³¹⁴ ($\mu\text{R/hr}$).³¹⁵ The RDSGEIS does not explain the origin of the 50 $\mu\text{R/hr}$ limit; however, this limit has been used by a number of oil and gas producing states, including Texas³¹⁶ and Louisiana.³¹⁷

³¹⁴ Microrentgens per hour ($\mu\text{R/hr}$) is a measurement of exposure from x-ray and gamma ray radiation in air.

³¹⁵ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 5-142.

³¹⁶ Texas Administrative Code, Title 16, Part 1, Chapter 4, Subchapter F, Economic Regulation, Railroad Commission of Texas, Environmental Protection, Oil and Gas NORM.

³¹⁷ Louisiana Administrative Code, Title 33 LAC Part XV, Radiation Protection.

Presumably, equipment containing a radioactive concentration of less than 50 $\mu\text{R/hr}$ would be disposed of in a NYS landfill; however, it is unclear if NYS' landfills are designed to accommodate waste containing radioactivity of up to 50 $\mu\text{R/hr}$.

Recommendation No. 74: NYSDEC should explain the origin of the 50 $\mu\text{R/hr}$ limit, and explain how NYS determined that this threshold is sufficiently protective for NYS. The SGEIS should explain where equipment containing a radioactive concentration of less than 50 $\mu\text{R/hr}$ would be disposed (e.g. a NYS landfill), and whether this waste disposal method was designed for this waste handling purpose.

The RDSGEIS Chapter 7 (Section 7.7.2) proposes NORM testing (radiation survey) requirements:

***The Department proposes to require, via permit condition and/or regulation, that radiation surveys be conducted at specified time intervals for Marcellus wells developed by high-volume hydraulic fracturing completion methods on all accessible well piping, tanks, or other equipment that could contain NORM scale buildup.** The surveys would be required to be conducted for as long as the facility remains in active use. Once taken out of use no increases in dose rate are to be expected. Therefore, surveys may stop until either the site again becomes active or equipment is planned to be removed from the site. If equipment is to be removed, radiation surveys would be performed to ensure appropriate disposal of the pipes and equipment. All surveys would be conducted in accordance with NYSDOH protocols. The NYSDOH's Radiation Survey Guidelines and a sample Radioactive Materials Handling License are presented in Appendix 27. The Department finds that existing regulations, in conjunction with the proposed requirements for radiation surveys, would fully mitigate any potential significant impacts from NORM [emphasis added].*³¹⁸

NYSDEC's proposal to require NORM testing (radiation surveys) for HVHF wells and equipment is an important improvement. This proposed mitigation measure is effectively translated into a permit condition. Appendix 10, Proposed EAF Addendum Requirements for HVHF, Condition No. 65, requires:

*65) Periodic **radiation surveys must be conducted at specified time intervals** during the production phase for Marcellus wells developed by high-volume hydraulic fracturing completion methods. Such surveys must be performed on all accessible well piping, tanks, or equipment that could contain NORM scale buildup. The surveys must be conducted for as long as the facility remains in active use. If piping, tanks, or equipment is to be removed, radiation surveys must be performed to ensure their appropriate disposal. All surveys must be conducted in accordance with NYSDOH protocols [emphasis added].*³¹⁹

However, this permit condition is only applied to HVHF wells and equipment. NORM can accumulate in all oil and gas equipment; therefore, this requirement is better suited for the NYCRR and should be applied to all oil and gas operations.

Additionally, it is recommended that the radiation testing frequency and method be specified. As explained in Dr. Glenn Miller's and Dr. Ralph Seiler's comments on the 2011 RDSGEIS, the test method is an important determinant in quantifying total radioactivity.³²⁰ Furthermore, Dr. Glenn Miller and Dr.

³¹⁸ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-119.

³¹⁹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 10, Page 12.

³²⁰ Miller, G. and Seiler, R., Comments Prepared for NRDC on 2011 NYSDEC, DSGEIS, 2012.

Ralph Seiler recommended that radiation testing not be limited to radium. For example, Dr. Ralph Seiler points out in his comments that while NYSDEC has identified Radium (Ra) as a contaminant of concern, NYSDEC has overlooked the potential significant unmitigated impact of Polonium 210 (²¹⁰Po) accumulating in pipe scale as a byproduct of radon decay (natural gas contains radon).³²¹

Recommendation No. 75: The requirement for radiation surveys should be codified in the NYCRR and applied to all oil and gas operations, not just HVHF operations. Radiation testing frequency and method should be specified to ensure that all potential radiation impacts are assessed and quantified. The proposed HVHF Permit Condition No. 65 could serve as a starting point for the NYCRR revisions.

Produced Water and Flowback Wastewater NORM: In 2009, HCLLC pointed out that water produced from wells can be rich in chloride, which enhances the solubility of other elements, including the radioactive element radium.³²² HCLLC also noted that flowback wastewater can contain NORM.

In 2009, NYSDEC reported that it had insufficient data on NORM in produced water and flowback wastewater, but acknowledged that NORM is present and is known to be found in elevated levels in produced water.

The Department of Energy (DOE) explains the presence of NORM in produced water:

Because the water has been in contact with the hydrocarbon-bearing formation for centuries, it contains some of the chemical characteristics of the formation and the hydrocarbon itself. *It may include water from the reservoir, water injected into the formation, and any chemicals added during the production and treatment processes. Produced water is also called “brine” and “formation water.”* **The major constituents of concern in produced water are:**

- *Salt content (salinity, total dissolved solids, electrical conductivity)*
- *Oil and grease (this is a measure of the organic chemical compounds)³²³*
- *Various natural inorganic and organic compounds or chemical additives used in drilling and operating the well*
- **Naturally occurring radioactive material (NORM).**

The physical and chemical properties of produced water vary considerably depending on the geographic location of the field, the geological host formation, and the type of hydrocarbon product being produced. Produced water properties and volume can even vary throughout the lifetime of a reservoir [emphasis added].³²⁴

³²¹ Seiler, R., Comments Prepared for NRDC on 2011 NYSDEC, DSGEIS, 2012.

³²² US Department of Interior, Naturally Occurring Radioactive Materials (NORM) in Produced Water and Oil-Field Equipment—an Issue for the Energy Industry, USGS Fact Sheet FS-142-99.

³²³ In addition to the major constituents of concern listed by DOE for produced water, Dr. Glenn Miller notes that both the gasoline and diesel range hydrocarbon fractions should be monitored, since they are more soluble than heavy hydrocarbons.

³²⁴ United States Department of Energy, Produced Water Management Information System, <http://www.netl.doe.gov/technologies/pwmis/intropw/index.html>.

Since 2009, NYSDEC gathered additional information and improved the 2011 RDSGEIS to acknowledge and quantify the potential adverse impact of produced water radioactivity. Although NYSDEC's research shows that flowback waste may not contain significant concentrations of radioactive material, NYSDEC acknowledges it has a limited dataset, and proposes radiation surveys for both types of wastewater (flowback and produced water).

NYSDEC's proposal to require NORM testing (radiation surveys) for flowback and production brine is a significant improvement to the 2011 RDSGEIS, and this proposed mitigation measure was effectively translated into a permit condition. Appendix 10, Proposed EAF Addendum Requirements for HVHF, Condition No. 64, requires:

64) Flowback water recovered after high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations must be tested for NORM prior to removal from the site. Fluids recovered during the production phase (i.e., production brine) must be tested for NORM prior to removal.³²⁵

However, this permit condition is only applied to HVHF wells and equipment. NORM can be present in all flowback wastewater, including hydraulic fracture treatments less than 300,000 gallons, and produced water from wells that are not subject to HVHF treatments. Therefore, this requirement is better suited for the NYCRR and should be applied to all oil and gas operations.

Additionally, it is recommended that the NORM testing method and frequency be specified. As explained in Dr. Glenn Miller's and Dr. Ralph Seiler's comments on the 2011 RDSGEIS, the test method is an important determinant in quantifying total radioactivity.³²⁶

Recommendation No. 76: The requirement to test produced water (production brine) and flowback wastewater (waste from hydraulic fracturing operations) should be codified in the NYCRR and applied to all oil and gas operations. NORM testing frequency and method should be specified. Proposed HVHF Permit Condition No. 64 could serve as a starting point for NYCRR revisions.

The RDSGEIS proposes to allow flowback wastewater and produced water to be disposed of at a Publically Owned Treatment Works (POTW), as long as the influent concentration of radium-226 (as measured prior to admixture with POTW influent) is limited to 15 pCi/L,³²⁷ or 25% of the 60 pCi/L concentration value listed in 6 NYCRR Part 380-11.7.

*The Department proposes to require, as a permit condition, that the permittee demonstrate that it has a source to treat or otherwise legally dispose of wastewater associated with flowback and production water prior to the issuance of the drilling permit. **Disposal and treatment options include publicly owned treatment works, privately owned high volume hydraulic fracturing wastewater treatment and/or reuse facilities, deep-well injection, and out of state disposal.***

³²⁵ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 10, Page 12.

³²⁶ Miller, G. and Seiler, R., Comments Prepared for NRDC on 2011 NYSDEC, DSGEIS, 2012.

³²⁷ Picocuries per gram (pCi/g) is a measure of the radioactivity in one gram of a material. One picocurie is that quantity of radionuclide(s) that decays at the rate of 3.7×10^{-2} disintegrations per second.

Flowback water and production water must be fully characterized prior to acceptance by a POTW for treatment. Note in particular Appendix C. IV of TOGS 1.3.8, Maximum Allowable Headworks Loading. The POTW must perform a MAHW analysis to assure that the flowback water and production water will not cause a violation of the POTW's effluent limits or sludge disposal criteria, allow pass through of unpermitted substances or inhibit the POTW's treatment processes. As a result, the SPDES permits for POTWs that accept this source of wastewater will be modified to include influent and effluent limits for Radium and TDS, if not already included in the existing SPDES permit, as well as for other parameters as necessary to ensure that the permit correctly and completely characterizes the discharge. **In the case of NORM, anyone proposing to discharge flowback or production water to a POTW must first determine the concentration of NORM present in those waste streams to determine appropriate treatment and disposal options. POTW operators who accept these waste streams are advised to limit the**

concentrations of NORM in the influent to their systems to prevent its inadvertent concentration in their sludge. For example, due to the potentially large volumes of these waste waters that could be processed through any given POTW, as well as the current lack of data on the level of NORM concentration that may take place, it will be proposed that POTW influent concentrations of radium-226 (as measured prior to admixture with POTW influent) be limited to 15 pCi/L, or 25% of the 60 pCi/L concentration value listed in 6 NYCRR Part 380-11.7. As more data become available on concentrations in influent vs. sludge it is possible that this concentration limit may be revisited [emphasis added].³²⁸

EPA data shows that produced water can contain 0.1 to 9,000 pCi/L of radium-226.³²⁹ Therefore, it is reasonably foreseeable that there will be substantial volumes of wastewater that will exceed the 15 pCi/L POTW influent limit. NYSDEC has not proposed a waste treatment or disposal solution for wastewater that exceeds the 15 pCi/L POTW influent limit.

Recommendation No. 77: The SGEIS should examine treatment and disposal options, and capacity within NYS, for wastewater exceeding 15 pCi/L radiation.

Additionally, it is unclear if NYS' POTWs are designed to treat incoming wastewater with 15 pCi/L radiation. The Federal Safe Drinking Water standard is 5 pCi/L³³⁰ (radium-226 and radium -228 combined).³³¹ The 5 pCi/L threshold was set because of the increased risk of cancer above this level. Because the RDSGEIS does not examine NYS' POTW's ability to treat incoming wastewater with 15 pCi/L radiation, it does not provide an estimate of the expected radiation level at the POTW effluent. Therefore, it is not clear whether POTW effluent discharge at a level greater than 5 pCi/L could end up in a drinking water supply, or how NYSDEC plans to monitor and ensure that this does not happen.

³²⁸ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 6-58 and 6-59.

³²⁹ USEPA Oil and Gas Production Wastes, Summary Table of Reported Concentrations of Radiation in TENORM, <http://www.epa.gov/radiation/tenorm/sources.html#summary-table>

³³⁰ Measured as Radium 226 and Radium 228 combined.

³³¹ USEPA Federal Safe Water Drinking Water Standards for Radionuclides at <http://water.epa.gov/drink/contaminants/index.cfm#List>.

Recommendation No. 78: The SGEIS should examine whether NYS' POTWs are designed to treat incoming wastewater with 15 pCi/L radiation, and should predict the maximum effluent radiation level. The SGEIS should explain how NYSDEC will ensure that drinking water sources will not exceed 5 pCi/L radiation.

The 2011 RDSGEIS does not prohibit road spreading of waste; it deferred this decision to a yet-to-be determined future process outside the SGEIS review. Yet, other oil and gas producing states, such as Texas, specifically prohibit road spreading of waste containing NORM.³³² A study conducted by Argonne National Lab for the US Department of Interior (DOI) concluded that land spreading of diluted NORM waste presented the highest potential dose of exposure to the general public of all waste disposal methods studied.³³³

Most states dispose of wastewater using deep well injection or use it to enhance hydrocarbon recovery operations. Land disposal is not common for onshore operations. The Department of Energy reports that more than 98% of oil and gas wastewater from onshore operations is injected into underground disposal wells, which are regulated by EPA, or used for enhanced hydrocarbon recovery.³³⁴ The 2009 DSGEIS explored produced water treatment and disposal options (e.g. injection wells, treatment plants, and road spreading),³³⁵ but did not land on a best practice.

The 2011 RDSGEIS concludes there is not enough information available to allow for road spreading under a Beneficial Use Determination (BUD).³³⁶ However, the RDSGEIS does not explicitly state that road spreading for any purpose is prohibited until NYSDEC and NYSDOH agree on exposure standards that will serve as thresholds for BUD determinations, with the proposed exposure standards undergoing a public review and comment period.

Since the current BUD does not require an operator to test for NORM,³³⁷ it is unclear how NORM testing at the well site will be integrated into the BUD process. The level of NORM, if any, that will be allowed in fluids used for road spreading is also unclear. The 2011 RDSGEIS does not examine the cumulative impact of spreading small amounts of NORM repeatedly over the same area. It is recommended that land and road spreading of produced water and other waste containing NORM be **prohibited**. Produced water containing NORM should be returned to the subsurface formation from which it came, or should be handled at an approved waste treatment plant.

Recommendation No. 79: The SGEIS should explicitly state that land and road spreading for any purpose is prohibited until NYSDEC and NYSDOH agree on exposure standards that will serve as thresholds for BUD determinations, with the proposed exposure standards undergoing a public review and comment period.

³³² Texas Railroad Commission (TXRRC), 16 Texas Administrative Code, Title 16, Part 1, Chapter 4, Subchapter F, §4.601 - 4.632. "Disposal of Oil and Gas NORM Waste". The TCEQ has jurisdiction over the disposal of other NORM wastes.

³³³ Argonne National Laboratory, Radiological Dose Assessment Related to Management of Naturally Occurring Radioactive Materials Generated by the Petroleum Industry, Publication ANL/EAD-2, 1996.

³³⁴ Argonne National Laboratory, Produced Water Volumes and Management Practices in the United States, Report Prepared for United States Department of Energy, Report No. ANL/EVS/R-09/1, 2009.

³³⁵ 2009 NYSDEC, DSGEIS, Page 5-131.

³³⁶ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-60.

³³⁷ The example BUD application provided in Appendix 12 requires testing for calcium, sodium, chloride, magnesium, total dissolved solids, pH, iron, barium, lead, sulfate, oil and grease, benzene, ethylbenzene, toluene and xylene, but not NORM.

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) identifies produced water pits (brine pits) as an outdated practice in cases where produced water contains NORM. If wastewater pond sediments pose a potential radiological health risk, tank sediments from wastewater stored in tanks also would pose a radiological health risk. EPA reports that:

*Lined and/or earthen pits were previously used for storing produced water and other nonhazardous oil field wastes, hydrocarbon storage brine, or mining wastes. In this case, TENORM³³⁸ in the water will concentrate in the bottom sludges or residual salts of the ponds. **Thus the pond sediments pose a potential radiological health risk**....produced waters are now generally reinjected into deep wells...No added radiological risks appear to be associated with this disposal method as long as the radioactive material carried by the produced water is returned in the same or lower concentration to the formations from which it was derived [emphasis added].³³⁹*

Recommendation No. 80: The SGEIS should address testing of wastewater sediments, and explain the collection, transportation, treatment, and disposal methods for this potential radiological health risk.

Drill Cutting NORM: The 2011 RDSGEIS acknowledges the fact that drill cuttings can contain NORM, but makes a blanket assumption that the level of radiation from cuttings will be low. The RDSGEIS does not require site-specific testing to verify this assumption, nor does it preclude cuttings disposal in existing solid waste landfills. Instead, the RDSGEIS only recommends that the well operator consult with the landfill operator prior to drill cuttings disposal.

*In New York State the **NORM in cuttings is not precluded by regulation from disposal in a solid waste landfill, though well operators should consult with the operators** of any landfills they are considering using for disposal regarding the acceptance of Marcellus Shale drill cuttings by that facility [emphasis added].³⁴⁰*

The 2011 RDSGEIS is unclear about the environmental and human health protections that would be achieved via the landfill consultation process. Appendix 10, Proposed EAF Addendum Requirements for HVHF, requires the operator to specify where it plans to dispose of cuttings, and requires evidence that the cuttings will go to a Part 360 solid waste landfill. However, the RDSGEIS does not provide scientific or engineering data to demonstrate that existing NYS landfills are properly designed and equipped to safely handle and store drill cuttings containing NORM.

NYSDEC acknowledges significant uncertainty about the NORM content of drill cuttings in Chapter 7, and raises questions as to whether there are sufficient data to fully assess NORM impacts at this time. The 2011 RDSGEIS states:

***Existing data from drilling in the Marcellus Formation** in other States, and from within New York for wells that were not hydraulically fractured, **shows significant variability in NORM content.** This variability appears to occur both between wells in different portions of the formation and at a given well over time. This makes it important that samples from wells in different locations within New York State are used to assess the extent of this variability.*

³³⁸ TENORM is Technologically Enhanced Natural Occurring Radioactive Material.

³³⁹ <http://www.epa.gov/radiation/tenorm/oilandgas.html#disposalpast>.

³⁴⁰ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 5-129 and 5-130.

During the initial Marcellus development efforts, sampling and analysis would be undertaken in order to assess this variability. These data would be used to determine whether additional mitigation is necessary to adequately protect workers, the general public, and environment of the State of New York [emphasis added].³⁴¹

Yet, the 2011 RDSGEIS does not propose NORM mitigation measures. It does not require drill cuttings testing prior to disposal in the landfill, nor does it establish a maximum allowed NORM disposal threshold for safe long-term cuttings disposal in a landfill.

Recommendation No. 81: Drill cuttings should be tested for NORM prior to disposal in a landfill. A maximum allowed NORM threshold for drill cuttings disposal in the landfill should be clearly established and scientifically justified. Testing and threshold requirements should be included in the SGEIS as a mitigation measure and codified in the NYCRR. Waste exceeding the established NORM threshold should be handled under NYS' radioactive waste handling rules.

Chapter 5.2.4.2 of the 2011 RDSGEIS concludes that NORM content in drill cuttings is equivalent to background levels of radiation occurring naturally in the atmosphere. This conclusion is based on Geiger counter and gamma ray spectroscopy sampling methods.

Yet, Dr. Glenn Miller points out in his comments on the 2011 RDSGEIS³⁴² that gamma ray spectroscopy is insufficient to assess all radioactive constituents (e.g. polonium is radioactive and only a weak gamma ray emitter), and gamma ray measurements do not provide insight into the potential for drill cuttings containing NORM to later oxidize, leach, and concentrate NORM when disposed. Dr. Miller concludes that NYS likely has underestimated the amount of NORM in drill cuttings, and recommends NYS require additional testing methods to verify total radiation levels and better understand the potential for drill cuttings to later oxidize, leach, and concentrate NORM when disposed. Additional work is needed to verify whether the disposal of drill cuttings containing NORM in existing NYS landfills is a best practice.

Recommendation No. 82: The SGEIS should provide scientific and engineering data to demonstrate that existing NYS landfills are properly designed and equipped to safely handle and store drill cuttings containing NORM, including lower concentrations of NORM that could cumulatively have a significant impact when stored in large volumes over long periods of time. The SGEIS should examine the potential for drill cuttings containing NORM to later oxidize, leach, and concentrate radioactive materials within the landfill. If NYSDEC cannot provide scientific and engineering data to demonstrate that existing NYS landfills are properly designed and equipped to safely handle and store drill cuttings containing NORM, it should identify alternative collection, transportation, treatment, and disposal requirements.

NYCRR Proposed Revisions: Proposed Permit Condition No. 53 requires waste fluids be handled in accordance with 6 NYCRR § 554.1(c)(1); yet, this regulation does not specify the best practice for handling hydraulic fracturing fluid and other drilling and completion wastes. Instead, 6 NYCRR § 554.1(c)(1) merely provides a process for the applicant to submit a waste management plan. In 2009, HCLLC recommended revisions to this regulation; yet, none are proposed. The existing regulation states:

*Prior to the issuance of a well-drilling permit for any operation in which the probability exists that brine, salt water or other polluting fluids will be produced or obtained during drilling operations in **sufficient quantities** to be deleterious to the surrounding environment, the operator*

³⁴¹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-119.

³⁴² Miller, G., Comments Prepared for NRDC on 2011 NYSDEC, DSGEIS, 2012.

*must submit and receive approval for a plan for the environmentally safe and proper ultimate disposal of such fluids. For purposes of this subdivision, drilling muds are not considered to be polluting fluids. Before requesting a plan for disposal of such fluids, the department will take into consideration the known geology of the area, the sensitivity of the surrounding environment to the polluting fluids and the history of any other drilling operations in the area. **Depending on the method of disposal chosen by the applicant**, a permit for discharge and/or disposal may be required by the department in addition to the well-drilling permit. An applicant may also be required to submit an acceptable contingency plan, the use of which shall be required if the primary plan is unsafe or impracticable at the time of disposal [emphasis added].*

Terms such as “sufficient quantities” are ambiguous, providing operators and regulators large latitude in how they interpret the regulation. Regulations should specify technically and scientifically based thresholds and management practices.

Under 6 NYCRR § 554.1(c)(1), the waste disposal method is selected by the applicant, with no instruction on how to determine the best waste management practice. While recycling and the reuse of fracturing fluid are discussed in the RDSGEIS, there is no requirement in the proposed permit conditions to use this best practice. Furthermore, NYSDEC does not explain how it will oversee the recycling and reuse processes.

Recommendation No. 83: Revisions are needed to 6 NYCRR § 554.1(c)(1) to require a more robust waste management planning and oversight process, including detailed instructions on collection, testing, transportation, treatment, and disposal of waste.

20. Hydrogen Sulfide

Background: In 2009, HCLLC recommended that the NYCRR require operators to follow American Petroleum Institute Recommended Practice 49 (API RP 49) for Drilling and Well Servicing Operations Involving Hydrogen Sulfide, and API RP 55 for Oil and Gas Producing and Gas Processing Plant Operations Involving Hydrogen Sulfide, to protect employees and the public.

The 2011 RDSGEIS: The 2011 RDSGEIS reports that Marcellus Shale operations in Pennsylvania have not produced substantial amounts of H₂S.³⁴³ However, this conclusion is based on limited information from wells drilled only in Pennsylvania. These data do not confirm that H₂S will not be present initially or over time in NYS wells.

H₂S gas produces a malodorous smell of rotten eggs at low concentrations, can cause serious health symptoms at elevated concentrations, and can be deadly at the higher concentrations found in some oil and gas wells.

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) recommends close monitoring of H₂S for human health and explosion mitigation:

Hydrogen Sulfide or sour gas (H₂S) is a flammable, colorless gas that is toxic at extremely low concentrations. It is heavier than air, and may accumulate in low-lying areas. It smells like "rotten eggs" at low concentrations and causes you to quickly lose your sense of smell. Many areas where the gas is found have been identified, but pockets of the gas can occur anywhere.

Iron sulfide is a byproduct of many production operations and may spontaneously combust with air.

Flaring operations associated with H₂S production will generate Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂), another toxic gas.

Active monitoring for hydrogen sulfide gas and good planning and training programs for workers are the best ways to prevent injury and death.³⁴⁴

The American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists recommends a Threshold Limit Value of 10ppm and a short-term exposure (STEL) limit of 15 ppm, averaged over 15 minutes, for the action level indicating the need for respiratory protection.³⁴⁵ While workers may be afforded respiratory protection, nearby members of the public do not have routine access to respiratory protection and monitoring systems. Routine, standardized testing should also be in place to ensure public health and safety.

A 300 ppm concentration of H₂S is considered by the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists as Immediately Dangerous to Life and Health.

³⁴³ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 5-138.

³⁴⁴ OSHA website at http://www.osha.gov/SLTC/etools/oilandgas/general_safety/h2s_monitoring.html.

³⁴⁵ OSHA website at http://www.osha.gov/SLTC/etools/oilandgas/general_safety/appendix_a.html.

In low concentrations, H₂S sometimes can be detectable by its characteristic odor; however, the smell cannot be relied upon to forewarn of dangerous concentrations (greater than 100ppm) of the gas because it rapidly paralyzes the sense of smell due to paralysis of the olfactory nerve. A longer exposure to the lower concentrations has a similar desensitizing effect on the sense of smell.

It should be well understood that the sense of smell will be rendered ineffective by hydrogen sulfide, which can result in an individual failing to recognize the presence of dangerously high concentrations. Exposure to hydrogen sulfide causes death by poisoning the respiratory system at the cellular level.³⁴⁶

Therefore, proper handling of H₂S is important from both a quality-of-life and human-safety standpoint for workers and nearby public.

While H₂S may not be initially present at a drillsite, the operator must remain vigilant in monitoring for H₂S over time, because sulfate reducing bacteria and other forms of acid producing bacteria can generate H₂S in the reservoir, such that H₂S concentrations elevate over time. Increasing levels of H₂S is a common problem in waterflooding operations in oil and gas fields. Biocides are typically used to mitigate bacteria growth; however, sometimes biocides are not successful.

Biocide use and close monitoring of H₂S early in field development is an important mitigation measure, because once elevated H₂S is present it is difficult to control. Industry anticipates H₂S will be a future concern in operations requiring large volumes of water for HVHF treatments, especially where treatment fluid is recycled, as planned in NYS. A 2010 Apache Corporation paper summarizes the problem:

One of the most severe threats in recycling waters for fracs is the control of bacteria (Tischler, 2009), including sulfate reducing bacteria (SRBs) and other forms such as acid producing bacteria (APB), iron fixing bacteria and slime formers. SRBs have created souring of some conventional reservoirs from injection of waters, both produced and semi-fresh, which have established a presence in the reservoirs and create H₂S gas and iron sulfide problems. Local well fouling problems are common where SRBs are spiked into the formation from drilling or completion fluids. This type of H₂S occurrence may cause local corrosion...in shale, however, the effect of uncontrolled bacteria is a general unknown, given the extremely large volumes of surface water used for slick water fracturing. For this reason, recycling of the water may seed all waters with bacteria and/or concentrate the bacteria; thus bacterial control is a necessity [emphasis added].³⁴⁷

Due to the potential close proximity of Marcellus Shale operations to the public, a robust initial monitoring program should be instituted to determine H₂S concentrations in Marcellus Shale gas throughout NYS. As described in American Petroleum Institute Recommended Practices 49 and 55, monitoring frequency can be adjusted over time as site-specific information is obtained. Initial sampling should be conducted at each drillsite, with at least monthly sampling thereafter.

³⁴⁶ OSHA website at http://www.osha.gov/SLTC/etools/oilandgas/general_safety/appendix_a.html

³⁴⁷ King, G.E., Apache Corporation, Thirty Years of Gas Shale Fracturing: What Have We Learned?, Society of Petroleum Engineers Technical Paper, SPE 133456, 2010, Page 30.

Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing, Permit Condition No. 25 includes a requirement to conform with API RP 49; however, there is no requirement for operators to conform with API RP 55, which applies after the well is drilled, during production operations.

NYCRR Proposed Revisions: As a control measure, when H₂S is present, the proposed regulations at 6 NYCRR § 560.6(c)(28) require the venting of any gas containing H₂S through a flare stack to combust the dangerous vapors.

Recommendation No. 84: H₂S monitoring and reporting requirements should be included in the RDSGEIS as a mitigation measure and codified in the NYCRR. Operators should be required to follow H₂S detection and handling procedures to protect employees and the public. Initial H₂S testing should be conducted at each drillsite. Subsequent test frequency should be based on the results of initial testing. H₂S levels can increase over time as gas fields age and sour. H₂S requirements should be included in regulation for both drilling and production operations, and should not just be relegated to a drilling permit condition. Additionally, when H₂S is present, nearby neighbors, local authorities, and public facilities should be notified, and provided information on the safety and control measures that the operator will undertake to protect human health and safety. In cases where elevated H₂S levels are present, audible alarms should be installed to alert the public when immediate evacuation procedures are warranted.

21. Chemical & Waste Tank Secondary Containment

Background: In 2009, HCLLC recommended that NYCRR be revised to include secondary containment for chemicals stored on the well pad or, alternatively, require the use of double-wall tanks. Chemicals, especially corrosive chemicals, can result in storage container leaks and spills to the environment. Best practice for permanent chemical storage is to install secondary containment under the storage container, and ensure the containers are not in contact with soil or standing water.³⁴⁸ Shale gas drilling and HVHF operations include the use of many chemical tanks and waste handling tanks (e.g. flowback tanks) that warrant secondary containment.

2011 RDSGEIS: NYSDEC responded to public comments and made appropriate revisions to the 2011 RDSGEIS with its requirement for 110% secondary containment for all chemical and waste handling tanks. It also requires secondary containment for chemical and waste transport, mixing and pumping equipment. The 2011 RDSGEIS states:

*Flowback water stored on-site must use covered watertight tanks within secondary containment and the fluid contained in the tanks must be removed from the site within certain time periods.*³⁴⁹

*Secondary containment would be required for all fracturing additive containers and additive staging areas. These requirements would be included in supplementary well permit conditions for high-volume hydraulic fracturing.*³⁵⁰

*Secondary containment measures may include one or a combination of the following; dikes, liners, pads, curbs, sumps, or other structures or equipment capable of containing the substance. Any such secondary containment would be required to be sufficient to contain 110% of the total capacity of the single largest container or tank within a common containment area.*³⁵¹

*Secondary containment for flowback tanks is required.*³⁵²

*The Department proposes to require that operators storing flowback water on-site would be required to use watertight tanks located within secondary containment, and remove the fluid from the wellpad within specified time frames.*³⁵³

*Location of additive containers and **transport, mixing and pumping equipment** ...within secondary containment...[emphasis added]*³⁵⁴

³⁴⁸ Bureau of Land Management, Surface Operating Standards and Guidelines for Oil and Gas Exploration and Development, The Gold Book, 2007.

³⁴⁹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Executive Summary, Page 25.

³⁵⁰ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-38.

³⁵¹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-38.

³⁵² 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-40.

³⁵³ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 1-12.

³⁵⁴ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-29.

Recommendation No. 85: Secondary containment requirements for well site chemicals should be applied as a best practice to all oil and gas development and codified in NYCRR, and should not be limited to shale gas and HVHF operations.

NYCRR Proposed Revisions: Proposed regulations codify the requirement for secondary containment for chemical and waste handling tanks, but do not specifically address secondary containment for chemical and waste transport, mixing and pumping equipment.

Recommendation No. 86: Consistent with the proposed RDSGEIS mitigation, 6 NYCRR § 750-3.11 and 6 NYCRR § 560.6 should be revised to require lined secondary containment for chemical and waste transport, mixing, and pumping equipment.

Proposed regulations at 6 NYCRR § 750-3.11 provide very specific instructions on how to construct adequate secondary containment, including the use of coated or lined materials that are chemically compatible with the environment and the substances they may contain. Regulations also state that the containment structures must have adequate freeboard, be protected from damage, and be able to contain at least 110% of the largest tank volume.

750-3.11 Applications of standards, limitations and other requirements

(e) The HVHF SWPPP must, at a minimum, include the HVHF SWPPP General Requirements listed in subparagraph (1) below, Structural Best Management Practices (BMPs), Non-structural BMPs, and Activity-Specific SWPPP Requirements.

*(v) Secondary Containment - To prevent the discharge of hazardous substances, the owner or operator shall provide, implement, and operate secondary containment measures. **Such secondary containment shall be: (a) designed and constructed in accordance with good engineering practices, (b) constructed, coated or lined with materials that are chemically compatible with the environment and the substances to be contained, (c) provide adequate freeboard, (d) protected from heavy vehicle or equipment traffic; and have a volume of at least 110 percent of the largest storage tank within the containment area [emphasis added].***

In contrast, proposed regulations at 6 NYCRR § 560.6 offer substantially less instruction on how to construct adequate secondary containment. They do not mandate the use of coated or lined materials that are chemically compatible with the environment and the substances they may contain. They do not require the containment structure have adequate freeboard. Nor do they require that the containment be protected from damage.

§560.6 Well Construction and Operation.

(c) Drilling, Hydraulic Fracturing and Flowback.

(26) Hydraulic fracturing operations must be conducted as follows:

*(i) secondary containment for fracturing additive containers and additive staging areas, and flowback tanks is required. **Secondary containment measures may include, as deemed appropriate by the department, one or a combination of the following: dikes, liners, pads, impoundments, curbs, sumps or other structures or equipment capable of containing the substance.** Any such secondary containment must be sufficient to contain*

110 percent of the total capacity of the single largest container or tank within a common containment area. No more than one hour before initiating any hydraulic fracturing stage, all secondary containment must be visually inspected to ensure all structures and equipment are in place and in proper working order [emphasis added].

Recommendation No. 87: 6 NYCRR § 560.6 should be revised to include specific secondary containment construction standards that are consistent with 6 NYCRR § 750-3.11.

Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing: Permit conditions have been developed to require secondary containment. However, the permit conditions merely echo proposed regulations at 6 NYCRR § 560.6. They do not provide additional or supplemental requirements to the NYCRR.

Recommendation No. 88: Streamline the Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing contained in the RDSGEIS to remove requirements that are redundant with NYCRR, or if retained, ensure that permit language matches the final codified version of NYCRR and cite the NYCRR requirements.

22. Fuel Tank Containment

Background: In 2009, HCLLC recommended that the NYCRR be revised to require more stringent oil spill prevention measures for temporary fuel tanks associated with drilling and well stimulation activities, and that NYS' regulations be at least as stringent as federal EPA's Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures (SPCC) Plan. HCLLC recommended that NYSDEC incorporate existing EPA oil spill prevention standards into the NYCRR. EPA standards require secondary containment if a facility stores 1,320 gallons of fuel or more (30 CFR § 112), including portable, temporary fuel tanks.

In 2009, NYSDEC proposed to exempt drilling rig and HVHF fuel tanks (even those as large as 10,000 gallons) from NYS' petroleum bulk storage regulations and tank registration requirements at 6 NYCRR §§ 612-614, citing the fact that the storage tanks are temporary (non-stationary) as the reason for the exemption. This problem persists in the 2011 RDSGEIS.

HCLCC questioned NYSDEC's rationale for exempting drilling rig and HVHF fuel tanks from NYS' spill prevention regulations, as all other tanks 1,100 gallons and larger must register in NYS, install secondary containment, and undergo inspections at 5- and 10-year intervals.

HCLLC pointed out that a temporary fuel tank poses a greater environmental risk than a stationary fuel tank, because temporary fuel tanks are relocated many times during their operating lives, increasing the potential for tank damage during transit and the likelihood of tank appurtenance leakage.

Large temporary fuel tanks should be subject to the same secondary containment requirements as large stationary fuel tanks in NYS, particularly in situations where temporary fuel tanks are installed in one location for a significant period of time (e.g. a multi-well pad where drilling and completion operations could span several years). Alternatively, where secondary containment is not technically feasible, the use of double-walled or vaulted tanks should be considered for portable fuel tanks.

In January 2011, NYS' consultant, Alpha Geoscience, reviewed HCLLC's recommendation and provided NYSDEC with incorrect guidance on EPA's secondary containment requirements for onshore oil drilling workover and mobile equipment and other fuel storage.³⁵⁵ Alpha Geoscience advised NYSDEC that EPA's SPCC regulations only addressed stationary fuel tanks greater than 1,320 gallons.

Alpha Geoscience's advice was incorrect because EPA's SPCC rules apply to facilities that have an aggregate fuel or hydrocarbon storage of 1,320 gallons or more at a facility, and secondary containment rules are not limited to stationary tanks.³⁵⁶

2011 RDSGEIS: NYSDEC's 2011 proposal for fuel tank secondary containment is confusing and inconsistent. The RDSGEIS both recommends and requires fuel tank secondary containment as a best practice, yet also exempts large fuel tanks used for drilling and HVHF operations.

For example, the 2011 RDSGEIS states that secondary containment will be required for fuel tanks and areas where fuel transfers occur:

³⁵⁵ Alpha Geoscience, Review of the dSCEIS and Identification Best Technology and Best Practices Recommendations Harvey Consulting, LLC; December 28, 2009, prepared for NYSERDA, January 20, 2011, Page 21.

³⁵⁶ USEPA, SPCC Guidance for Regional Inspectors Version 1.0, November 28, 2005, Page 2-16.

The Department proposes to require, via permit condition and/or new regulation, that operators provide secondary containment around all additive staging areas and fueling tanks, manned fluid/fuel transfers and visible piping and appropriate use of troughs, drip pads or drip pans [emphasis added].³⁵⁷

NYSDEC supports its recommendation for fuel tank secondary containment by pointing out that its consultant has identified it as a best management practice:

*In addition to its regulatory survey, Alpha also reviewed and discussed best management practices directly observed in the northern tier of Pennsylvania and noted that “[t]he reclamation approach and regulations being applied in PA may be an effective analogue going forward in New York.” **The best management practices referenced by Alpha include...Secondary containment structures around petroleum storage tanks and lined trenches to direct fluids to lined sumps where spills can be recovered without environmental contamination [emphasis added].***³⁵⁸

Yet, the 2011 RDSGEIS exempts large fuel tanks from secondary containment by designating drilling rig and HVHF fuel tanks as “temporary”:

*The diesel tank fueling storage associated with the larger rigs described in Chapter 5 may be larger than 10,000 gallons in capacity and may be in one location on a multi-well pad for the length of time required to drill all of the wells on the pad. However, the tank would be removed along with the rig during any drilling hiatus between wells or after all the wells have been drilled. There are no long-term or permanent operations at a drill pad which require an on-site fueling tank. **Therefore, the tank is considered non-stationary and is exempt from the Department’s petroleum bulk storage regulations and tank registration requirements [emphasis added].***³⁵⁹

The 2011 RDSGEIS does not explain why a temporary fuel tank would pose less risk of a spill than a stationary fuel tank.

The 2011 RDSGEIS further confuses the issue by stating that all fuel tanks would be included in secondary containment:

*The following measures are proposed to be required, via permit condition and/or regulation, to prevent and mitigate spills. **For all wells subject to the SGEIS, supplementary permit conditions for high-volume hydraulic fracturing would include the following requirements with respect to fueling tanks and refilling activities:***

*a. **Secondary containment consistent with the objectives of SPOTS 10 for all fueling tanks.***

***The secondary containment system could include one or a combination of the following: dikes, liners, pads, holding ponds, curbs, ditches, sumps, receiving tanks or other equipment capable of containing spilled fuel.** Soil that is used for secondary containment would be of such character that a spill into the soil will be readily recoverable and would result in a minimal amount of soil contamination and*

³⁵⁷ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 1-11.

³⁵⁸ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 8-5.

³⁵⁹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-343.

*infiltration. Draft Department Program Policy DER-1730 may be consulted for permeability criteria for dikes and dike construction standards, including capacity of at least 110% of the tank's volume [emphasis added].*³⁶⁰

Ultimately, the 2011 RDSGEIS, includes secondary containment requirements for all fuel tanks, in Appendix 10, Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing.

- 13) ***Secondary containment*** consistent with the Department's Spill Prevention Operations Technology Series 10, Secondary Containment Systems for Aboveground Storage Tanks, (SPOTS 10) ***is required for all fueling tanks*** [emphasis added];
- 14) *To the extent practical, fueling tanks must not be placed within 500 feet of a public or private water well, a domestic-supply spring, a reservoir, a perennial or intermittent stream, a storm drain, a wetland, a lake or a pond;*
- 15) *Fueling tank filling operations must be manned at the fueling truck and at the tank if the tank is not visible to the fueling operator from the truck, and;*
- 16) *Troughs, drip pads or drip pans are required beneath the fill port of a fueling tank during filling operations if the fill port is not within the secondary containment.*³⁶¹

While, it is useful that the RDSGEIS finally lands on requiring secondary containment for fuel tanks, there remains a conflict in the text where NYSDEC has proposed to exempt temporary fuel tanks.

Recommendation No. 89: The SGEIS text should be revised to remove the temporary fuel tank exemption from secondary containment described on page 7-34.

Additionally, Appendix 10 permit conditions merely echo proposed regulations at 6 NYCRR § 560.6, and do not provide additional or supplemental requirements to the NYCRR. Therefore, if adopted into regulation, the permit conditions could be streamlined.

Recommendation No. 90: Streamline the Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing to remove requirements that are redundant with the proposed revisions to NYCRR, or if retained, ensure that permit language matches the final codified version of NYCRR and cite the NYCRR requirements.

NYCRR Proposed Revisions: The proposed regulations at 6 NYCRR § 560.6 codify the requirement for fuel tank secondary containment, and set no limit on the size or duration of fuel tank use. These proposed regulations are protective of the environment. The RDSGEIS should be revised to be consistent with the proposed regulations, avoiding future confusion about NYSDEC's intent.

§560.6 Well Construction and Operation.

(b) Site Maintenance.

(1) For any well:

³⁶⁰ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-34.

³⁶¹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 10, Page 3.

- (i) **secondary containment is required for all fueling tanks** [emphasis added];
- (ii) *to the extent practical, fueling tanks must not be placed within 500 feet of a perennial or intermittent stream, storm drain, wetland, lake or pond;*
- (iii) *fueling tank filling operations must be supervised at the fueling truck and at the tank if the tank is not visible to the fueling operator from the truck; and*
- (iv) *troughs, drip pads or drip pans are required beneath the fill port of a fueling tank during filling operations if the fill port is not within the secondary containment required by subparagraph (i) of this subdivision.*

Recommendation No. 91: The SGEIS should be revised to be consistent with the proposed regulations, which require secondary containment for all fuel tanks (6 NYCRR § 560.6) used for shale gas drilling and HVHF operations.

While proposed regulations at 6 NYCRR § 560.6 are useful because they make it clear that secondary containment is required for all fuel tanks, the proposed regulations do not provide specific instruction on how to construct adequate containment.

Recommendation No. 92: 6 NYCRR § 560.6 should be revised to clearly state that all fuel tank secondary containment should be designed and constructed in accordance with good engineering practices, incremental to the minimum federal standards. Good engineering practices include: using coated or lined materials that are chemically compatible with the environment and the substances to be contained; providing adequate freeboard; protecting containment from heavy vehicle or equipment traffic; and having a volume of at least 110 percent of the largest storage tank within the containment area.

NYCRR Proposed Revisions: The proposed regulations at 6 NYCRR § 560.6 require a 500' setback for fuel tanks from perennial or intermittent streams, storm drains, wetlands, lakes, and ponds, but only to the "extent practical" with no explanation of what that means in real terms, and under what conditions it would be acceptable to place a fuel tank closer. NYCRR does not include any setbacks from homes or public facilities.

§560.6 Well Construction and Operation.

(b) Site Maintenance.

(1) For any well:

- (i) *secondary containment is required for all fueling tanks;*
- (ii) **to the extent practical**, *fueling tanks must not be placed within 500 feet of a perennial or intermittent stream, storm drain, wetland, lake or pond*[emphasis added];
- (iii) *fueling tank filling operations must be supervised at the fueling truck and at the tank if the tank is not visible to the fueling operator from the truck; and*
- (iv) *troughs, drip pads or drip pans are required beneath the fill port of a fueling tank during filling operations if the fill port is not within the secondary containment required by subparagraph (i) of this subdivision.*

Recommendation No. 93: Proposed regulations at 6 NYCRR § 560.6 (b)(1)(ii) should be revised to delete the term “to the extent practical,” and should include minimum setbacks for fuel tanks from homes and public buildings.

Additionally, the RDSGEIS is problematic because it still references a **draft** NYSDEC Program Policy (DER-17) for construction standards and a September 28, 1994 Spill Prevention Operations Technology Series (SPOTS) memo for guidance on secondary containment construction.

Recommendation No. 94: The SGEIS should not rely on a draft³⁶² NYSDEC Program Policy document (DER-17) for construction standards and an outdated September 28, 1994 Spill Prevention Operations Technology Series (SPOTS) memo for guidance on secondary containment construction. Instead, secondary containment requirements for fuel tanks should be codified in the NYCRR and written in a way that is clear, consistent, and enforceable.

The importance of secondary containment for fuel tanks extends beyond shale gas drilling and HVHF operations to all hydrocarbon drilling and HVHF operations.

Recommendation No. 95: Secondary containment requirements for fuel tanks should extend to all hydrocarbon drilling and HVHF operations in NYS. The requirements should not be limited to shale gas drilling and HVHF operations. Therefore, the recommendations made above should be captured in both 6 NYCRR § 560 and 6 NYCRR § 554.

The RDSGEIS does not cite existing EPA spill prevention requirements at 40 CFR § 112, which apply to all fuel tanks, including drilling tanks, at 40 CFR § 112.7(c) and 40 CFR § 112.10(c). EPA’s regulations, which were revised in 2002, require secondary containment for fuel tanks at facilities storing 1,320 gallons and more. EPA allows an operator the opportunity to demonstrate under 40 CFR § 112.7(d) that it is impracticable to install secondary containment; however, EPA requires a formal written “impracticability determination.” Under this determination, EPA requires periodic tank integrity testing, leak testing of the valves and associated piping, a Part 109 contingency plan, and a written commitment of manpower, equipment, and materials to respond to a spill.

Recommendation No. 96: The SGEIS should cite federal standards (similar to how NYSDEC cited relevant USEPA standards for air quality) and notify the operator that the federal standards must be met. The SGEIS should also clearly explain what additional requirements will be imposed by NYS.

The RDSGEIS should also include: periodic fuel tank inspections to examine structural conditions and document corrosion or damage; the installation of high-liquid-level alarms that sound and display in an immediately recognizable manner; the installation of high-liquid-level automatic pump shutoff devices, which are designed to stop flow at a predetermined tank content level; and a means of immediately determining the liquid level of tanks.

Recommendation No. 97: In the NYCRR, NYSDEC should require tank inspections and tank alarm systems.

³⁶² If NYSDEC decides to refer to policy and guidance documents, those documents at a minimum should be final documents, and NYSDEC should state within those documents that the contents are enforceable.

NYSDEC does not address whether vaulted, double-walled, or self-diking tanks can be used as alternatives to constructing large temporary containment areas. Other oil and gas producing states allow the use of vaulted, self-diking, or double-walled portable tanks to meet the secondary containment requirement in cases where the operator can demonstrate that it is infeasible to install a containment area meeting EPA's 110% of the largest tank volume requirement. NYSDEC could consider allowing these alternative tanks in places where secondary containment is proven to be infeasible.

Vaulted, self-diking, and double-walled portable tanks are equipped with catchments that hold fuel overflow or divert it into an integral secondary containment area. Industry standards for the construction of vaulted, self-diking, and double-walled portable tanks include:

- Underwriters Laboratories' Steel Aboveground Tanks for Flammable and Combustible Liquids (UL 142);
- Appendix J of the American Petroleum Institute's (API) Welded Steel Tanks for Oil Storage (API 650); and
- API's Specification for Shop Welded Tanks for Storage of Production Liquids (API Spec 12F).

Due to the higher potential for damage during relocation and use at multiple sites, it is recommended that inspections be routinely performed on vaulted, self-diking, and double-walled portable tanks. The inspections should identify damage and corrosion using one of the following standards:

- Steel Tank Institute's (STI) Standard for the Inspection of Aboveground Storage Tanks, Third Edition (STI SP001); or
- API's Tank Inspection, Repair, Alteration, and Reconstruction Standard (API 653).

As an oil spill prevention measure, portable tanks can be equipped with high-liquid-level alarms that sound and display in an immediately recognizable manner; high-liquid-level automatic pump shutoff devices, which are designed to stop flow at a predetermined tank content level; and a means of immediately determining the liquid level of tanks.

Recommendation No. 98: NYSDEC should clarify whether vaulted, self-diking, and double-walled portable tanks will be allowed, and codify in the NYCRR the requirements for the use of those tanks, including inspections and spill prevention alarm systems.

23. Corrosion & Erosion Mitigation & Integrity Monitoring Programs

Background: In 2009, HCLLC recommended that NYSDEC require corrosion and erosion mitigation programs. More specifically HCLLC recommended that: equipment be designed to prevent corrosion and erosion; monitoring programs be put into place to identify corrosion and erosion over the well and equipment operating lifetime; and repair and replacement of damaged wells and equipment be completed.

Downhole tubing and casing, surface pipelines, pressure vessels, and storage tanks used in oil and gas exploration and production can be subject to internal and external corrosion. Corrosion can be caused by water, corrosive soils, oxygen, corrosive fluids used to treat wells, and the carbon dioxide (CO₂) and hydrogen sulfide (H₂S) present in gas. High velocity gas contaminated with water and sediment can internally erode pipes, fittings, and valves.

HVHF treatments, if improperly designed, can accelerate well corrosion. Additionally, acids used to stimulate well production and remove scale can be corrosive. The 2011 RDSGEIS includes a discussion on corrosion inhibitors used by industry in fracture treatments, but does not require them as best practice. Furthermore, the RDSGEIS does not require facilities be designed to resist corrosion (e.g. material selection and coatings), nor does it require corrosion monitoring, or the repair and replacement of corroded equipment.³⁶³

As explained in Chapter 20 of this report, the use of recycled HVHF fluid can result in the inoculation of sulfate reducing bacteria in the reservoir, and increased downhole equipment corrosion. And, while NYSDEC indicates that H₂S levels may be initially low in the Marcellus Shale, this may not be the case during the full life-cycle of the well. Nor does the RDSGEIS examine the H₂S of all other low permeability gas reservoirs to know what the H₂S might be for those formations.

Corroded well casings can provide a pathway for gas and well fluids to leak into protected aquifers. Therefore, it is important to install a robust casing system, and it's equally important to ensure that the casing system's integrity is maintained during the well's life.

Corrosion measured on production casing is an important piece of information, because corrosive fluids are known to also degrade the quality of the cement barrier. Corrosive fluids reduce the cement strength and make it more permeable, potentially providing a pathway for hydrocarbons to migrate from zones of higher pressure to lower pressure freshwater zones.

Additionally, the bond between the casing and cement can be compromised over the well's life, creating a "micro-annulus" (a space between the outer pipe wall and cement sheath) that allows vertical migration of hydrocarbons along the outside of the pipe wall.^{364,365} Micro-annulus' can be formed during initial

³⁶³ Curran, E., Corrosion Control in Gas Pipelines, Coating Protection Provides a Lifetime of Prevention, Pipeline & Gas Journal, October 2007.

³⁶⁴ See Ravi, K. (Halliburton), Bosma, M. (Shell) and Gastebled, O. (TNO Building and Construction Research), Safe and Economic Gas Wells through Cement Design for the Life of the Well, Society of Petroleum Engineering Paper No. 75700, 2002. Ravi et. al. concludes: "The extreme operating conditions that occur in gas-storage and gas-producing wells could cause the cement sheath to fail, resulting in fluid migration through the annulus... The sustained casing pressure observed on a number of wells after they have been put on production emphasizes the need to design a cement sheath that will maintain integrity during the life of the well... However, recent experience has shown that after well operations such as completing, pressure testing, injecting, stimulating and producing, the cement sheath could lose its ability to provide zonal isolation. This failure can create a path for formation fluids to enter the annulus, which pressurizes the well and renders the well unsafe to operate... Failure of the cement sheath is most often caused by pressure – or temperature-induced stresses inherent in well operations during the well's economic life."

cementing, or later in the well's life, due to: pipe wall thinning; cement deterioration; the shock of additional well workover activities (perforations, stimulation, drilling); pressure and temperature changes in the well; or by seismic vibrations.

In January 2011, NYS' consultant, Alpha Geoscience, recommended that NYSDEC ignore HCLLC's best practice recommendations for corrosion and erosion, citing Section 6.1.4.2 and 6.1.5.1 of the 2009 DSGEIS. In these sections, another NYS consultant (ICF) estimated the risk of groundwater contamination due to casing failure in a Class II injection well is 1 in 50 million wells.³⁶⁶ Alpha Geoscience concludes that corrosion and erosion prevention, monitoring, and repair requirements are unnecessary in the NYCRR.

Neither Alpha Geoscience nor ICF provide technical justification for the use of a Class II injection well corrosion risk analysis as a surrogate for a gas well corrosion risk analysis. A Class II injection well risk profile is different than a gas well. Gas wells can continuously produce sources of corrosive gas (CO₂ and H₂S), water, and sediment, that can corrode and erode well casing and surface piping over time.

Neither Alpha Geoscience nor ICF examined:

- The full life cycle of a gas well, and the fact that there is substantial field evidence that well casings do corrode and erode over time;
- The fact that casing inspection logs, caliper logs, temperature surveys, and other wellbore diagnostics are commonly run to examine the well casing condition due to the known problem of gas well corrosion;
- Information on the amount of money spent annually on corrosion inhibitors, pipe coating, and other preventive measures to mitigate corrosion impacts;
- The fact that well service specialists routinely provide well casing patching, repair, and replacement services,³⁶⁷ because gas well casing failure is a known problem; and,
- The fact that it is best practice to examine the condition of well casing over the well life to verify its integrity, especially before major well work (e.g. additional drilling, stimulation) is completed on an aging well.³⁶⁸

Additionally, Alpha Geoscience criticizes HCLLC for citing industry literature on corrosion best practices, stating that HCLLC's inclusion of this material shows industry bias. HCLLC disagrees with Alpha Geoscience's conclusion. Industry has developed most of the technology to address the problem; therefore, it is logical to cite industry literature on this point.

³⁶⁵ See Stewart, R.B. and Schouten, F.C. (Shell), Gas Invasion and Migration in Cemented Annuli: Causes and Cures, Society of Petroleum Engineering Paper No. 14779, SPE Drilling Engineering, March 1988. Stewart and Schouten conclude: "Gas migration resulting from casing contraction is a common field problem... Annular gas-migration problems can develop in an old well owing to changes in pressure or thermal conditions in the well."

³⁶⁶ Alpha Geoscience, Review of the dSGEIS and Identification of Best Technology and Best Practices Recommendations, Harvey Consulting, LLC; December 28, 2009, prepared for NYSERDA, January 20, 2011, Page 18.

³⁶⁷ Storaune, A., Winters, W.J. (BP America Inc.), Versatile Expandables Technology for Casing Repair, Society of Petroleum Engineers, SPE Paper No. 92330-MS, SPE/IADC Drilling Conference, 23-25 February 2005, Amsterdam, Netherlands, 2005, p.1.

³⁶⁸ Brondel, D., Edwards, R., Hayman, A., Hill, D., Shreekant, M., Semerad, T., Corrosion in the Oil Industry, Oilfield Review, April 1994, p. 9-10.

Experienced engineers know the importance of assessing and implementing programs to mitigate corrosion/erosion risk early in the field/well lifecycle. Corrosion of gas production equipment is a fundamental concern for the oil and gas industry that has been identified for decades.

Failures of equipment handling or producing natural gas occur only in the absence of an adequate corrosion-control program. A successful program is shown to include (1) anticipation of corrosion in design factors of all equipment, (2) detection of corrosion within the system and measurement of its severity for future reference, (3) use of mitigation measures and (4) continual follow-up and adjustment of control techniques. Design factors to be considered are tubing couplings, packers, tubing grade and size, and the number of tubing strings to be set. **Future corrosion problems and mitigation work should be recognized at the time the well completion is made so that the best possible design factors can be realized. Corrosion can be detected by gas analysis, water analysis, coupon exposures and caliper surveys. Quantitative data are needed to determine the severity of the problem and to design a suitable program of alleviation of the corrosion.** Use of inhibitors and plastic coatings are popular methods for mitigation of corrosion. Both methods have advantages and disadvantages that must be realized and evaluated. Control limits for a mitigation program should be established so that the operator can be certain that he is receiving the desired protection. **Gas gathering and process equipment also often suffer from corrosion....**

It is suggested that an adequate corrosion-control program must include efforts at various levels of company operations. All engineers and supervisors must participate actively in the corrosion-control effort. **As a property is being developed, corrosion control should be considered when the equipment to be used is being selected. When development is complete, the operating people must determine the seriousness of their corrosion problems. They must realize that the corrosion attack may change with changes in production characteristics and that absence of corrosion today does not guarantee absence of corrosion tomorrow. When corrosion is detected within an operation, mitigation is in order** [emphasis added].³⁶⁹

Because of the known problem of casing corrosion, the National Association of Corrosion Engineers (NACE) developed Recommended Practice RP0186 to mitigate external casing corrosion; this standard applies to the design of cathodic protection for external surfaces of steel well casings, and would be used when soil/subsurface reservoir conditions present a corrosive environment warranting installation of cathodic protection system installation.³⁷⁰

NACE International writes:

Oil and gas wells represent a large capital investment. It is imperative that corrosion of well casings be controlled to prevent loss of oil and gas, environmental damage, and personnel hazards, and in order to ensure economical depletion of oil and gas reserves necessary [emphasis added].³⁷¹

³⁶⁹ Fincher, D.R. (Tidewater Oil Co.), Corrosion in Gas Wells and Gas Gathering Systems, Journal of Petroleum Technology, Volume 13, Number 9, September 1961, Abstract.

³⁷⁰ NACE International Standard RP0186-2001, Application of Cathodic Protection for External Surfaces of Steel Well Casings.

³⁷¹ NACE International, Application of Cathodic Protection for External Surfaces of Steel Well Casings, RP0186-2001, 2001, p.1.

Gas operators stress the importance of corrosion monitoring and control programs. For example, OMV Exploration and Production writes:

Corrosion remains a key issue in petroleum production. *Its continued occurrence has consequences on the safety of people and environment and the integrity of facilities and affects the economy of the oil or gas field. Particularly the presence of severe environments containing corrosive components such as carbon dioxide and hydrogen sulphide poses serious problems. A central element in the design of facilities and the corrosion control is therefore the proper choice of materials which are both economical and provide a satisfactory performance over the entire service life with respect to the given environment. Prior to the production phase reliable corrosion monitoring programmes have to be selected, established, and implemented, as necessary [emphasis added].*³⁷²

The magnitude and complexity of a corrosion/erosion mitigation program will vary depending on site-specific conditions. The important step is to complete the initial evaluation, assess the site-specific circumstances, and develop an adequate corrosion/erosion mitigation plan. Some mitigation programs are started early, some are applied intermittently, and others are instituted later in the gas production process; in all cases, an engineering assessment prior to gas drilling and production must be completed to determine the optimal plan.

The corrosion engineering textbook, Corrosion Control in Oil and Gas Production, explains the importance of developing a site-specific plan:

The many possible alternatives available today for corrosion management for gas and oil well environments, dictates the need for a thorough evaluation and development of long term plans to assure a safe, economical and effective program. *History has shown that both corrosion inhibition and corrosion resistant alloys (CRAs) have been used successfully in tough environments. The final decision on which method to use is often made on the basis of available capital versus long term operating costs [emphasis added].*³⁷³

The 2011 RDSGEIS: The 2011 RDSGEIS includes a substantially improved well casing program, including a three-casing-string design. However, this casing is typically made of carbon steel, and must be protected from corrosion and erosion. Chromium steel and corrosion resistant alloys are commonly installed in corrosive environments; however, these metals are substantially more expensive and are not currently proposed for NYS.

Well casing, once installed and cemented into place, will remain in the well for its entire lifecycle, and is often abandoned in place.³⁷⁴ Therefore, it is in the operator's best economic interest to ensure that its casing investment is protected from corrosion and erosion.

³⁷² Oberndorfer, M. (OMV Exploration and Production), Corrosion Control in the Oil and Gas Production-5 Successful Case Histories, CORROSION Conference 2007, March 11-15, 2007, Nashville Tennessee, NACE International, 2007, p.1.

³⁷³ Treseder, R.S., Tuttle, R.N., Corrosion Control in Oil and Gas Production, Chapter 14, Corrosion of Steels in Gas Wells, 1998.

³⁷⁴ In some circumstances corroded casing will be pulled from a well prior to abandonment, although this process can prove difficult, time consuming, and expensive for fully cemented casing strings.

It would be shortsighted for NYS to require a robust well casing program, and not build in a corrosion and erosion control program. Chemicals, metallurgy, monitoring, and repair techniques are available to the operator to manage corrosion and erosion downhole (in the well) and at its surface facilities (e.g. corrosion inhibitors, cathodic protection systems, coatings).

Tools that can be used to monitor well corrosion include caliper tools and casing inspection logs. A caliper tool is run down the inside of the well casing or tubing to measure the internal diameter and assess metal wall loss. Casing inspection logs use ultrasonic and magnetic-flux technology to estimate metal wall loss. Additionally, temperature surveys can be run to look for gas cooling anomalies in the well, which are an indication of casing holes.³⁷⁵

NYSDEC has proposed cement evaluation tools to be run when HVHF wells are initially drilled and completed, which is a best practice. Cement integrity should also be monitored periodically over the well's life if casing corrosion occurs. Casing corrosion is an indicator of potential cement deterioration, as explained above.

Without regulations, the decision to invest in corrosion/erosion mitigation and wellbore integrity monitoring is left to the operator. In some cases, operators postpone mitigation to improve early economics. Deferral strategies can produce unfavorable results in the long-term, but may be attractive to small operators that have limited funds, or to large operators that plan to reap the benefits of early production and sell assets soon thereafter. Operators may not implement, unless required, long-term monitoring when faced with declining production, lower profits and when operating cost cuts are sought.

Corrosion and erosion programs that are instituted early can prolong the life of equipment and well casings, and reduce environmental risk. Delayed attention to corrosion and erosion mitigation can result in increased safety, environmental, and human health risks.

Gas well corrosion and erosion can occur in many ways:

- Oxygen contaminated drilling fluids are injected downhole, and can corrode well casing and drilling equipment;
- Water produced along with gas can corrode well casing, tubing, and downhole equipment;
- Acid stimulation treatments, used alone or in conjunction with hydraulic fracturing, readily attack metal;
- Well casing and surface piping can be eroded by high gas production velocities, especially when laden with sediment, sands, or hydraulic fracturing proppants;
- Corrosive soils can cause external corrosion of carbon steel casing;
- Hydrogen sulfide and carbon dioxide, often present in gas production, can corrode carbon steel; and
- Higher wellbore temperatures, increased velocity, and increased salinity accelerate corrosion rates.

NYCRR Proposed Revisions: NYSDEC has not proposed any new requirements for corrosion or erosion mitigation for the Marcellus, Utica, or other low-permeability reservoirs. There are no requirements for corrosion or erosion mitigation or long-term well integrity monitoring in the existing NYCRR.

³⁷⁵ Pennsylvania Governor's Marcellus Shale Advisory Commission Report, July 22, 2011, recommends pressure testing each casing to ensure initial integrity of casing design and cement, and pressure testing and logging to verify the mechanical integrity of the casing and cement over the life of the well, p. 109.

Recommendation No. 99: Best corrosion and erosion mitigation practices and long-term well integrity monitoring should be included in the SGEIS and codified in the NYCRR. Operators should be required to design equipment to prevent corrosion and erosion. Corrosion and erosion monitoring, repair, and replacement programs should be instituted.

24. Well Control & Emergency Response Capability

Background: In 2009, HCLLC recommended that NYSDEC require an operator to have an Emergency Response Plan (ERP) and a well blowout control plan. HCLLC recommended that operators be required to demonstrate that they have access to sufficient personnel and resources to respond to a fire, explosion, blowout, or other industrial accident. Best practices include: developing response and well control plans; verifying there are a sufficient number of trained and qualified personnel to carry out the plans; ensuring operators have access to the necessary response equipment; and testing (drills and exercises) the plan prior to drilling.

In 2009, HCLLC also recommended that NYSDEC examine the capacity of local emergency response teams. Oil and gas industry accidents often require highly specialized response capability and equipment. Operators should be required to supplement local emergency response resources to meet this need.

In January 2011, NYS' consultant, Alpha Geoscience, concluded that NYS well control and emergency response planning requirements are narrowly focused on the Bass Island Trend wells. Alpha Geoscience agreed with HCLLC that new regulations are needed for the formations proposed for development under this SGEIS.³⁷⁶

The 2011 RDSGEIS: The 2011 RDSGEIS includes a new section (Section 7.13) on Emergency Response Plans, which is a substantial improvement. Section 7.13 states:

7.13 Emergency Response Plan

*There is always a risk that despite all precautions, non-routine incidents may occur during oil and gas exploration and development activities. **An Emergency Response Plan (ERP) describes how the operator of the site will respond in emergency situations which may occur at the site.** The procedures outlined in the ERP are intended to provide for the protection of lives, property, and natural resources through appropriate advance planning and the use of company and community assets. **The Department proposes to require supplementary permit conditions for high-volume hydraulic fracturing that would include a requirement that the operator provide the Department with an ERP consistent with the SGEIS at least 3 days prior to well spud.** The ERP would also indicate that the operator or operator's designated representative will be on site during drilling and/or completion operations including hydraulic fracturing, and such person or personnel would have a current well control certification from an accredited training program that is acceptable to the Department [emphasis added].*

The ERP, at a minimum, would also include the following elements:

- *Identity of a knowledgeable and qualified individual with the authority to respond to emergency situations and implement the ERP;*
- *Site name, type, location (include copy of 7 ½ minute USGS map), and operator information;*
- *Emergency notification and reporting (including a list of emergency contact numbers for the area in which the well site is located; and appropriate Regional*

³⁷⁶ Alpha Geoscience, Review of the dSGEIS and Identification Best Technology and Best Practices Recommendations, Harvey Consulting, LLC; December 28, 2009, prepared for NYSERDA, January 20, 2011, Page 42.

Minerals' Office), equipment, key personnel, first responders, hospitals, and evacuation plan;

- *Identification and evaluation of potential release, fire and explosion hazards;*
- *Description of release, fire, and explosion prevention procedures and equipment;*
- *Implementation plans for shut down, containment and disposal;*
- *Site training, exercises, drills, and meeting logs; and*
- *Security measures, including signage, lighting, fencing and supervision.*³⁷⁷

Appendix 6, Proposed Environmental Assessment Form Addendum, requires an Emergency Response Plan be located at the rig, and that the plan be followed.³⁷⁸

Appendix 10, Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF, Condition No. 2, requires an ERP be provided 3 days prior to spud and available at the site. Condition No. 2 requires the ERP be developed in a manner consistent with the SGEIS, but it does not reference the Chapter 7.13 minimum requirements.

*An emergency response plan (ERP) consistent with the SGEIS must be prepared by the well operator and be available on-site during any operation from well spud (i.e., first instance of driving pipe or drilling) through well completion. A list of emergency contact numbers for the area in which the well site is located must be included in the ERP and the list must be prominently displayed at the well site during operations conducted under this permit. Further, a copy of the ERP in electronic form must be provided to this office at least 3 days prior to well spud.*³⁷⁹

The addition of an Emergency Response requirement to the SGEIS is a substantial improvement. However, it is recommended that NYSDEC include a review, approval, and audit process to ensure that quality plans are developed. NYSDEC should have a program to audit ERPs via drills, exercises, equipment inspections, and personnel training audits.

As proposed by NYSDEC, the operator is required to submit an ERP three days prior to commencing drilling. This leaves no time for regulators to review and approve the ERP. NYSDEC proposes no process for determining the adequacy of the ERP. There is no assessment of personnel training and qualifications, equipment resources, or local emergency response services.

Industrial fires, explosions, blowouts, and spills require specialized emergency response equipment, which may not be available at local fire and emergency services departments. For example, local fire and emergency services departments typically do not have well capping and control systems.

Larger, paid fire and emergency services departments, located near existing industrial developments, may have some industrial firefighting capability; however, the level of capability should be assessed by the operator and supplemented. If local emergency response services are relied upon in the ERP, operators should ensure emergency response personnel are trained, qualified, and equipped to respond to oil and gas industrial accidents. Small, local, volunteer fire and emergency services departments will typically not be equipped or qualified to meet this need.

³⁷⁷ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Page 7-146.

³⁷⁸ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 6, Page A6-7.

³⁷⁹ 2011 NYSDEC, RDSGEIS, Appendix 10, Page 1 of 17.

Recommendation No. 100: NYSDEC should identify an Emergency Response Plan (ERP) review, approval, and audit process to ensure that quality plans are developed. Objectives of the ERP should include adequately trained and qualified personnel, and the availability of adequate equipment. If local emergency response resources are relied on in the ERP, operators should ensure they are trained, qualified, and equipped to respond to an industrial accident. Additionally, NYSDEC should have a program to audit ERPs via drills, exercises, equipment inspections, and personnel training audits.

On average, a blowout occurs in 7 out of every 1,000 onshore exploration wells.³⁸⁰ This risk statistic is applicable to Marcellus and other low-permeability gas reservoir drilling that is still in the exploration and appraisal phase in NYS. Blowout rates are less frequent for production wells where more information is known about the reservoir, well control is optimized, and personnel are more experienced in site-specific conditions. For example, a review of production well blowouts in California estimated 1 blowout per 2,500 wells drilled.³⁸¹ California's data showed that: 25% of the blowouts affected more than 25 acres; the average blowout lasted 18 hours; and the maximum blowout length was 6 months.

Using the California statistic of 1 blowout per 2,500 production wells drilled (which is more conservative than the exploration well statistic of 7 blowouts per 1,000 exploration wells), and NYS' estimate of 1600 wells per year over 30 years, an incremental likelihood of 19 blowouts is estimated for NYS.³⁸² Because some of the early wells drilled will be exploration wells, the blowout frequency may be higher in the first few years of shale gas development in NYS and it is plausible that 40³⁸³ or more well blowouts could occur during the next 30 years. Therefore, blowouts are a reasonably foreseeable significant impact, and mitigation is warranted.

Hydrocarbon reservoirs can contain large quantities of gas and formation water, which can be released into the surrounding environment during a well blowout, resulting in significant damage. For example, the Chesapeake Energy 2011 Marcellus well blowout in Bradford County, Pennsylvania spilled thousands of gallons of fracture treatment fluid over "containment walls, through fields, personal property and farms, even where cattle continue[d] to graze."³⁸⁴

Methods to control a gas well blowout can require significant water withdrawals – from 500,000 to 6,000,000 gallons per day. Well control experts may also use foam and dry chemicals to respond to a blowout. Controlling a well blowout can create large volumes of waste. Rig-deluge operations create large pools of water that can transport oil, chemicals, fuels, and other materials toward lower elevation drainage areas.

In addition to the Chesapeake Energy 2011 well blowout, another Pennsylvania Marcellus Shale blowout occurred in 2010.^{385,386} Also, in 2010, there was a major industrial fire. The 2010 incidents prompted

³⁸⁰ Rana, S., Environmental Risks- Oil and Gas Operations Reducing Compliance Cost Using Smarter Technologies, Society of Petroleum Engineering Paper 121595-MS, Asia Pacific Health, Safety, Security and Environment Conference, 4-6 August 2009, Jakarta, Indonesia, 2009.

³⁸¹ Jordan, P.D., and Benson, S. M., Well Blowout Rates in California Oil and Gas District 4- Update and Trends, Summary of Well Blowout Risks for California Oil and Gas District 4, 1991-2005, Table 1

³⁸² 19 blowouts= (1,600 wells drilled per year)(30 years)(1 blowout per 2500 wells drilled).

³⁸³ 40 blowouts= 1,600 wells drilled per year)(2 years)(7 blowout per 1000 wells drilled)+(1,600 wells drilled per year)(28 years)(1 blowout per 2500 wells drilled).

³⁸⁴ Pennsylvania Fracking Spill: Natural Gas Well Blowout Spills Thousands of Gallons of Drilling Fluid, The Huffington Post, April 20, 2011.

³⁸⁵ Blowout Occurs at Pennsylvania Gas Well, Wall Street Journal, June 4, 2010.

Pennsylvania to realize the need for its own emergency response services, with trained and qualified personnel and adequate equipment available 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. The news reported that it took “16 hours for out-of-state crews to address a June 3 blowout in Clearfield County and 11 hours to extinguish a July 23 fire in Allegheny County. In both cases, well operators had to wait for response crews to fly in from Texas.”³⁸⁷

In 2010, CUDD Well Control located a new facility in Canton Township, Bradford County, Pennsylvania. Canton Township is located near the southern NYS border. It may be possible for NYS operators to contract with CUDD to provide emergency response services. However, a better alternative may be for NYS to collaborate with a well control specialist to provide more centrally located services dedicated to supporting NYS’ proposed drilling activity.

The 2011 RDSGEIS requires operators to develop and implement a blowout preventer (BOP) testing program. However, the SGEIS does not unequivocally require a well control expert be on contract. It is recommended that NYSDEC require operators to have a contract in place for immediate response by a trained and qualified well control contractor. If a contract with a well control expert is not in place when a blowout occurs, contract negotiations can cause detrimental delays.

Well capping is a proven, effective, and rapid method to control a blowout. Well control contractors provide the expertise and equipment for this operation. However, in some limited cases, well capping is not effective, and a relief well may be required. Therefore, it is important for operators to also have prearranged access to a relief well rig, either via a contract with a rig provider or via a memorandum of agreement to provide emergency response assistance with a nearby operator.

Recommendation No. 101: NYSDEC should require a well blowout response plan (either included in the Emergency Response Plan or as a separate plan), a contract retainer with an emergency well control expert, and prearranged access to a relief well rig.

NYCRR Proposed Revisions: NYSDEC has proposed a new regulation at 6 NYCRR § 560.5 requiring an ERP for HVHF wells. This is a substantial improvement; however, this plan should be required for all wells in NYS, not just HVHF wells. Additionally, the NYCRR should more clearly specify the ERP content requirements and include the recommendations listed above.

Recommendation No. 102: The requirement for an Emergency Response Plan should be codified in the NYCRR. It should apply to all wells in NYS, not just HVHF wells. The NYCRR should specify ERP content requirements. These requirements should be consistent with NYSDEC’s recommendations listed in Chapter 7.13 of the 2011 RDSGEIS.

³⁸⁶ Pennsylvania Fracking Spill: Natural Gas Well Blowout Spills Thousands of Gallons of Drilling Fluid, The Huffington Post, April 20, 2011.

³⁸⁷ <http://pagasdrilling.com/tag/cudd-well-control/>

25. Financial Assurance Amount

Background: In December 15, 2008, scoping comments to NYSDEC, NRDC, and its co-signatories requested the DSGEIS examine whether NYSDEC requires a sufficient financial assurance amount (in the form of a bond or other financial instrument). In its comments on the 2009 DSGEIS, NRDC and its co-signatories, as well as HCLLC, noted that the DSGEIS did not provide an analysis of the current financial assurance requirements, and requested that work be done.

HCLLC recommended that the SGEIS examine financial assurance amounts to ensure there is funding available to properly plug and abandon wells; remove equipment and contamination; complete surface restoration; and provide adequate insurance to compensate nearby public for adverse impacts (e.g., well contamination).

Long horizontal wells are more costly to plug and abandon than vertical wells. Also, surface impacts are increased when high-volume fracture stimulation treatments are employed and multiple wells are drilled from a single well pad. Both of these operations require additional gas treatment and transportation facilities.

In January 2011, NYS' consultant, Alpha Geoscience, advised NYSDEC to ignore financial assurance recommendations, declaring it "out of scope" of the SGEIS, because legislative action would be required at ECL 23-0305(8)(k).³⁸⁸ HCLCC disagrees. Regardless of whether a legislative change is required, financial assurance improvements for Marcellus Shale gas well drilling should not be disregarded in the RDSGEIS; instead, the SGEIS should recommend to NYS' Legislature the need for legislative action as a mitigating measure.

The 2011 RDSGEIS: The 2011 RDSGEIS still does not include recommendations for increasing the financial assurance amounts for HVHF shale gas operations.

NYCRR Proposed Revisions: There is no proposed revision to the amount of financial security for wells up to 6,000' deep. 6 NYCRR § 551.5. For wells between 2,500' and 6,000' in depth, NYSDEC requires only \$5,000 financial security per well, with the overall total per operator not to exceed \$150,000.

For wells drilled more than 6,000' deep, NYSDEC is proposing a regulatory revision that requires the operator to provide financial security in an amount based on the anticipated cost for plugging and abandoning the well (6 NYCRR § 551.6).

In 2003, ICF completed a report for the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA) on NYS oil and gas wells.³⁸⁹ ICF's report advised NYS that well plugging and abandonment can range from \$5,000 per well to more than \$50,000 per well depending on the well depth, well condition, site access, and site condition.³⁹⁰ ICF's 2003 report recommended that NYS consider increased financial security requirements. NYSDEC's current requirement of only \$5,000 financial

³⁸⁸ Alpha Geoscience, Review of the dSGEIS and Identification Best Technology and Best Practices Recommendations Harvey Consulting, LLC; December 28, 2009, prepared for NYSERDA, January 20, 2011, Page 46.

³⁸⁹ ICF Consulting, Well Characterization and Evaluation Program for New York State Oil and Gas Wells, Draft Report for the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, PSA No. 7012, July 2003. This report is found at <http://esogis.nysm.nysed.gov/esogisdata/downloads/NYSERDA/7012.pdf>. The report is listed as a draft, and a final could not be located on the world-wide web.

³⁹⁰ ICF Consulting, Well Characterization and Evaluation Program for New York State Oil and Gas Wells, Draft Report for the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, PSA No. 7012, July 2003, Page. ES-1.

security per well is clearly insufficient, if ICF determined in 2003 that the cost could be as much as \$50,000 per well. Today's cost would likely be higher, almost a decade later.

In Ohio, an operator is required to obtain liability insurance coverage of at least \$1,000,000 and up to \$3,000,000 for wells in urban areas. The Ohio Code at Title 15, Chapter 1509 requires:

1509.07 Liability insurance coverage. An owner of any well, except an exempt Mississippian well or an exempt domestic well, shall obtain liability insurance coverage from a company authorized to do business in this state in an amount of not less than one million dollars bodily injury coverage and property damage coverage to pay damages for injury to persons or damage to property caused by the drilling, operation, or plugging of all the owner's wells in this state. However, if any well is located within an urbanized area, the owner shall obtain liability insurance coverage in an amount of not less than three million dollars for bodily injury coverage and property damage coverage to pay damages for injury to persons or damage to property caused by the drilling, operation, or plugging of all of the owner's wells in this state. The owner shall maintain the coverage until all the owner's wells are plugged and abandoned or are transferred to an owner who has obtained insurance as required under this section and who is not under a notice of material and substantial violation or under a suspension order. The owner shall provide proof of liability insurance coverage to the chief of the division of oil and gas resources management upon request. Upon failure of the owner to provide that proof when requested, the chief may order the suspension of any outstanding permits and operations of the owner until the owner provides proof of the required insurance coverage.[emphasis added]

Except as otherwise provided in this section, an owner of any well, before being issued a permit under section 1509.06 of the Revised Code or before operating or producing from a well, shall execute and file with the division of oil and gas resources management a surety bond conditioned on compliance with the restoration requirements of section 1509.072, the plugging requirements of section 1509.12, the permit provisions of section 1509.13 of the Revised Code, and all rules and orders of the chief relating thereto, in an amount set by rule of the chief.

Recommendation No. 103: NYSDEC's financial assurance requirements should not narrowly focus on the cost for plugging and abandoning a well. Instead, NYSDEC's financial assurance requirements should include a combination of bonding and insurance that addresses the costs and risks of long-term monitoring; publicly incurred response and cleanup operations; site remediation and well abandonment; and adequate compensation to the public for adverse impacts (e.g., water well contamination). Recommendations for financial assurance improvements for Marcellus Shale gas well drilling should be included in the SGEIS as a mitigating measure, even if legislative action is ultimately required. Additionally, improved financial assurance should be codified in the NYCRR during this revision to the extent possible.

By comparison, Fort Worth, Texas requires an operator drilling 1-5 wells to provide a blanket bond or letter of credit of at least \$150,000, with incremental increases of \$50,000 for each additional well.³⁹¹ Therefore, under Fort Worth, Texas requirements, an operator drilling 100 wells would be required to hold a bond of \$4,900,000, as compared to \$150,000 in NYS.

³⁹¹ Fort Worth, Texas Ordinance No. 18449-2-2009, An Ordinance Amending the Code of Ordinances for the City of Fort Worth for Gas Drilling, 2009.

In addition to the bond amount, Fort Worth, Texas also requires the operator to carry multiple insurance policies:

1. *Standard Commercial General Liability Policy of at least \$1,000,000 per occurrence. The Standard Commercial General Liability insurance must include: “premises, operations, blowout or explosion, products, completed operations, sudden and accidental pollution, blanket contractual liability, underground resources and equipment hazard damage, broad form property damage, independent contractors’ protective liability and personal injury.”*
2. *Excess or Umbrella Liability of \$5,000,000;*
3. *Environmental Pollution Liability Coverage of at least \$5,000,000 “applicable to bodily injury, property damage, including the loss of use of damaged property or of property that has not been physically injured or destroyed; cleanup costs; and defense, including costs and expenses incurred in the investigation, defense or settlement of claims...coverage shall apply to sudden and accidental, as well as gradual pollution conditions resulting from the escape or release of smoke, vapors, fumes, acids, alkalis, toxic chemicals, liquids or gases, waste material or other irritants, contaminants or pollutants.”*
4. *Control of Well Policy of at least \$5,000,000 per occurrence/combined single limit with a \$500,000 sub-limit endorsement for damage to property for which the Operator has care, custody and control; and*
5. *Other insurance required by Texas (e.g. Workers Compensation Insurance, Auto Insurance, and other corporate insurance required to do business in the state of Texas).³⁹²*

Financial assurance requirements should be increased to address worst-case risk exposure. Risk assessments should include worst-case scenario financial impact models. The risk modeling should be used to set higher financial assurance requirements.

Recommendation No. 104: The financial assurance requirements at 6 NYCRR §§ 551.5 and 551.6 are insufficient to address the risks to NYS and private parties associated with oil and gas development. It is recommended that each operator provide a bond of at least \$100,000 per well, with a cap of \$5,000,000 for each operator. Additionally, NYSDEC should require Commercial General Liability Insurance, including Excess Insurance, Environmental Pollution Liability Coverage, and a Well Control Policy, of at least \$5,000,000. If NYSDEC deviates from these financial assurance requirements, it should be justified with a rigorous economic assessment that is provided to the public for review and comment.

³⁹² Fort Worth, Texas Ordinance No. 18449-2-2009, An Ordinance Amending the Code of Ordinances for the City of Fort Worth for Gas Drilling, 2009.

26. Seismic Data Collection

Background: In 2009, HCLLC recommended that NYSDEC improve the DSGEIS and establish regulatory requirements for seismic data collection to reduce impacts to the environment and the public. The 2009 DSGEIS addressed naturally occurring seismic events in Chapter 4, but was silent on the impacts from industrial seismic exploration, which is used to locate subsurface gas reservoirs including shale gas targets.

This problem persists in the 2011 RDSGEIS. The 2011 RDSGEIS discusses naturally occurring seismic events, and seismically induced fractures from HVHF operations, but does not include any analysis of the potential impacts or mitigation needed for two-dimensional (2D) or three-dimensional (3D) seismic surveys used to target hydrocarbon formations for exploration and appraisal drilling. These seismic surveys are also useful to identify major fault systems to be used in HVHF design and modeling. Improved understanding of the subsurface stratigraphy and fault systems will improved 3D model simulation predictions and can aid engineers in designing HVHF treatments that do not link induced fractures with existing, conductive, natural fault systems that could move HF fluids into protected groundwater resources or water wells.

In January 2011, NYS' consultant, Alpha Geoscience provided a misguided recommendation to NYSDEC to ignore seismic data collection mitigation in the RDSGEIS, as "irrelevant."³⁹³ Because seismic data collection is typically the first step in unexplored areas, to locate and optimize exploration drilling targets, seismic data collection mitigation when used to target Marcellus Shale wells is hardly "irrelevant."

Therefore, it is unclear whether NYSDEC is not familiar with the use of seismic data collection to target hydrocarbon formations for drilling, and the mitigation measures needed because its consultants advised against study of this important mitigation, or whether shale gas operators have told NYSDEC that they don't intend to collect two-dimensional (2D) or three-dimensional (3D) seismic surveys prior to exploring in the Marcellus Shale.


If operators do not intend to collect additional 2D and 3D data, that representation should be stated in the RDSGEIS, and the 2D and 3D data collection should be precluded in NYS. Otherwise, the impacts of this work should be identified and mitigated. This is an important issue to resolve, because seismic surveys can create significant surface impacts and disruptions.

Recommendation No. 105: If 2D or 3D seismic surveys are planned, or are possible in the future, the NYCRR should codify a permitting process for these activities and institute mitigating measures in the SGEIS to minimize surface impacts and disruptions, and require rehabilitation of impacted areas.

Exploration for oil and natural gas typically begins with a geologic examination of the surface structure of the earth, to identify areas where petroleum or gas deposits might exist. Once a geologist/geophysicist has identified an area of potential interest based on surface geologic maps, seismic data collection is typically obtained to identify possible subsurface hydrocarbon traps and structures.

³⁹³ Alpha Geoscience, Review of the dSGEIS and Identification Best Technology and Best Practices Recommendations, Harvey Consulting, LLC; December 28, 2009, prepared for NYSERDA, January 20, 2011.

Seismic exploration equipment is used to send seismic waves into the earth. Seismic waves are generated by a surface positioned source and are measured by a surface positioned receiver. The rate that seismic energy is transmitted and received through the earth crust provides information on the subsurface geology, because seismic waves reflect at different speeds and intensity off various rock strata and geologic structures. Collecting seismic data in this manner is called a Reflection Seismic Survey.³⁹⁴



A reflection seismic survey involves generating hundreds to tens of thousands of seismic source events, or shots, at various locations in the survey area. The seismic energy generated by each shot is detected and recorded by sensitive receivers (“geophones” on land and “hydrophones” under water) at a variety of distances from the source location. Geophones and hydrophones are connected by long cables to relay the collected information back to a centralized computer. The photo to the left is a geophone and cable system.³⁹⁵

For every source event, each geophone generates a seismogram or trace, which is a time series representing the earth movement at the receiver location. A record of all traces for each shot is transmitted to a computer for storage and conversion into a seamless cross-sectional representation of the subsurface for subsequent study and interpretation by a trained geophysicist.

Onland seismic operations involve generation of seismic vibrations by explosive energy sources or by mechanical sources. One type of energy source for seismic exploration is an explosive charge. Small holes (“shot-holes”), typically 4 inches in diameter are drilled into the earth surface, 10-60’ deep depending on surface terrain.³⁹⁶ Although, some drill holes have been drilled to 200’.³⁹⁷ The photo to the right shows an example of a shot-hole drill unit.



³⁹⁴ U.S. Geologic Survey, Seismic Data Acquisition.

³⁹⁵ Geophone and cable photo from <http://www.anr.state.vt.us/dec/geo/newbedu.htm>, State of Vermont.

³⁹⁶ Westlund, D., Thurber, M.W., Best Environmental Practices for Seismic Exploration in Tropical Rainforest, Society of Petroleum Engineers International Conference on Health, Safety and Environment in Oil and Gas Exploration and Production, SPE 10HSE 126844-PP, April 2010.

³⁹⁷ US Fish and Wildlife Service, 612 FW 2, Oil and Gas, Policy Manual.

The hole must be drilled into a hard layer of soil that is sufficiently dense to carry the seismic wave.³⁹⁸ Explosive charges (typically 5-50 pounds each)³⁹⁹ are lowered into the hole and detonated to create a shock wave (vibration). Some states have limits on the size of charges that can be deployed near environmentally sensitive areas, human habitation and near roadways.

Historic use of explosives on the ground surface resulted in large craters and extensive surface damage. Explosive charges are no longer deployed at the surface. Instead, a shot-hole must be drilled and the explosive lowered into the shot-hole at a sufficient depth to prevent surface craters. Shot-holes are filled with cuttings, bentonite and rocks to minimize surface impact.

Mechanical vibrators are an alternative to the use of explosives, and are more commonly used. Mechanical vibrators provide more consistent source strength and repeatability, and they are more reliable in the case of repeat data acquisition programs or for time-lapse studies.

Mechanical vibrators can include: a pad that thumps the surface of the earth (“thumper trucks”), driven by gravity or compressed air; a truck that generates vibrations (“Vibroiseis™ Truck”); and compressed air guns.⁴⁰⁰ The photo to the right shows a Vibroseis Truck. The Vibroseis method involves a truck equipped with vibrator pads that are lowered to the ground and triggered. Depending on the subsurface target depth and the purpose of the seismic survey, two or more seismic Vibroseis Trucks (vibrating in sync) may be needed.



In cold climates, ice road construction and use of Vibroseis Trucks for seismic data acquisition is the norm. Seismic data is typically secured over the winter months along ice road routes, to reduce footprint and stress to sensitive areas of the tundra environment.



The use of thumper trucks is not considered best practice because it involves dropping a steel slab that weighs about three tons to the ground to create a seismic vibration. Thumper trucks are large, requiring extensive tree and vegetation removal, and leave land scars.

In areas where seismic data is collected in water, the energy source is usually compressed air in an airgun submerged underwater, because explosives can cause adverse impacts to aquatic life.

³⁹⁸ The Pembina Institute, Seismic Exploration, www.pembina.org.

³⁹⁹ US Fish and Wildlife Service, 612 FW 2, Oil and Gas, Policy Manual.


⁴⁰⁰ Petroleum Engineering Handbook, Reservoir Engineering and Petrophysics, Volume V(A), Society of Petroleum Engineers, 2007.

Significant surface impacts can be caused by extensive tree and vegetation removal to create straight “cutlines” to run seismic equipment (as shown in the photo to the left). Lines need to be cut to run mechanical vibration equipment or set explosives to generate the seismic waves, and other seismic lines are cleared to set geophones to measure the seismic reflection. The width of each cutline depends on the seismic survey method used, but can be on the order of 20’-50’ wide where large seismic equipment units are required. Best practice is to decrease the width of the cutlines to as small as possible using hand carried equipment. More recently companies have been able to reduce cutline width to 6’-10’ in certain circumstances.

The spacing between each cutline is dependent on the type of seismic equipment used and depth of examination into the earth. The distance between each cutline is typically 300’ apart (shallow reservoir targets) to 3,000’ apart (deeper reservoir targets).⁴⁰¹

Depending on existing development, infrastructure and access in the area planned for onshore seismic exploration, a seismic operator may need to build access roads, set up temporary camps and establish helicopter landings to bring in personnel and equipment. In areas where there are existing roads, housing and airports, surface disturbance can be minimized.

A basic set of seismic data can be obtained by setting a two dimensional array of seismic sources and receivers (2D seismic). Typically 2D seismic requires seismic lines tens of miles apart. Often 2D data is acquired along existing roads or access routes to minimize surface impacts. Along the 2D seismic cutlines shot-points and receivers are evenly spaced to send and receive a signal. This process produces a 2D slice of the subsurface.



If funding is available, operators generally opt to collect three dimensional seismic (3D seismic) images of the subsurface. 3D seismic data acquisition involves a much more intensive data collection effort, using multiple shot lines arranged perpendicular to multiple receiver lines of geophones, with seismic lines spaced several hundred feet apart, rather than miles apart.⁴⁰² An example of a map produced from a 3D seismic survey is shown to the left.

Seismic operations are very labor intensive and require large amounts of equipment, personnel and support systems. Depending on the size of the area under study, and the type of equipment selected, seismic operations can require dozens to hundreds of personnel. In addition to seismic exploration equipment, there is a need for housing, catering, waste management systems, water supplies, medical facilities, equipment maintenance and repair shops, and other logistical support functions. None of these impacts have been analyzed in the NYS RDSGEIS.

There are typically six different crews deployed: (1) access crews, that clear seismic lines, (2) “shooters” that drill the shot-holes and set the explosive charges or run the mechanical vibration equipment to generate seismic waves, (3) “recorders” that set the geophones and measure the seismic reflection, (4) the “pick-up” crews that move the equipment from one location to the next along the seismic lines,

⁴⁰¹ The Pembina Institute, Seismic Exploration, www.pembina.org.

⁴⁰² Westlund, D., Thurber, M.W., Best Environmental Practices for Seismic Exploration in Tropical Rainforest, Society of Petroleum Engineers International Conference on Health, Safety and Environment in Oil and Gas Exploration and Production, SPE 10HSE 126844-PP, April 2010.

(5) logistical support crews that provide housing, food, medical, maintenance and repair, and transportation; and (6) remediation and plugging crews that restore the area and plug shot-holes (if used).

Recommendation No. 106: The increased industrial activity (e.g. economic impacts, noise, surface disturbance, wildlife impacts, etc.) associated with 2D and 3D seismic surveys should be examined in the SGEIS.

In 2011, HCLLC developed a report for NRDC and Sierra Club describing the types of impacts that occur from 2D and 3D seismic surveys, and made recommendations for best practices and model permit requirements. The recommendations in this report could be considered by NYSDEC in crafting seismic survey requirements for NYCRR.⁴⁰³

Recommendation No. 107: Consider the best practices and model permit requirements proposed in Harvey Consulting, LLC., Onshore Seismic Exploration Best Practices & Model Permit Requirements Report to: Sierra Club and Natural Resources Defense Council, January 20, 2011, for inclusion as mitigation measures in the SGEIS and improvements in the NYCRR to regulate seismic survey data collection.

⁴⁰³ Harvey Consulting, LLC., Onshore Seismic Exploration Best Practices & Model Permit Requirements Report to: Sierra Club and Natural Resources Defense Council, January 20, 2011.

APPENDIX A

Surface Casing Table

Appendix A - Surface Casing Table

Surface Casing Requirement	2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 8 Casing and Cementing Practices	2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 9 Existing Fresh Water Supplementary Permit Conditions Required for Wells Drilled in Primary and Principal Aquifers	2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 10 Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF	Analysis of Proposed Permit Conditions and Recommendations in 2011 RDSGEIS	NYCRR Requirements for all Wells, NYCRR Part 554	ADDITIONAL NYCRR Requirements for all HVHF Wells, NYCRR Part 560	Analysis of Proposed NYCRR Requirements and Recommendations
Setting Depth	75' beyond the deepest fresh water zone encountered or 75' into competent rock (bedrock), whichever is deeper.	100' below the deepest freshwater zone and at least 100' into bedrock.	No requirement listed; assume it defaults to the Appendix 8 requirement of 75'.	The Appendix 10 HVHF surface casing setting depth requirement is less stringent than the Appendix 9 requirement; both should be 100'. NYSDEC should consider a 100' protection for all oil and gas wells. Additionally, NYSDEC needs to clarify whether the setting depth is intended to protect potable freshwater only, or include a broader definition of protected groundwater, which would result in deeper surface casing depths.	Surface casing must be run in all wells to extend below the deepest potable fresh water level. Neither the 75' nor the 100' setting depth below the deepest protected water zone is specified in the NYCRR.	No additional requirement.	NYSDEC should consider a 100' protection for all oil and gas wells. Additionally, NYSDEC needs to clarify whether this setting depth is intended to protect potable freshwater only, or include a broader definition of protected groundwater, which would result in deeper surface casing depths. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells.
Protected water depth estimate and verification	No requirement.	Estimated in drilling application and verified while drilling.	No requirement.	The freshwater depth should be estimated in the drilling application to aid in well construction design. The actual protected water depth should be verified with a resistivity log or other sampling method. If the actual protected water depth extends beyond the estimated protected water depth, an additional string of intermediate casing should be required.	No requirement.	No requirement.	The freshwater depth should be estimated in the drilling application to aid in well construction design. The actual protected water depth should be verified with a resistivity log or other sampling method. If the actual protected water depth extends beyond the estimated protected water depth, an additional string of intermediate casing should be required. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells.
Cement Sheath Width	No requirement.	At least 1-1/4".	No requirement.	A cement sheath of at least 1-1/4" should be installed on all oil and gas wells. Thin cement sheaths are easily cracked and damaged.	No requirement.	No requirement.	A cement sheath of at least 1-1/4" should be installed on all oil and gas wells. Thin cement sheaths are easily cracked and damaged. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells.

Appendix A - Surface Casing Table

Surface Casing Requirement	2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 8 Casing and Cementing Practices	2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 9 Existing Fresh Water Supplementary Permit Conditions Required for Wells Drilled in Primary and Principal Aquifers	2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 10 Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF	Analysis of Proposed Permit Conditions and Recommendations in 2011 RDSGEIS	NYCRR Requirements for all Wells, NYCRR Part 554	ADDITIONAL NYCRR Requirements for all HVHF Wells, NYCRR Part 560	Analysis of Proposed NYCRR Requirements and Recommendations
Amount of Cement in Annulus	Not specified, but it is presumed that the goal is to complete annulus cementing, because the requirements include 25% excess cement; however, the conditions require a reporting of the cement top location, if cement is not returned to the surface, which indicates that NYSDEC could accept a partially cemented annulus.	Entire annulus must be cemented; cement squeeze may be required.	No requirement listed; assume it defaults to Appendix 8 requirement.	The surface casing annulus should be completely filled with cement; this should be clearly specified. There should be no void space in the annulus.	There is a requirement to circulate cement to the top of the hole.	No additional requirement.	The surface casing annulus should be completely filled with cement; this should be clearly specified. There should be no void space in the annulus. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells.
Shallow gas hazards	Surface hole drilling must stop and surface casing must be set and cemented before drilling deeper into hydrocarbon resources.	The likelihood of shallow gas hazards must be estimated in the drilling application and verified while drilling.	No requirement listed; assume it defaults to Appendix 8 requirement.	All oil and gas well designs and applications should plan for shallow gas hazards. Any shallow gas hazards encountered while drilling should be recorded. If a shallow gas hazard is encountered, surface casing should be set and cemented to protect water resources, before drilling deeper into hydrocarbon resources.	No requirement.	No requirement.	If a shallow gas hazard is encountered, surface hole drilling must stop, and surface casing must be set and cemented, before drilling deeper into hydrocarbon resources. All oil and gas well designs and applications should plan for shallow gas hazards. Any shallow gas hazards encountered while drilling should be recorded. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells.
Excess Cement Requirement	25%	50%	No requirement listed; assume it defaults to Appendix 8 requirement of 25%.	25% excess cement is standard practice, unless a caliper log is run to more accurately assess hole shape and required cement volume.	No requirement.	No requirement.	25% excess cement is standard practice, unless a caliper log is run to more accurately assess hole shape and required cement volume. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells.

Appendix A - Surface Casing Table

Surface Casing Requirement	2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 8 Casing and Cementing Practices	2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 9 Existing Fresh Water Supplementary Permit Conditions Required for Wells Drilled in Primary and Principal Aquifers	2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 10 Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF	Analysis of Proposed Permit Conditions and Recommendations in 2011 RDSGEIS	NYCRR Requirements for all Wells, NYCRR Part 554	ADDITIONAL NYCRR Requirements for all HVHF Wells, NYCRR Part 560	Analysis of Proposed NYCRR Requirements and Recommendations
Cement Type	The cement slurry shall be prepared according to the manufacturer's or contractor's specifications to minimize free water content in the cement.	No requirement listed; assume it defaults to Appendix 8 requirement.	The cement must conform to API Specification 10A, Specifications for Cement and Material for Well Cementing (April 2002 and January 2005 Addendum). Further, the cement slurry must be prepared to minimize its free water content, in accordance with the same API specification, and it must contain a gas-block additive.	HVHF cement quality requirements (including API specifications and the use of gas-blocking additives) is best practice. These practices should apply to all wells, not just HVHF wells.	No requirement.	The cement must conform to the industry standards specified in the permit to drill, and the cement slurry must be prepared to minimize its free water content and contain a gas-block additive.	The cement must conform to API Specification 10A, Specifications for Cement and Material for Well Cementing (April 2002 and January 2005 Addendum). Further, the cement slurry must be prepared to minimize its free water content, in accordance with the same API specification, and it must contain a gas-block additive. HVHF cement quality requirements (including API specifications and the use of gas-blocking additives) is best practice. These practices should apply to all wells, not just HVHF wells.
Cement Mix Water Temperature and pH Monitoring	Required.	No requirement listed; assume it defaults to Appendix 8 requirement.	No requirement listed; assume it defaults to Appendix 8 requirement.	Best practice is for the free water separation to average no more than six milliliters per 250 milliliters of tested cement, in accordance with the current API RP 10B. Best practice is to test for pH to evaluate water chemistry and ensure cement is mixed to manufacturer's recommendations.	No requirement.	The cement must conform to the industry standards specified in the permit to drill, and the cement slurry must be prepared to minimize its free water content.	Best practice is for the free water separation to average no more than six milliliters per 250 milliliters of tested cement, in accordance with the current API RP 10B. Best practice is to test for pH to evaluate water chemistry and ensure cement is mixed to manufacturer's recommendations. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells, not just HVHF wells.
Lost Circulation Control	Required.	Required.	Required.	Lost circulation control is best practice.	No requirement.	No requirement.	Lost circulation control is best practice. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells, not just HVHF wells.

Appendix A - Surface Casing Table

Surface Casing Requirement	2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 8 Casing and Cementing Practices	2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 9 Existing Fresh Water Supplementary Permit Conditions Required for Wells Drilled in Primary and Principal Aquifers	2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 10 Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF	Analysis of Proposed Permit Conditions and Recommendations in 2011 RDSGEIS	NYCRR Requirements for all Wells, NYCRR Part 554	ADDITIONAL NYCRR Requirements for all HVHF Wells, NYCRR Part 560	Analysis of Proposed NYCRR Requirements and Recommendations
Spacer Fluids	Required.	No requirement listed; assume it defaults to Appendix 8 requirement.	Required.	The use of spacer fluids to separate mud and cement, to avoid mud contamination of the cement, is best practice.	No requirement.	A spacer of adequate volume, makeup, and consistency must be pumped ahead of the cement.	The use of spacer fluids to separate mud and cement, to avoid mud contamination of the cement, is best practice. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells, not just HVHF wells.
Hole conditioning before cementing	Gas flows must be killed or lost circulation must be controlled and the hole be conditioned before cementing.	No requirement listed; assume it defaults to Appendix 8 requirement.	No requirement listed; assume it defaults to Appendix 8 requirement.	Hole conditioning before cementing is best practice.	No requirement.	Prior to cementing any casing string, the borehole must be circulated and conditioned to ensure an adequate cement bond.	Hole conditioning before cementing is best practice. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells, not just HVHF wells.
Cement Installation and Pump Rate	No requirement.	No requirement.	The cement must be pumped at a rate and in a flow regime that inhibits channeling of the cement in the annulus.	The requirement for cement to be pumped at a rate and in a flow regime that inhibits channeling of the cement in the annulus is a good practice; this requirement should apply to all oil and gas wells, not just HVHF wells.	No requirement.	Cement must be pumped at a rate and in a flow regime that inhibits channeling of the cement in the annulus.	The requirement for cement to be pumped at a rate and in a flow regime that inhibits channeling of the cement in the annulus is a good practice; this requirement should apply to all oil and gas wells, not just HVHF wells.
Rotating and Reciprocating Casing While Cementing	No requirement.	No requirement.	No requirement.	Rotating and reciprocating casing while cementing is a best practice to improve cement placement.	No requirement.	No additional requirement.	Rotating and reciprocating casing while cementing is a best practice to improve cement placement. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells.
Centralizers	At least every 120', with a minimum of two centralizers. A table of centralizer-hole size combinations is included.	At least every 120'.	At least two centralizers (one in the middle and one at the top), and all bow-spring style centralizers must conform to API Specification 10D for Bow-Spring Casing Centralizers (March 2002).	The proposed conditions reference an outdated API casing centralizer standard. Best practice is to use at least two centralizers and follow API RP 10D-2 (July 2010).	No requirement.	In addition to centralizers otherwise required by the department, at least two centralizers, one in the middle and one at the top of the first joint of casing, must be installed, and all bow-spring style centralizers must conform to the industry standards specified in the permit to drill.	The proposed conditions reference an outdated API casing centralizer standard. Best practice is to use at least two centralizers and follow API RP 10D-2 (July 2010). This requirement should apply to all NYS wells, not just HVHF wells.

Appendix A - Surface Casing Table

Surface Casing Requirement	2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 8 Casing and Cementing Practices	2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 9 Existing Fresh Water Supplementary Permit Conditions Required for Wells Drilled in Primary and Principal Aquifers	2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 10 Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF	Analysis of Proposed Permit Conditions and Recommendations in 2011 RDSGEIS	NYCRR Requirements for all Wells, NYCRR Part 554	ADDITIONAL NYCRR Requirements for all HVHF Wells, NYCRR Part 560	Analysis of Proposed NYCRR Requirements and Recommendations
Casing quality	All surface casing shall be a string of new pipe with a mill test of at least 1,100 pounds per square inch (psi); used casing may be approved for use, but must be pressure tested before drilling out the casing shoe.	New pipe with minimum internal yield pressure (MIYP) of 1,800 psi, or reconditioned pipe that has been tested internally to a minimum of 2,700 psi, must be used.	New pipe is required and must conform to American Petroleum Institute (API) Specification 5CT, Specifications for Casing and Tubing (April 2002).	New casing should be used in all wells. Once installed, surface casing remains in the well for the life of the well, and typically remains in place when the well is plugged and abandoned. It is important that the surface casing piping string (known as "the water protection piping string") is of high quality to maximize the corrosion allowance and life-cycle of the piping. The installation of older, used, thinner pipe, with less remaining corrosion allowance, may be a temporary solution, but not a long-term investment in groundwater protection. Used piping may pass an initial pressure test; however, it will not last as long as new piping, and will not be as protective of water resources in the long-term.	No requirement.	All casing must be new and conform to the industry standards specified in the permit to drill.	New casing should be used in all wells. Once installed, surface casing remains in the well for the life of the well, and typically remains in place when the well is plugged and abandoned. It is important that the surface casing piping string (known as "the water protection piping string") is of high quality to maximize the corrosion allowance and life-cycle of the piping. The installation of older, used, thinner pipe, with less remaining corrosion allowance, may be a temporary solution, but not a long-term investment in groundwater protection. Used piping may pass an initial pressure test; however, it will not last as long as new piping, and will not be as protective of water resources in the long-term.
Casing Thread Compound	No requirement.	No requirement.	Casing thread compound and its use must conform to API Recommended Practice (RP) 5A3, RP on Thread Compounds for Casing, Tubing, Line Pipe, and Drill Stem Elements (November 2009).	The requirement to use casing thread compound that conforms to API RP 5A3 (November 2009) is a good practice. This requirement should apply to all oil and gas wells, not HVHF wells.	No requirement.	Casing thread compound and its use must conform to the industry standards specified in the permit to drill.	The requirement to use casing thread compound that conforms to API RP 5A3 (November 2009) is a good practice. This requirement should apply to all oil and gas wells, not HVHF wells.

Appendix A - Surface Casing Table

Surface Casing Requirement	2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 8 Casing and Cementing Practices	2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 9 Existing Fresh Water Supplementary Permit Conditions Required for Wells Drilled in Primary and Principal Aquifers	2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 10 Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF	Analysis of Proposed Permit Conditions and Recommendations in 2011 RDSGEIS	NYCRR Requirements for all Wells, NYCRR Part 554	ADDITIONAL NYCRR Requirements for all HVHF Wells, NYCRR Part 560	Analysis of Proposed NYCRR Requirements and Recommendations
Drilling Mud	No requirement.	Compressed air or WBM, no SMB or OBM.	Not listed in Appendix 10, but the RDSGEIS text includes a section that states compressed air or WBM should be used on HVHF wells.	The use of compressed air or WBM (with no toxic additives) is best practice when drilling through protected water zones. This should be a requirement for all wells, not just those described in Appendix 9.	No requirement.	No requirement.	The use of compressed air or WBM (with no toxic additives) is best practice when drilling through protected water zones. This should be a requirement for all NYS wells.
Cement Setting Time	Compressive strength standard of 500 psi.	No requirement listed; assume it defaults to Appendix 8 requirement.	8 hours Wait on Cement (WOC) and compressive strength standard of 500 psi.	Best practice is to have surface casing strings stand under pressure until the cement has reached a compressive strength of at least 500 psi in the zone of critical cement, before drilling out the cement plug or initiating a test. Additionally, the cement mixture in the zone of critical cement should have a 72-hour compressive strength of at least 1,200 psi.	No requirement.	8 hours Wait on Cement (WOC) and compressive strength standard of 500 psi.	Best practice is to have surface casing strings stand under pressure until the cement has reached a compressive strength of at least 500 psi in the zone of critical cement, before drilling out the cement plug or initiating a test. Additionally, the cement mixture in the zone of critical cement should have a 72-hour compressive strength of at least 1,200 psi. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells.
NYSDEC Inspector	No requirement.	Required to be onsite for cementing operations.	No requirement.	Best practice is to have a state inspector on site during cementing operations, to verify surface casing cement is correctly installed, before attaching the blowout preventer and drilling deeper into the formation.	No requirement.	No additional requirement.	Best practice is to have a state inspector on site during cementing operations, to verify surface casing cement is correctly installed, before attaching the blowout preventer and drilling deeper into the formation. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells.

Appendix A - Surface Casing Table

Surface Casing Requirement	2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 8 Casing and Cementing Practices	2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 9 Existing Fresh Water Supplementary Permit Conditions Required for Wells Drilled in Primary and Principal Aquifers	2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 10 Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF	Analysis of Proposed Permit Conditions and Recommendations in 2011 RDSGEIS	NYCRR Requirements for all Wells, NYCRR Part 554	ADDITIONAL NYCRR Requirements for all HVHF Wells, NYCRR Part 560	Analysis of Proposed NYCRR Requirements and Recommendations
Cement QA/QC - Cement Evaluation Log	NYSDEC reserves the right to require the operator run a cement bond log, but does not require one on every well.	NYSDEC reserves the right to require the operator run a cement bond log, but does not require one on every well.	No requirement listed; assume it defaults to Appendix 8 requirement.	Circulating cement to the surface is one indication of successfully cemented surface casing, but it is not the only QA/QC check that should be conducted. Cement circulation to surface can be achieved even when there are mud or gas channels, or other voids, in the cement column. Circulating cement to the surface also may not identify poor cement to casing wall bonding. These integrity problems, among others, can be further examined using a cement evaluation tool and temperature survey.	No requirement.	No additional requirement.	Circulating cement to the surface is one indication of successfully cemented surface casing, but it is not the only QA/QC check that should be conducted. Cement circulation to surface can be achieved even when there are mud or gas channels, or other voids, in the cement column. Circulating cement to the surface also may not identify poor cement to casing wall bonding. These integrity problems, among others, can be further examined using a cement evaluation tool and temperature survey.
Formation Integrity Test	No requirement.	No requirement.	No requirement.	It is best practice to complete a formation integrity test to verify the integrity of the cement in the surface casing annulus at the surface casing shoe. The test should be conducted after drilling out of the casing shoe, into at least 20 feet, but not more than 50 feet of new formation. The test results should demonstrate that the integrity of the casing shoe is sufficient to contain the anticipated wellbore pressures identified in the application for the Permit to Drill.	No requirement.	No requirement.	It is best practice to complete a formation integrity test to verify the integrity of the cement in the surface casing annulus at the surface casing shoe. The test should be conducted after drilling out of the casing shoe, into at least 20 feet, but not more than 50 feet of new formation. The test results should demonstrate that the integrity of the casing shoe is sufficient to contain the anticipated wellbore pressures identified in the application for the Permit to Drill. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells.

Appendix A - Surface Casing Table

Surface Casing Requirement	2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 8 Casing and Cementing Practices	2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 9 Existing Fresh Water Supplementary Permit Conditions Required for Wells Drilled in Primary and Principal Aquifers	2011 RDSGEIS Appendix 10 Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF	Analysis of Proposed Permit Conditions and Recommendations in 2011 RDSGEIS	NYCRR Requirements for all Wells, NYCRR Part 554	ADDITIONAL NYCRR Requirements for all HVHF Wells, NYCRR Part 560	Analysis of Proposed NYCRR Requirements and Recommendations
BOP Installation	Confirmation that the surface casing is set and cemented into place, such that the BOP can be secured and effective when drilling deeper into the well.	No requirement listed; assume it defaults to Appendix 8 requirement.	No requirement listed; assume it defaults to Appendix 8 requirement.	The Appendix 8 requirement is best practice. Additionally, the surface casing should be pressure tested to ensure it can hold the required working pressure of the BOP.	No requirement.	No requirement.	The Appendix 8 requirement is best practice. Additionally, the surface casing should be pressure tested to ensure it can hold the required working pressure of the BOP. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells.
Record keeping	Not specified.	Not specified.	Records must be kept for five years after the well is P&A'd, and be available for review upon NYSDEC's request.	Best practice is to keep permanent records for each well, even after the well is P&A'd. This information will be needed by NYSDEC and industry during the well's operating life, will be critical for designing the P&A, and may be required if the well leaks post P&A. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells, not just HVHF wells. P&A'd wells do occasionally leak, and well information is may be needed to develop a re-entry, repair, re-P&A plan.	No requirement.	Records must be kept for five years after the well is P&A'd, and be available for review upon NYSDEC's request.	Best practice is to keep permanent records for each well, even after the well is P&A'd. This information will be needed by NYSDEC and industry during the well's operating life, will be critical for designing the P&A, and may be required if the well leaks post P&A. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells, not just HVHF wells. P&A'd wells do occasionally leak, and well information is may be needed to develop a re-entry, repair, re-P&A plan.
Additional Casing or Repair	Not specified.	Not specified.	The installation of an additional cemented casing string or strings in the well, as deemed necessary by the Department for environmental and/or public safety reasons, may be required at any time.	NYSDEC should reserve the right to require industry to install additional cemented casing strings in wells, and repair defective casing or cementing, as deemed necessary for environmental and/or public safety reasons. This requirement should apply to all wells, not just HVHF wells.	No requirement.	The installation of an additional cemented casing string or strings in the well, as deemed necessary by the department for environmental and/or public safety reasons, may be required at any time.	NYSDEC should reserve the right to require industry to install additional cemented casing strings in wells, and repair defective casing or cementing, as deemed necessary for environmental and/or public safety reasons. This requirement should apply to all wells, not just HVHF wells.

APPENDIX B

Intermediate Casing Table

Appendix B - Intermediate Casing Table

Intermediate Casing Requirement	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 8 Casing and Cementing Practices	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 9 Existing Fresh Water Supplementary Permit Conditions Required for Wells Drilled in Primary and Principal Aquifers	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 10 Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF	Analysis of Proposed NYS RDSGEIS, Permit Conditions and Recommendations	NYCRR Requirement for all NYS Wells, NYCRR Part 554	Additional NYCRR Requirement for HVHF Wells, NYCRR Part 560	Analysis of Proposed NYCRR Requirements and Recommendations
Waiver Provision to Exclude Use of Intermediate Casing	Intermediate casing is required on a case-by-case basis.	Intermediate casing is required on a case-by-case basis.	Intermediate casing is required on all wells unless a waiver is granted.	It is best practice to install intermediate casing on a case-by-case basis for most wells; however, it is best practice to install it on all HVHF wells. The waiver provision proposed in the RDSGEIS to exclude intermediate casing on HVHF wells is not technically justified.	No requirement.	Intermediate casing is required on all wells unless a waiver is granted.	It is best practice to install intermediate casing on a case-by-case basis for most wells; however, it is best practice to install it on all HVHF wells. The waiver provision proposed in the RDSGEIS to exclude intermediate casing on HVHF wells is not technically justified.
Setting Depth	No requirement.	No requirement.	The setting depth and design of the casing must consider all applicable drilling, geologic, and well control factors.	Best practice is to set intermediate casing at least 100' below the deepest protected groundwater, to seal off anomalous pressure zones, lost circulation zones, and other drilling hazards. Although intermediate casing setting depth is site specific, there should be criteria for determining that depth.	No requirement.	The setting depth and design of the casing must consider all applicable drilling, geologic, and well control factors.	Best practice is to set intermediate casing at least 100' below the deepest protected groundwater, to seal off anomalous pressure zones, lost circulation zones, and other drilling hazards. Although intermediate casing setting depth is site specific, there should be criteria for determining that depth. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells.
Protected Water Depth Estimate and Verification	No requirement.	No requirement.	No requirement.	The freshwater depth should be estimated in the drilling application to aid in well construction design. The actual protected water depth should be verified with a resistivity log or other sampling method during drilling, ensuring intermediate casing protects that groundwater.	No requirement.	No requirement.	The freshwater depth should be estimated in the drilling application to aid in well construction design. The actual protected water depth should be verified with a resistivity log or other sampling method during drilling, ensuring intermediate casing protects that groundwater. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells where intermediate casing is set.
Cement Sheath Width	No requirement.	No requirement.	No requirement.	A cement sheath of at least 1-1/4" should be installed. Thin cement sheaths are easily cracked and damaged.	No requirement.	No requirement.	A cement sheath of at least 1-1/4" should be installed. Thin cement sheaths are easily cracked and damaged. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells where intermediate casing is set.
Amount of Cement in Annulus	No requirement.	No requirement.	Intermediate casing must be fully cemented to surface with excess cement.	It is best practice to fully cement intermediate casing if technically feasible to isolate protected water zones, and to seal off anomalous pressure zones, lost circulation zones, and other drilling hazards. If the casing can not be fully cemented most states require cement to be placed from the casing shoe to a point at least 500-600' above the shoe.	No requirement.	Intermediate casing must be fully cemented to surface with excess cement.	It is best practice to fully cement intermediate casing if technically feasible to isolate protected water zones, and to seal off anomalous pressure zones, lost circulation zones, and other drilling hazards. If the casing can not be fully cemented most states require cement to be placed from the casing shoe to a point at least 500-600' above the shoe. This requirement should apply to all wells where intermediate casing is set.
Excess Cement Requirement	No requirement.	No requirement.	25% unless a caliper log is run; if a caliper log is run, the excess cement requirement is 10%.	25% excess cement is standard practice, unless a caliper log is run to assess the hole shape and required cement volume.	No requirement.	25% unless a caliper log is run; if a caliper log is run, the excess cement requirement is 10%.	25% excess cement is standard practice, unless a caliper log is run to assess the hole shape and required cement volume. This requirement should apply to all wells where intermediate casing is set.

Appendix B - Intermediate Casing Table

Intermediate Casing Requirement	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 8 Casing and Cementing Practices	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 9 Existing Fresh Water Supplementary Permit Conditions Required for Wells Drilled in Primary and Principal Aquifers	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 10 Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF	Analysis of Proposed NYS RDSGEIS, Permit Conditions and Recommendations	NYCRR Requirement for all NYS Wells, NYCRR Part 554	Additional NYCRR Requirement for HVHF Wells, NYCRR Part 560	Analysis of Proposed NYCRR Requirements and Recommendations
Cement Type	No requirement.	No requirement.	Cement must conform to API Specification 10A, Specifications for Cement and Material for Well Cementing (April 2002 and January 2005 Addendum). The cement slurry must be prepared to minimize its free water content, in accordance with the same API specification, and it must contain a gas-block additive.	HVHF cement quality requirements (including API specifications and the use of gas-blocking additives) are best practice. However, these practices should apply to all wells where intermediate casing is installed, not just HVHF wells.	No requirement.	Cement must conform to industry standards, specified in the permit to drill, and the cement slurry must be prepared to minimize its free water content, in accordance with the industry standards, and contain a gas-block additive.	Cement must conform to API Specification 10A, Specifications for Cement and Material for Well Cementing (April 2002 and January 2005 Addendum). The cement slurry must be prepared to minimize its free water content, in accordance with the same API specification, and it must contain a gas-block additive. HVHF cement quality requirements (including API specifications and the use of gas-blocking additives) are best practice. However, these practices should apply to all wells where intermediate casing is installed, not just HVHF wells.
Cement Mix Water Temperature and pH Monitoring	No requirement.	No requirement.	Cement slurry must be prepared to minimize its free water content, in accordance with industry standards and specifications.	Best practice is for the free water separation to average no more than six milliliters per 250 milliliters of tested cement, in accordance with the current API RP 10B. Best practice is to test for pH to evaluate water chemistry and ensure cement is mixed to manufacturer's recommendations.	No requirement.	Cement must conform to industry standards, specified in the permit to drill, and the cement slurry must be prepared to minimize its free water content, in accordance with the industry standards.	Best practice is for the free water separation to average no more than six milliliters per 250 milliliters of tested cement, in accordance with the current API RP 10B. Best practice is to test for pH to evaluate water chemistry and ensure cement is mixed to manufacturer's recommendations. These requirements should apply to all NYS wells where intermediate casing is required, not just HVHF wells.
Lost Circulation Control	No requirement.	No requirement.	No requirement.	Lost circulation control is best practice.	No requirement.	No requirement.	Lost circulation control is best practice. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells where intermediate casing is required.
Spacer Fluids	No requirement.	No requirement.	A spacer of adequate volume, makeup, and consistency must be pumped ahead of the cement.	The use of spacer fluids to separate mud and cement, to avoid mud contamination of the cement, is best practice.	No requirement.	A spacer of adequate volume, makeup, and consistency must be pumped ahead of the cement.	The use of spacer fluids to separate mud and cement, to avoid mud contamination of the cement, is best practice. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells where intermediate casing is used, not just HVHF wells.
Hole conditioning before cementing	No requirement.	No requirement.	Prior to cementing any casing string, the borehole must be circulated and conditioned to ensure an adequate cement bond.	Hole conditioning before cementing is best practice.	No requirement.	Prior to cementing any casing string, the borehole must be circulated and conditioned to ensure an adequate cement bond.	Hole conditioning before cementing is best practice. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells, not just HVHF wells.
Cement Installation and Pump Rate	No requirement.	No requirement.	The cement must be pumped at a rate and in a flow regime that inhibits channeling of the cement in the annulus.	The requirement for cement to be pumped at a rate and in a flow regime that inhibits channeling of the cement in the annulus is a good practice.	No requirement.	The cement must be pumped at a rate and in a flow regime that inhibits channeling of the cement in the annulus.	The requirement for cement to be pumped at a rate and in a flow regime that inhibits channeling of the cement in the annulus is a good practice. This requirement should apply to all oil and gas wells, not just HVHF wells.

Appendix B - Intermediate Casing Table

Intermediate Casing Requirement	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 8 Casing and Cementing Practices	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 9 Existing Fresh Water Supplementary Permit Conditions Required for Wells Drilled in Primary and Principal Aquifers	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 10 Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF	Analysis of Proposed NYS RDSGEIS, Permit Conditions and Recommendations	NYCRR Requirement for all NYS Wells, NYCRR Part 554	Additional NYCRR Requirement for HVHF Wells, NYCRR Part 560	Analysis of Proposed NYCRR Requirements and Recommendations
Rotating and Reciprocating Casing While Cementing	No requirement.	No requirement.	No requirement.	Rotating and reciprocating casing while cementing is a best practice to improve cement placement.	No requirement.	No requirement.	Rotating and reciprocating casing while cementing is a best practice to improve cement placement. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells.
Centralizers	No requirement.	No requirement.	At least two centralizers (one in the middle and one at the top), and all bow-spring style centralizers, must conform to API Specification 10D for Bow-Spring Casing Centralizers (March 2002).	The proposed conditions reference an outdated API casing centralizer standard. Best practice is to use at least two centralizers and follow API Recommended Practice for Centralizer Placement, API RP 10D-2 (July 2010).	No requirement.	In addition to centralizers otherwise required by the Department, at least two centralizers, one in the middle and one at the top of the first joint of casing, must be installed, and all bow-spring style centralizers must conform to the industry standards specified in the permit to drill.	The proposed conditions reference an outdated API casing centralizer standard. Best practice is to use at least two centralizers and follow API Recommended Practice for Centralizer Placement, API RP 10D-2 (July 2010). This requirement should apply to all NYS wells where intermediate casing is installed.
Casing quality	No requirement.	No requirement.	New pipe is required and must conform to American Petroleum Institute (API) Specification 5CT, Specifications for Casing and Tubing (April 2002).	The use of new pipe conforming to API Specification 5CT is best practice.	No requirement.	All casings must be new and conform to industry standards specified in the permit to drill.	The use of new pipe conforming to API Specification 5CT is best practice. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells where intermediate casing is set.
Casing Thread Compound	No requirement.	No requirement.	Casing thread compound and its use must conform to API Recommended Practice (RP) 5A3, RP on Thread Compounds for Casing, Tubing, Line Pipe, and Drill Stem Elements (November 2009).	The requirement to use casing thread compound that conforms to API RP 5A3 (November 2009) is a good practice. This requirement should apply to all oil and gas wells, not just HVHF wells.	No requirement.	Casing thread compound and its use must conform to industry standards specified in the permit to drill.	The requirement to use casing thread compound that conforms to API RP 5A3 (November 2009) is a good practice. This requirement should apply to all oil and gas wells, not just HVHF wells.
Drilling Mud	No requirement.	No requirement.	No requirement.	The use of compressed air or WBM (with no toxic additives) is best practice when drilling through protected water zones. This should be a requirement for all wells during the period when drilling occurs through protected water zones.	No requirement.	No requirement.	The use of compressed air or WBM (with no toxic additives) is best practice when drilling through protected water zones. This should be a requirement for all wells during the period when drilling occurs through protected water zones.
Cement Setting Time	No requirement.	No requirement.	8 hours Wait on Cement (WOC) and compressive strength standard of 500 psi.	Best practice is to have casing strings stand under pressure until cement reaches a compressive strength of at least 500 psi in the zone of critical cement, before drilling out the cement plug or initiating a test. Additionally, the cement mixture in the zone of critical cement should have a 72-hour compressive strength of at least 1,200 psi.	No requirement.	8 hours Wait on Cement (WOC) and compressive strength standard of 500 psi.	Best practice is to have casing strings stand under pressure until cement reaches a compressive strength of at least 500 psi in the zone of critical cement, before drilling out the cement plug or initiating a test. Additionally, the cement mixture in the zone of critical cement should have a 72-hour compressive strength of at least 1,200 psi. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells, not just HVHF wells.

Appendix B - Intermediate Casing Table

Intermediate Casing Requirement	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 8 Casing and Cementing Practices	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 9 Existing Fresh Water Supplementary Permit Conditions Required for Wells Drilled in Primary and Principal Aquifers	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 10 Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF	Analysis of Proposed NYS RDSGEIS, Permit Conditions and Recommendations	NYCRR Requirement for all NYS Wells, NYCRR Part 554	Additional NYCRR Requirement for HVHF Wells, NYCRR Part 560	Analysis of Proposed NYCRR Requirements and Recommendations
NYSDEC Inspector	No requirement.	No requirement.	Required to be onsite for cementing operations.	Best practice is to have a state inspector onsite during cementing operations.	No requirement.	No requirement.	Best practice is to have a state inspector onsite during cementing operations. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells where intermediate casing is installed.
Cement QA/QC - Cement Evaluation Log	No requirement.	No requirement.	The operator must run a radial cement bond evaluation log or other evaluation tool approved by the Department to verify the cement bond on the intermediate casing.	The use of a cement evaluation logging tool is best practice.	No requirement.	The operator must run a radial cement bond evaluation log or other evaluation tool approved by the Department to verify the cement bond on the intermediate casing.	The use of a cement evaluation logging tool is best practice. This requirement should apply to all wells where intermediate casing is set.
Record keeping	Not specified.	Not specified.	Records must be kept for five years after the well is P&A'd, and be available for review upon NYSDEC's request.	Best practice is to keep permanent records for each well, even after the well is P&A'd. This information will be needed by NYSDEC and industry during the well's operating life, will be critical for designing the P&A, and may be required if the well leaks post P&A. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells, not just HVHF wells. P&A'd wells do occasionally leak, and well information is may be needed to develop a re-entry, repair, re-P&A plan.	No requirement.	Records must be kept for five years after the well is P&A'd, and be available for review upon NYSDEC's request.	Best practice is to keep permanent records for each well, even after the well is P&A'd. This information will be needed by NYSDEC and industry during the well's operating life, will be critical for designing the P&A, and may be required if the well leaks post P&A. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells, not just HVHF wells. P&A'd wells do occasionally leak, and well information is may be needed to develop a re-entry, repair, re-P&A plan.
Additional Casing or Repair	No requirement.	No requirement.	No requirement.	NYSDEC should reserve the right to require industry to install additional cemented casing strings in wells, and repair defective casing or cementing, as deemed necessary for environmental and/or public safety reasons. This requirement should apply to all wells.	The installation of an additional cemented casing string or strings in the well, as deemed necessary by the department for environmental and/or public safety reasons, may be required at any time.	No additional requirement.	NYSDEC should reserve the right to require industry to install additional cemented casing strings in wells, and repair defective casing or cementing, as deemed necessary for environmental and/or public safety reasons. This requirement should apply to all wells.

APPENDIX C

Production Casing Table

Appendix C - Production Casing Table

Production Casing Requirement	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 8 Casing and Cementing Practices	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 9 Existing Fresh Water Supplementary Permit Conditions Required for Wells Drilled in Primary and Principal Aquifers	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 10 Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF	Analysis of Proposed NYS RDSGEIS, Permit Conditions and Recommendations	NYCRR Requirement for all NYS Wells, NYCRR Part 554	Additional NYCRR Requirement for HVHF Wells, NYCRR Part 560	Analysis of Proposed NYCRR Requirements and Recommendations
Casing Design	No requirement.	No requirement.	Full string of production casing be set across the production zone and be run to surface, and that the production casing be cemented in place.	For all wells, it is best practice for the productive horizon(s) to be determined by coring, electric log, mud-logging, and/or testing to aide in optimizing final production string design and placement. It is best practice to install production casing on a case-by-case basis for most wells; however, it is best practice to install a full string of production casing on HVHF wells to provide a conduit for the HVHF job and provide an extra layer of casing and cement.	The drilling, casing and completion program adopted for any well shall be such as to prevent the migration of oil, gas or other fluids from one pool or stratum to another.	Full string of production casing be set across the production zone and be run to surface, and that the production casing be cemented in place.	For all wells, it is best practice for the productive horizon(s) to be determined by coring, electric log, mud-logging, and/or testing to aide in optimizing final production string design and placement. It is best practice to install production casing on a case-by-case basis for most wells; however, it is best practice to install a full string of production casing on HVHF wells to provide a conduit for the HVHF job and provide an extra layer of casing and cement.
Cement Sheath Width	No requirement.	No requirement.	No requirement.	A cement sheath of at least 1-1/4" should be installed. Thin cement sheaths are easily cracked and damaged.	No requirement.	No additional requirement.	A cement sheath of at least 1-1/4" should be installed. Thin cement sheaths are easily cracked and damaged. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells where production casing is set.
Amount of Cement in Annulus	The production casing cement shall extend at least 500 feet above the casing shoe or tie into the previous casing string, whichever is less. If any oil or gas shows are encountered or known to be present in the area, as determined by the Department at the time of permit application, or subsequently encountered during drilling, the production casing cement shall extend at least 100 feet above any such shows. The Department may allow the use of a weighted fluid in the annulus to prevent gas migration in specific instances when the weight of the cement column could be a problem.	No additional requirement. Appendix 8 requirement would apply.	If installation of the intermediate casing is waived by the Department, then production casing must be fully cemented to surface. If intermediate casing is installed, the production casing cement must be tied into the intermediate casing string with at least 500 feet of cement measured using True Vertical Depth (TVD).	Cementing production casing to surface if technically feasible (becomes more difficult with increasing depth), or at least 500' into the intermediate casing string is best practice.	If it is elected to complete a rotary-drilled well and production casing is run, it shall be cemented by a pump and plug or displacement method with sufficient cement to circulate above the top of the completion zone to a height sufficient to prevent any movement of oil or gas or other fluids around the exterior of the production casing.	If installation of the intermediate casing is waived by the Department, then production casing must be fully cemented to surface. If intermediate casing is installed, the production casing cement must be tied into the intermediate casing string with at least 500 feet of cement measured using True Vertical Depth (TVD).	Cementing production casing to surface if technically feasible (becomes more difficult with increasing depth), or at least 500' into the intermediate casing string is best practice. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells where production casing is set.

Appendix C - Production Casing Table

Production Casing Requirement	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 8 Casing and Cementing Practices	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 9 Existing Fresh Water Supplementary Permit Conditions Required for Wells Drilled in Primary and Principal Aquifers	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 10 Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF	Analysis of Proposed NYS RDSGEIS, Permit Conditions and Recommendations	NYCRR Requirement for all NYS Wells, NYCRR Part 554	Additional NYCRR Requirement for HVHF Wells, NYCRR Part 560	Analysis of Proposed NYCRR Requirements and Recommendations
Excess Cement Requirement	A minimum of 25% excess cement shall be used. When caliper logs are run, a 10% excess will suffice. Additional excesses may be required by the Department in certain areas.	No additional requirement. Appendix 8 requirement would apply.	No additional requirement. Appendix 8 requirement would apply.	25% excess cement is standard practice, unless a caliper log is run to assess the hole shape and required cement volume.	No requirement.	No additional requirement.	25% excess cement is standard practice, unless a caliper log is run to assess the hole shape and required cement volume. This requirement should apply to all wells where production casing is set.
Cement Type	No requirement.	No requirement.	Cement must conform to API Specification 10A, Specifications for Cement and Material for Well Cementing (April 2002 and January 2005 Addendum). Further, the cement slurry must be prepared to minimize its free water content in accordance with the same API specification and it must contain a gas-block additive.	HVHF cement quality requirements (including API specifications and the use of gas-blocking additives) are best practice. However, these practices should apply to all wells where production casing is installed, not just HVHF wells.	No requirement.	Cement must conform to industry standards, specified in the permit to drill, and the cement slurry must be prepared to minimize its free water content, in accordance with the industry standards, and contain a gas-block additive.	Cement must conform to API Specification 10A, Specifications for Cement and Material for Well Cementing (April 2002 and January 2005 Addendum). Further, the cement slurry must be prepared to minimize its free water content in accordance with the same API specification and it must contain a gas-block additive. HVHF cement quality requirements (including API specifications and the use of gas-blocking additives) are best practice. However, these practices should apply to all wells where production casing is installed, not just HVHF wells.
Cement Mix Water Temperature and pH Monitoring	The operator shall test or require the cementing contractor to test the mixing water for pH and temperature prior to mixing the cement and to record the results on the cementing tickets and/or the drilling log. WOC time shall be adjusted based on the results of the test.	No additional requirement. Appendix 8 requirement would apply.	No additional requirement. Appendix 8 requirement would apply.	Best practice is for the free water separation to average no more than six milliliters per 250 milliliters of tested cement, in accordance with the current API RP 10B. Best practice is to test for pH to evaluate water chemistry and ensure cement is mixed to manufacturer's recommendations.	No requirement.	No additional requirement.	Best practice is for the free water separation to average no more than six milliliters per 250 milliliters of tested cement, in accordance with the current API RP 10B. Best practice is to test for pH to evaluate water chemistry and ensure cement is mixed to manufacturer's recommendations. These requirements should apply to all NYS wells where production casing is required, not just HVHF wells.
Lost Circulation Control	No requirement.	No requirement.	No requirement.	Lost circulation control is best practice.	No requirement.	No additional requirement.	Lost circulation control is best practice. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells where production casing is required.
Spacer Fluids	No requirement.	No requirement.	A spacer of adequate volume, makeup and consistency must be pumped ahead of the cement.	The use of spacer fluids to separate mud and cement, to avoid mud contamination of the cement, is best practice.	No requirement.	A spacer of adequate volume, makeup, and consistency must be pumped ahead of the cement.	The use of spacer fluids to separate mud and cement, to avoid mud contamination of the cement, is best practice. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells where production casing is used, not just HVHF wells.
Hole conditioning before cementing	No requirement.	No requirement.	Prior to cementing any casing string, the borehole must be circulated and conditioned to ensure an adequate cement bond.	Hole conditioning before cementing is best practice.	No requirement.	Prior to cementing any casing string, the borehole must be circulated and conditioned to ensure an adequate cement bond.	Hole conditioning before cementing is best practice. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells, not just HVHF wells.

Appendix C - Production Casing Table

Production Casing Requirement	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 8 Casing and Cementing Practices	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 9 Existing Fresh Water Supplementary Permit Conditions Required for Wells Drilled in Primary and Principal Aquifers	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 10 Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF	Analysis of Proposed NYS RDSGEIS, Permit Conditions and Recommendations	NYCRR Requirement for all NYS Wells, NYCRR Part 554	Additional NYCRR Requirement for HVHF Wells, NYCRR Part 560	Analysis of Proposed NYCRR Requirements and Recommendations
Cement Installation and Pump Rate	The pump and plug method shall be used for all production casing cement jobs deeper than 1500 feet. If the pump and plug technique is not used (less than 1500 feet), the operator shall not displace the cement closer than 35 feet above the bottom of the casing. If plugs are used, the plug catcher shall be placed at the top of the lowest (deepest) full joint of casing.	No additional requirement. Appendix 8 requirement would apply.	The cement must be pumped at a rate and in a flow regime that inhibits channeling of the cement in the annulus.	The requirement for cement to be pumped at a rate and in a flow regime that inhibits channeling of the cement in the annulus is a good practice. The pump and plug installation method is a best practice.	No requirement.	The cement must be pumped at a rate and in a flow regime that inhibits channeling of the cement in the annulus.	The requirement for cement to be pumped at a rate and in a flow regime that inhibits channeling of the cement in the annulus is a good practice. This requirement should apply to all oil and gas wells, not just HVHF wells.
Rotating and Reciprocating Casing While Cementing	No requirement.	No requirement.	No requirement.	Rotating and reciprocating casing while cementing is a best practice to improve cement placement. This will become more difficult with a deviated wellbore, but should be attempted if achievable.	No requirement.	No additional requirement.	Rotating and reciprocating casing while cementing is a best practice to improve cement placement. This will become more difficult with a deviated wellbore, but should be attempted if achievable. This requirement should apply to all NYS oil and gas wells, not just HVHF wells.
Centralizers	Centralizers shall be placed at the base and at the top of the production interval if casing is run and extends through that interval, with one additional centralizer every 300 feet of the cemented interval.	No additional requirement. Appendix 8 requirement would apply.	At least two centralizers (one in the middle and one at the top) must be installed on the first joint of casing (except production casing) and all bow-spring style centralizers must conform to API Specification 10D for Bow-Spring Casing Centralizers (March 2002)	The proposed conditions reference an outdated API casing centralizer standard. Best practice is to use at least two centralizers and follow API Recommended Practice for Centralizer Placement, API RP 10D-2 (July 2010).	No requirement.	In addition to centralizers otherwise required by the Department, at least two centralizers, one in the middle and one at the top of the first joint of casing, must be installed, and all bow-spring style centralizers must conform to the industry standards specified in the permit to drill.	The proposed conditions reference an outdated API casing centralizer standard. Best practice is to use at least two centralizers and follow API Recommended Practice for Centralizer Placement, API RP 10D-2 (July 2010). This requirement should apply to all NYS wells where production casing is installed.
Casing quality	The casing shall be of sufficient strength to contain any expected formation or stimulation pressures.	No additional requirement. Appendix 8 requirement would apply.	Casing must be new and conform to American Petroleum Institute (API) Specification 5CT, Specifications for Casing and Tubing (April 2002), and welded connections are prohibited.	The use of new pipe conforming to API Specification 5CT is best practice.	No requirement.	All casings must be new and conform to industry standards specified in the permit to drill.	The use of new pipe conforming to API Specification 5CT is best practice. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells where production casing is set.

Appendix C - Production Casing Table

Production Casing Requirement	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 8 Casing and Cementing Practices	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 9 Existing Fresh Water Supplementary Permit Conditions Required for Wells Drilled in Primary and Principal Aquifers	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 10 Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF	Analysis of Proposed NYS RDSGEIS, Permit Conditions and Recommendations	NYCRR Requirement for all NYS Wells, NYCRR Part 554	Additional NYCRR Requirement for HVHF Wells, NYCRR Part 560	Analysis of Proposed NYCRR Requirements and Recommendations
Casing Thread Compound	No requirement.	No requirement.	Casing thread compound and its use must conform to API Recommended Practice (RP) 5A3, RP on Thread Compounds for Casing, Tubing, Line Pipe, and Drill Stem Elements (November 2009).	The requirement to use casing thread compound that conforms to API RP 5A3 (November 2009) is a good practice. This requirement should apply to all oil and gas wells, not just HVHF wells.	No requirement.	Casing thread compound and its use must conform to industry standards specified in the permit to drill.	The requirement to use casing thread compound that conforms to API RP 5A3 (November 2009) is a good practice. This requirement should apply to all oil and gas wells, not just HVHF wells.
Cement Setting Time	Following cementing and removal of cementing equipment, the operator shall wait until a compressive strength of 500 psi is achieved before the casing is disturbed in any way.	No additional requirement. Appendix 8 requirement would apply.	After the cement is pumped, the operator must wait on cement (WOC): 1. until the cement achieves a calculated (e.g., performance chart) compressive strength of at least 500 psi, and 2. a minimum WOC time of 8 hours before the casing is disturbed in any way, including installation of a blow-out preventer (BOP). The operator may request a waiver from the Department from the required WOC time if the operator has bench tested the actual cement batch and blend using mix water from the actual source for the job, and determined that 8 hours is not required to reach a compressive strength of 500 psi.	Best practice is to have casing strings stand under pressure until cement reaches a compressive strength of at least 500 psi in the zone of critical cement, before drilling out the cement plug or initiating a test.	Operations shall be suspended until the cement has been permitted to set in accordance with prudent current industry practices.	8 hours Wait on Cement (WOC) and compressive strength standard of 500 psi.	Best practice is to have casing strings stand under pressure until cement reaches a compressive strength of at least 500 psi in the zone of critical cement, before drilling out the cement plug or initiating a test. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells, not just HVHF wells.
NYSDEC Inspector	No requirement.	No requirement.	This office must be notified _____ hours prior to production casing cementing operations.	Best practice is to have a state inspector onsite during cementing operations. This is more typical for surface and intermediate casing, but can be considered for production casing as well.	No requirement.	No additional requirement.	Best practice is to have a state inspector onsite during cementing operations. This is more typical for surface and intermediate casing, but can be considered for production casing as well.

Appendix C - Production Casing Table

Production Casing Requirement	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 8 Casing and Cementing Practices	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 9 Existing Fresh Water Supplementary Permit Conditions Required for Wells Drilled in Primary and Principal Aquifers	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 10 Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF	Analysis of Proposed NYS RDSGEIS, Permit Conditions and Recommendations	NYCRR Requirement for all NYS Wells, NYCRR Part 554	Additional NYCRR Requirement for HVHF Wells, NYCRR Part 560	Analysis of Proposed NYCRR Requirements and Recommendations
Cement QA/QC - Cement Evaluation Log	No requirement.	No requirement.	The operator must run a radial cement bond evaluation log or other evaluation tool approved by the Department to verify the cement bond on the production casing. The quality and effectiveness of the cement job shall be evaluated by the operator using the above required evaluation in conjunction with appropriate supporting data per Section 6.4 "Other Testing and Information" under the heading of "Well Logging and Other Testing" of American Petroleum Institute (API) Guidance Document HF1 (First Edition, October 2009).	The use of a cement evaluation logging tool is best practice.	No requirement.	The operator must run a radial cement bond evaluation log or other evaluation tool approved by the Department to verify the cement bond on the production casing.	The use of a cement evaluation logging tool is best practice. This requirement should apply to all wells where production casing is set.
Record keeping	No requirement.	No requirement.	A copy of the cement job log for any cemented casing in the well must be available to the Department at the wellsite during drilling operations, and thereafter available to the Department upon request. The operator must provide such to the Department upon request at any time during the period up to and including five years after the well is permanently plugged and abandoned under a Department permit. If the well is located on a multi-well pad, all cementing records must be maintained and made available during the period up to and including five years after the last well on the pad is permanently plugged and abandoned under a Department permit.	Best practice is to keep permanent records for each well, even after the well is P&A'd. This information will be needed by NYSDEC and industry during the well's operating life, will be critical for designing the P&A, and may be required if the well leaks post P&A. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells, not just HVHF wells. P&A'd wells do occasionally leak, and well information is may be needed to develop a re-entry, repair, re-P&A plan.	No requirement.	Records must be kept for five years after the well is P&A'd, and be available for review upon NYSDEC's request.	Best practice is to keep permanent records for each well, even after the well is P&A'd. This information will be needed by NYSDEC and industry during the well's operating life, will be critical for designing the P&A, and may be required if the well leaks post P&A. This requirement should apply to all NYS wells, not just HVHF wells. P&A'd wells do occasionally leak, and well information is may be needed to develop a re-entry, repair, re-P&A plan.

Appendix C - Production Casing Table

Production Casing Requirement	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 8 Casing and Cementing Practices	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 9 Existing Fresh Water Supplementary Permit Conditions Required for Wells Drilled in Primary and Principal Aquifers	NYS RDSGEIS Appendix 10 Proposed Supplementary Permit Conditions for HVHF	Analysis of Proposed NYS RDSGEIS, Permit Conditions and Recommendations	NYCRR Requirement for all NYS Wells, NYCRR Part 554	Additional NYCRR Requirement for HVHF Wells, NYCRR Part 560	Analysis of Proposed NYCRR Requirements and Recommendations
Additional Casing or Repair	No requirement.	No requirement.	Remedial cementing is required if the cement bond is not adequate to effectively isolate hydraulic fracturing operations.	NYSDEC should reserve the right to require industry to install additional cemented casing strings in wells, and repair defective casing or cementing, as deemed necessary for environmental and/or public safety reasons. This requirement should apply to all wells.	No requirement.	The installation of an additional cemented casing string or strings in the well, as deemed necessary by the department for environmental and/or public safety reasons, may be required at any time.	NYSDEC should reserve the right to require industry to install additional cemented casing strings in wells, and repair defective casing or cementing, as deemed necessary for environmental and/or public safety reasons. This requirement should apply to all wells.

Appendix D: List of Acronyms

²¹⁰ Po	Polonium 210
2D	two-dimensional
3D	three-dimensional
API	American Petroleum Institute
API RP	American Petroleum Institute Recommended Practice
AQ	Air Quality
AMD	Acid mine discharge
ARD	Acid Rock Drainage
Bcf	billion cubic feet
BOP	Blow-out preventer
BTEX	benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes
BUD	Beneficial Use Determination
C-NLOPB	Canada-Newfoundland and Labrador Offshore Petroleum Board
CDA	Concentrated Development Area
CRI	Cuttings reinjection technology
CRA	Corrosion-resistant alloys
CRDPF	Continuously Regenerating Diesel Particulate Filters
DOI	United States Department of the Interior
DMM	Division of Materials Management
EAF	Environmental Assessment Form
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ERP	Emergency Response Plan
GHG	Greenhouse Gases
H ₂ S	Hydrogen Sulfide
HAP	Hazardous Air Pollutants
HVHF	High Volume Hydraulic Fracturing
JPAD	Jonah-Pinedale Anticline Development Area
LDAR	Leak Detection and Repair
MACT	Maximum Achievable Control Technology
MFN	Microseismic Fracture Network
MMscf	Million standard cubic feet
MSDS	Material Safety Data Sheet
MSW	Municipal solid waste
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NACE	National Association of Corrosion Engineers
NO _x	Nitrogen Oxide
NORM	Naturally Occurring Radioactive Material
NRDC	Natural Resources Defense Council
NYCRR	New York Code of Rules and Regulations
NYS	New York State
NYSDEC	New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
NYSERDA	New York State Energy Research and Development Authority
NYSDOH	New York State Department of Health
OBM	Oil-Based Mud
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
OSPAR	Oslo-Paris Convention

P&A Plug & Abandonment
PA Pennsylvania
PADEP Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
PLONOR Pose Little Or No Risk
PM_{2.5} Particulate Matter, 2.5 microns or smaller in diameter
POTW Publically Owned Treatment Works
ppm parts per million
psi pounds per square inch
QC/QA Quality Control/Quality Assurance
Ra Radium
RDSGEIS Revised Draft Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement
REC Reduced Emission Completions
RP Recommended Practice
RCRA Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
SBM Synthetic-Based Muds
SCR Selective Catalytic Reduction
SDWA Safe Drinking Water Act
SEQRA State Environmental Quality Review Act
SPDES State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
SO₂ Sulfur Dioxide
SPCC Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures
SPOTS Spill Prevention Operations Technology Series
SRB Sulfate-reducing bacteria
STEL Short-term exposure limit
STI Steel Tank Institute
SWPPP Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
TDS Total Dissolved Solids
TEG Triethylene Glycol
TENORM Technologically Enhanced Naturally Occurring Radioactive Material
TVD True Vertical Depth
USDW Underground Sources of Drinking Water
USEPA United States Environmental Protection Agency
USGS United States Geological Survey
VOC Volatile Organic Compound
WBM Water-based muds
WOC Wait on Concrete

Attachment 2

Tom Myers, Ph. D.

Technical Memorandum

Review and Analysis

Revised Draft

**Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement on the Oil, Gas and
Solution Mining Regulatory Program**

**Well Permit Issuance for Horizontal Drilling and High-Volume Hydraulic
Fracturing to Develop the Marcellus Shale and Other Low-Permeability Gas
Reservoirs**

September 2011

January 5, 2011

Prepared for:

Natural Resources Defense Council

New York, New York

Prepared by

Tom Myers, Ph.D.

Hydrologic Consultant

Reno, NV

Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	2
General Hydrogeology	4
Presence of Fresh and Salt Water	4
Hydrogeology of the Shale	6
Description of Hydraulic Fracturing	8
Contaminant Transport from the Shale	12
Other Pathways for Groundwater Contamination	14
Groundwater Quality Monitoring	16
WATER RESOURCES	19
PROJECT MITIGATION MEASURES	22
Acid Rock Drainage	26
COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC PROPOSED REGULATIONS	26
REFERENCES	29

INTRODUCTION

This technical memorandum reviews aspects of the *Revised Draft Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement (RDSGEIS)* on the *Oil, Gas and Solution Mining Regulatory Program regarding Well Permit Issuance for Horizontal Drilling and High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing to Develop the Marcellus Shale and Other Low-Permeability Gas Reservoir*. The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) is the lead agency.

Throughout this review, I refer to the document as the RDSGEIS. The document was “revised” since its initial publication in 2009. I had prepared a review of the 2009 DSGEIS as Myers (2009).

Appendix A to this technical memorandum is my specific review of Appendix 11 in the RDSGEIS, which has been excerpted from the 2009 DSGEIS without change. Appendix B to this technical memorandum is a paper I wrote which is currently undergoing peer review for a journal; this paper concerns vertical transport of contaminants from the shale to freshwater groundwater.

Since the 2009 DSGEIS, the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA) contracted with Alpha Geoscience (Alpha) to review the comments I prepared on the 2009 DSGEIS (Myers, 2009). Alpha produced a report titled: *Review of dSGEIS and Identification of Best Technology and Best Practices Recommendations, Tom Myers: December 28, 2009*, prepared by Alpha. The RDSGEIS does not reference, or apparently rely, on this Alpha review in any meaningful way; the bibliography includes a list of 2011 reports by Alpha, but the apparent reference to this review (Alpha 2011) does not include my name. The consultants bibliography includes a subheading with Alpha’s report, with “Myers” misspelled, but no apparent use of this reference either. Alpha’s reviews prepared for NYSEDA were not available directly on the RDSGEIS web page other than through an obscure link. Appendix C to this technical memorandum is my response to Alpha (2011).

This technical memorandum also reviews the water resources/hydrogeology aspects of the revised regulations, published as *Proposed Express Terms 6 NYCRR Parts 550 through 556 and 560, Subchapter B: Mineral Resources*, referred to throughout as the proposed regulations. This technical memorandum proposes additional regulations throughout the review, and then includes a separate section regarding specific proposed regulations.

The report focuses on three main aspects of the RDSGEIS: (1) hydrogeology, including the hydraulic fracturing (fracking) process, (2) low flow surface water resources, and (3) water-resource-related setbacks. Hydrogeology includes review of the geology, contaminant transport, shale hydrogeology, groundwater quality, and induced seismicity analyses. Low flow

surface water resources include an assessment of the analysis required to determine passby flows and the requirements/restrictions on pumping from aquifers. Consideration of the proposed setbacks includes whether the proposed setback is based on facts or analysis. Specific setbacks considered include those proposed to protect aquifers, wells, springs, and other water-related resources.

The RDSGEIS provides data and analysis almost exclusive to the Marcellus shale, although the regulations purport to govern all low-permeability formations, including the Utica shale (which is mentioned in the RDSGEIS). Developing different low-permeability formations would have different effects than would development of the Marcellus shale, which is the focus of the RDSGEIS. Deeper shale, such as the Utica shale, would generate far more cuttings and use more drilling mud, which present different disposal issues. The amount of water used for fracking could be different, as well. Development of shallower shales would increase the regional hydrogeology impacts and increase the potential vertical contaminant transport and the prevalence of improperly plugged abandoned wells. Additionally, the RDSGEIS focused its analysis from the total amount of surface water withdrawals to wastewater disposal on the wells expected in the Marcellus shale. Additional shale development would vastly increase the impacts beyond those revealed in this RDSGEIS

- *The RDSGEIS and proposed regulations should acknowledge that they apply only to the Marcellus shale.*
- *Additional low-permeability gas plays require additional supplemental GEIS analyses as suggested in RDSGEIS 3.2.1.*

The focus on this review is on development of the Marcellus shale, because except for Chapter 4, the RDSGEIS discussion is limited to the Marcellus shale.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The RDSGEIS only poorly describes the hydrogeology of the Marcellus shale area and of the shale in particular. It does not provide a description of what fracking does to the shale or how it affects the regional hydrogeology. There is no description provided of the geologic formations between the shale and the surface beyond the general stratigraphy and stating that it would be nonconductive to upward flow, a point not supported with data or by the literature. The fault mapping is outdated.

Industry should be required to complete geophysical logging, including conductivity, to determine the lower extent of freshwater (Williams 2010). The definition of freshwater should

be as protective as federal standards, meaning that surface casing should extend to TDS at 10,000 ppm.

The description of fracking is incomplete and incorrect from a hydrogeologic perspective. The contention that out of formation fracking is rare is incorrect based on industry data which has documented fractures as much as 2000 feet above the top of the shale in other states. Also, the contention that fracking pressure dissipates immediately upon cessation of injection is also incorrect, except right at the well. Model simulations show that pressure in the shale remains elevated for more than three months and that that prevents some of the injected fluid from flowing back to the gas well. The injected fluid displaces substantial amounts of formation fluid from the shale into surrounding formations; existing and new fractures allows that fluid to move much further from the shale than expected due simply to the volume injected.

The RDSGEIS dismisses the concept of contaminant transport from the shale to the near-surface aquifers, but there is overwhelming evidence that it is at least possible. Fracking fluids and methane have been found in water wells from fracking in different areas. Simulations indicate it could occur much more in the future. Fracking displaces large quantities of brine, and fractures provide pathways to the surface; fracking may also widen those existing pathways. Areas of natural artesian pressure would allow advection to move fluids and contaminants vertically upward. Mapping areas of artesian pressure, improved regional fault mapping, and site-specific project by project fault mapping should be employed to avoid areas of enhanced vertical transport potential. Long-term multilevel monitoring is also needed to track the future potential of vertical contaminant movement.

NYSDEC proposes setbacks that are not obviously based on observed data. If the setback from fracking in a protected watershed is 4000 feet, the setback from primary or principal aquifers or from public water supply wells should be no less, unless justified by site-specific analyses. Wells located in a 100-year floodplain have a greater than 1 in 4 chance of being flooded in a 30-year project life, therefore wells should be setback further from streams.

The proposed monitoring plans are paltry and insufficient. Simply monitoring existing water wells only shows when that user is affected, it does not protect the aquifer. Water wells are not designed for monitoring. The industry should establish a dedicated groundwater monitoring system downgradient from every well pad, out to at least the distance that a contaminant would travel in five years. Monitoring should continue for at least five years after the cessation of production.

The required passby flows have improved since 2009, as has the method for determining them. In general requiring the Q60 and Q75 monthly flow avoids diversions at all when flows are in the bottom 40 or 25 percent of their normal monthly flow regime, depending on area and

month. Q75 only applies to larger streams (> 50 square mile watershed) during the winter months when flow is generally higher. The RDSGEIS should provide some data to show the estimation methods for ungaged sites is accurate.

HYDROGEOLOGY

This section considers all aspects of the RDSGEIS that concern underground resources, including aspects of geology, shale hydrogeology, contaminant transport, the descriptions of fracking and the potential for fracking-induced seismicity. The toxicity of fracking fluid additives was considered was considered by Dr. Glenn Miller.

General Hydrogeology

The distinction between primary and principal aquifers and other sources (RDSGEIS, p. 2-20) ignores the connections between surface and groundwater. Groundwater from principal aquifers may seep into streams, especially during periods of low flow. Because those aquifers are also used by New Yorkers for water supply, the assertion in the RDSGEIS that “one quarter of New Yorkers ... rely on groundwater as a source of potable water” (Id.) understates the number of people who may be affected by groundwater contamination

RDSGEIS Figure 2.1 shows that the north end of the shale parallels a large principal aquifer north of Syracuse. This coincidence deserves explanation at some point in the document.

The RDSGEIS mentions that one quarter of New Yorkers rely on groundwater as a source of potable water (RDSGEIS, p. 2-20). This downplays the connection of groundwater with surface water; many aquifers support stream flow, especially during low flow period, therefore aquifer contamination potentially affects many more people.

Safe yield (RDSGEIS, p. 2-29) is an outdated and flawed concept which should not be repeated in the RDSGEIS. It is flawed because all pumping depletes the aquifer, which contradicts the definition of the phrase (Id.). The preferable concept is sustainable yield which is the amount of water that can be pumped without having significant negative effects on the aquifer and on resources connected to that aquifer; what is significant is a societal question related to the values that depend on the aquifer (Alley et al, 1999).

Presence of Fresh and Salt Water

The federal Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) defines an underground source of drinking water (USDW) as “[a]n aquifer or portion of an aquifer that supplies any public water system or that

contains a sufficient quantity of ground water to supply a public water system, and currently supplies drinking water for human consumption, or that contains fewer than 10,000 mg/l total dissolved solids and is not an exempted aquifer”

(<http://water.epa.gov/type/groundwater/uic/glossary.cfm>). However, NYSDEC apparently ignores this federal requirement where it specifies that surface casings be extended to 75 feet below the transition from fresh- to saltwater but also specifies 850 feet below ground surface (bgs) as a “practical generalization for the depth to potable water”, the point at which near-surface freshwater transitions to saline water, which corresponds to 1000 ppm total dissolved solids (TDS) and 250 mg/l chlorides (RDSGEIS, p. 2-23, 6NYCRR §550(at)). The NYSDEC regulations, by only protecting water to a 1000 ppm cutoff for TDS may not provide protections that for some waters that could apparently meet the definition under the SDWA.

The hydrogeology of southern New York over the Marcellus gas play does suggest that there may be very little water with a TDS higher than the threshold that could actually be developed. Williams (2010) found that freshwater transitions to salt water at about 200 feet bgs in valley areas and about 800 ft bgs in upland areas in three counties in the middle of the Marcellus shale gas play. There was uncertainty around the depth estimates with some freshwater observations at deeper depths. Also the distinction between fresh- and saltwater in his survey of both water and gas wells was based on taste tests rather than any scientific measurement. Williams et al (1998) found similar results in similar geology just across the border in Pennsylvania. Many electric conductivity logs for bedrock water wells in the north Catskill Mountains (Heisig and Knutson 1997) showed that EC would jump from low values representing freshwater to high values representing salt water in a short transition zone or threshold. This suggests that many of the bedrock areas over the Marcellus shale gas play have either high-quality, low-TDS water, or very poor-quality high-TDS water; few wells apparently have water quality near the actual cut-off value. Considering the geology of the area, the zones that have high TDS are also mostly very low hydraulic conductivity zones, so they would not be considered an aquifer because they would not produce sufficient water to support a water supply.

However, the presence of salt water welling up under the alluvial aquifers, which often coincides with fault zones, suggests that salt water does move upward in fractured areas. Water with TDS up to 10,000 ppm may be developable in these higher conductivity fracture zones. In these areas, the NYSDEC regulations may be violating the SDWA requirements to protect USDWs, although the regulations regarding development in primary and principal aquifer may limit drilling in the areas underlain by fractured rock which could have developable high TDS water. Regardless of those aquifer regulations, the threshold for protection should include all areas that qualify as underground sources of water as defined under the Safe Drinking Water Act. These would include waters with TDS up to 10,000 ppm where they exist in an aquifer, and to 1000 ppm or

250 mg/l Cl⁻ in areas underlain by unconfined bedrock. See the separate technical review submitted by Harvey Consulting LLC, for further discussion of the requirements on the SDWA.

- The operator should extend the surface casing to below the 10,000 ppm TDS threshold, unless the operator can show that the formation containing groundwater between 1000 and 10,000 ppm could not produce water in usable quantities. In this case, the operator should extend the surface casing to below the 1000 ppm TDS threshold.

The RDSGEIS does not indicate that the regulations will require the driller to actually locate the transition depth, which would define the depth below which the surface casing would extend a minimum of 75 feet (RDSGEIS, p. 7-50).

- *The regulations should require the operator to complete geophysical logging, including specific conductance logging, prior to casing the well, to determine the actual depth of protected water to which to apply the casing regulations.*

Hydrogeology of the Shale

RDSGEIS Section 4.0 covers Geology, but leaves out most of the important aspects of the Marcellus shale. There is no discussion of hydrogeology of the formations between the targeted shales and the surface, including no discussion of the hydrogeology of the shale itself beyond mention of the permeability. This failure means there is no baseline against which to compare the hydrogeologic changes caused by fracking. There is no hydrogeologic description of the sedimentary layers between the shale and the surface other than very cursory mentions of how it has low permeability. The lack of data on the hydrogeology of formations between the target shale and ground surface is important because NYSDEC relies on geology to “limit or avoid the potential for groundwater contamination” (RDSGEIS, p. 6-2).

Formations that lie between the shale and the surface are generally considered a natural control on fracture propagation and contaminant transport vertically from the shale (RDSGEIS, p. 6-54). RDSGEIS Figure 4-2 does not support the statement that overlying formations will prevent vertical movement of contaminants (RDSGEIS, p. 6-54) because it shows that layers above the Marcellus are primarily sand, limestone, and shale, with no indication of the proportion of each, which controls their conductivity and their propensity to propagate fractures. Most important from the perspective of contaminant transport from the shale to the surface is the prevalence of fractures, both due to faults and otherwise. Faults could be a pathway for vertical contaminant transport (Osborn et al 2011; Myers in review) and could also allow fractures to propagate further from the shale. The RDSGEIS discusses faults only with regard to present day seismicity and the potential for induced seismicity and presents an outdated map (Isachsen and McKendree 1977). A more detailed and integrated analysis of faults and fractures revealed there are many more faults in New York’s Appalachian Basin than

previously suspected (Jacobi 2002). The RDSGEIS should include up-to-date information and acknowledge that more faults are probably yet to be found.

There is little information provided in the geology or hydrogeology sections about the make-up of the shale, beyond the amount of organic carbon. The geology chapter does not even mention the presence of pyrite in the Marcellus shale, although there is a brief reference to it for the Utica shale. The sections on “Solids Disposal” mentions pyrite and acid rock drainage of cuttings derived from the Marcellus shale. “As the basal portion of the Marcellus has been reported to contain abundant pyrite (an iron sulfide mineral), there exists the potential that cuttings derived from this interval and placed in reserve pit may oxidize and leach, resulting in an acidic discharge to groundwater, commonly referred to as acid rock drainage (ARD)” (RDSGEIS, p 7-67). ARD will be discussed more below in the Regulations section.

Most industry references state the Marcellus shale is “low-permeability” (RDSGEIS, p. 2), and the proposed regulations apparently rely on this categorization, although not all sources agree with it. Soeder (1988) described Marcellus shale as “surprisingly permeable” and presented data showing the permeability ranges up to 60 microdarcies, as compared to the Huron shale with permeability two orders of magnitude lower. Most reported permeability values are estimated from core samples, but, in a hydrogeologic sense, these estimates do not represent the formation-wide conductivity; point estimates due to scaling effects can be several orders of magnitude less conductive than the formation as a whole due to preferential flow through fractures (Schulze-Makuch et al, 1999), which are prevalent in this area. RDSGEIS Figure 4-2 also does not show the fractures in the overlying formations which prevail throughout New York including in the Marcellus shale zone (Myers in review).

The assertion that the shale requires fracturing “to produce fluids” (Id.) does not prove that the shale above the Marcellus is equally poorly transmissive. Shales above the Marcellus have not apparently trapped gas or fluids for significant time periods, a fact which undercuts the claim they are not transmissive or there is a lack of vertical flow. Fractures that go out-of-formation above the shale connect the shale with the much more transmissive formations above the shale.

The Geology section should also discuss general groundwater flow paths in the formations above the shale; this should include vertical gradients and recharge zones.

- *The RDSGEIS should discuss the hydrogeology of the formations between the targeted shale and ground surface, including data on the hydraulic conductivity of the formations.*

- *The RDSGEIS should also map the groundwater gradients for the formations just above the targeted shale using water level data obtained from geothermal applications and previous deep wells.*
- *The NYSDEC should require the industry to do a seismic survey to locate faults near proposed drilling, within half a mile of the center of the well pad or 1000 feet beyond the projected end of the horizontal wells, whichever is further from the well pad.*
- *The RDSGEIS should include up-to-date fault mapping.*
- *Industry should be required to complete and provide to the NYSDEC geophysical logging of the formations above the targeted shale showing fractures, lithology, and groundwater characteristics.*

Description of Hydraulic Fracturing

RDSGEIS Chapter 5 describes the fracking process, but it does not describe what actually happens to the shale – what does it look like after fracking and what are its properties. It is much more permeable to gas flow, perhaps substantially so, therefore it must also be much more transmissive to water flow. With up to an expected 40,000 horizontal wells over the next 30 years in New York (RDSGEIS, p. 6-6), the properties of the shale, which currently is an aquitard, will change substantially. The RDSGEIS completely fails to address these changes.

Industry designs fracking jobs to keep the fractures in the shale, but data show that the results of the fracking do not always or even often verify the design. The industry rarely monitors or measures the actual extent of fractures (RDSGEIS, p. 5-88), beyond monitoring pressure and injected fluid during fracking. The RDSGEIS references Fisher (2010) as being proof that fractures do not extend into the aquifer zone, but his data actually show that fractures commonly go out of formation (Figure 1). His data show many instances of the top of the fracture zone being more than 1000 feet above the centerline of the shale. As the depth to the centerline of the shale decreases from 8000 to 5000 feet, the vertical fracture growth also appears to decrease from 2000 feet above to 500 feet above the centerline of the shale. The apparent trend to fracture growth above the formation decreasing with decreasing depth may relate to the pressure on the rock or its hardness. The data were not sorted according to formation type and there is no data concerning shale thickness, therefore it is unknown whether fractures extend further in some types of rock or whether out-of-formation fractures are more common with thinner shales.

- *The RDSGEIS should not rely on industry's alleged intent to avoid out-of-formation fracking as a means of preventing the consequences of out-of-formation fracking.*

- *The RDSGEIS and regulations should require geophysical logging and microseismic tests to map how far fractures extend out of formation, and the density of the fractures in different formation. This information should be publically available so that all companies can benefit from experience and so that the public can better understand the process.*

FIGURE 2




Figure 1: Figure 2 from Fisher (2010) showing the well centerline and a depth to the top of the fracture zone.

It is common practice to compare pressure and flow rate monitoring results from fracking operations to expected values from pre-fracking modeling as a method for evaluating the results of a fracking procedure (RDSGEIS, p. 5-88). Considering that many things affect the pumping flow rate, including pores between the well and the leading extent of the fluid moving away from the well, hydraulically it is difficult to imagine that a significant pressure drop would accompany the leading edge of the fluid reaching surrounding formations. Fracturing into surrounding formations would not bring additional water into the shale, as suggested (Id.), because of the pressures as described elsewhere (Myers in review). The increased porosity in the shale would release substantial brine bound in the shale.

Fracking injects up to 7.2 million gallons of frack fluid into the shale over a well bore up to 4000 ft long – the RDSGEIS suggests these are general upper limits based on fracking in the Marcellus shale in other states. Fractures form or widen as the injection pressure exceeds the normal stress in the shale (RDSGEIS, p. 5-95). The injection would slowly displace any water and gas

that exists in the (extremely small) pore spaces near the well; it would push the natural fluid away from the well bore. Because less than 35% of the injected fluid returns to the well as flowback, a significant proportion of the injected fluid remains underground, presumably occupying pores extending out from the well bore. Assuming a job injects 5 million gallons and there is 20% flowback, approximate average values, and 10% effective porosity resulting from the fracking, the fluid could occupy all pore spaces in a 21-ft diameter cylinder centered on the well. Assuming a more realistic resulting effective porosity of 1%, the fluid could fully occupy the pores out to 62 feet in all directions from the well. Fluids that existed there prior to fracking would be pushed further from the wellbore, likely into surrounding formations. Thus, simple consideration of the volume of fracking fluid injected shows that fluid would move far from the well bore and displace formation fluids even further. The calculation does not account for pre-existing preferential flow paths or heterogeneities in the direction that fractures develop, so the fluid would likely move further from the well bore in some directions. The fluid would also follow pathways created by the fractures above the shale, thus fluids could end up much further from the well bore than simple considerations would indicate. .

Shale NG development will affect a large proportion of the shale in New York with fracking fluid, as can be shown by comparing expected fracking fluid volumes with shale volume. The RDSGEIS does not indicate the total area of Marcellus shale within New York. However, Figure 2 in Myers (in review) shows the extent of shale within New York to be 18,680 sq miles. Assuming an average thickness of 100 ft, the total volume is $5.2 \times 10^{13} \text{ ft}^3$. If the expected 40,000 wells are all developed in the Marcellus shale, the injected water volume will approximate $2.1 \times 10^{10} \text{ ft}^3$, which at porosity of 0.01 means that fracking fluid would occupy all of the pores in about 4% of the total Marcellus shale volume¹. This assumes that none of the fluid reaches surrounding formations, which as shown above is unlikely. It is also unlikely that development will be evenly spaced over the shale as supposed in this calculation, therefore the effect in areas of concentrated development could be underestimated.

Fracking efficiency does not improve if the well spacing is significantly less than 300 m, or about 1000 ft (Krissane and Weisset 2011). It is therefore appropriate to assume that fracking changes the shale over the entire spacing unit, or an area of 660 by 4000 ft. The total area affected by 40,000 wells would be about 3800 square miles, which is about 20% of the total shale area in New York. Based on the extent that injected fluid reaches from the well and the frequency of out-of-formation fracturing (Fisher 2010), it is reasonable to conclude that most fracking affects the shale to its edge. Fracking, based on these assumptions, will significantly change the hydrogeology over at least 20 % of a shale aquitard that extends over 18,680 square miles of New York. Because not all of the total area will be developed, it is a good assumption

¹ This calculation assumes 5,000,000 gallons injected per well and 20% flowback for each of 40,000 wells.

that where development actually occurs, fracking will substantially change the shale hydrogeology.

The statement, that “the volume of fluid used to fracture a well could only fill a small percentage of the void space between the shale and the aquifer” (RDSGEIS, p. 6-53), is also misleading. The total proportion of pores actually filled by injected fluid may be relatively small, but combined with displaced existing brines the injection will affect groundwater over a much larger proportion of the pores. The boundary between salt and freshwater may be displaced or disrupted by advection and dispersion of and by fluids associated with fracking. Additionally the changed properties of the shale over a large area will affect the upward movement of the natural brines. Simple consideration of advection and dispersion shows that the current balance between fresh and salt water could be substantially upset by fracking.

The RDSGEIS also erroneously claims that the pressure applied for injection will dissipate immediately upon cessation of pumping; in the well bore that may be correct, but the fact that pressure exists to push fluid back into the well bore proves that residual pressure remains in the shale and possibly beyond. The statement that “the amount of time that fluids are pumped under pressure into the target formation is orders of magnitude less than the time that would be required for fluids to travel through 1,000 feet of low-permeability rock” (RDSGEIS, p. 5-94, p. 6-53) is technically correct but highly misleading because pressures and conditions for transport from the shale to the near surface will exist long after fracking has finished. Fluids can move away from the well bore at distances from the well bore after the injection ends until the pressure has dissipated; the contrary statement (RDSGEIS, p. 5-94) is wrong in that respect. Myers (in review) describes the modeling of injection and its effect on the pressure distribution in detail. The following is a simpler and more accurate description that should be what appears in the RDSGEIS:

Hydraulic fracturing involves high pressure injection of fracking fluid into the shale from a horizontal well. This injection fractures the shale and increases the size and connectivity of existing pores. The high pressure creates a pressure gradient from the well to a point in the shale just beyond the expanding volume of injecting fluid where the pressure remains equal to background. If the fluid disperses from the well evenly, the volume will be a cylinder. As injection continues, the radius of the cylinder increases and pressure gradient is from the well to the edge of the cylinder. Offsetting the decreased pressure gradient is an increased effective cross-sectional area for the fluid to cross. The flow away from the well fractures the shale, creating new fractures and increasing the size of the existing fractures. When injection ceases the pressure in the well drops immediately to atmospheric pressure coincident with the well-bottom depth. However, the pressure in the shale begins to drop more slowly, initially equals that caused by injection. Flow away from the well continues as the pressure in the reservoir

created by the HVHF treatment moves fluids towards the well and away from the well both but since there is no more pressure being applied at the well the pressure in the shale near the well begins to drop.

Descriptions in the RDSGEIS (p 5-94) are therefore wrong. Fracking is a transient situation wherein a pressure divide, where the pressure is higher between the well and the end of the fluid, sets up with some fluid movement toward the well and some away from the bore continues. The modeling (Myers in review) shows that this requires about 90 days to effectively dissipate. This counters several statements in the RDSGEIS implying that all fracturing and flow from the well bore ceases at the end of fracking, in about five days.

The claim that the flow direction away from the wellbore would be reversed during flowback (RDSGEIS, p. 6-54) also cannot be correct if only 10 to 30% of the injected fluid actually returns to the well. Some must continue to flow away from, or at least not toward, the well.

NYSDEC makes an unreasonable assumption regarding the flow around the shale after fracking, regarding a discussion of the period between fracking operations if refracking would occur. “It is important to note, however, that between fracturing operations, while the well is producing, flow direction is towards the fracture zone and the wellbore” (RDSGEIS, p. 5-99). Because the goal is to attract gas from the shale, any such low pressure would likely affect just the fracked shale, not formations away from the shale in which fluids would flow according to the background hydraulic gradient. That a small amount of formation water may be produced with time indicates that water from only a small portion of the shale near the well flows toward the well. If the natural gradient in formations above the shale has a vertical component, there will be upward advection of water and contaminants away from the shale.

- *Measurements of the water pressure profile should be made in each well prior to fracking, as it is drilled and before it is cased. This could be a part of the geophysical logging process.*

NYSDEC assumes that it will be rare for a well to be refracked, that is, to repeat the fracking operation years after initially completing it, inappropriately relying on “Marcellus operators” assurances without reference to a source (RDSGEIS, p. 5-98).

Contaminant Transport from the Shale

The RDSGEIS completely dismisses the concept of vertical contaminant migration from the shale to fresh-water aquifers. Statements suggesting that the only way for the public to be exposed to fracking fluid would be through an accident or spill (RDSGEIS, 5-74) reflect the

dismissal of the potential long-term transport from the shale. This section reviews the evidence and potential for contaminant transport from the shale.

Claiming that regulatory officials from 15 states have “testified that groundwater contamination as a result of the hydraulic fracturing process ... has not occurred” (RDSGEIS, p. 6-41 & 6-52) is misleading because they have simply never looked for contamination beyond reports from water well owners. There are no monitoring well networks designed to monitor contaminant transport upward from the fracked shale. The upward transport could also take years, decades, or centuries, not just the few days considered in the RDSGEIS. They are wrong to suggest there is no evidence for such transport.

Two reports have documented or suggested the movement of fracking fluid from the target formation to water wells (EPA 1987; Thyne 2008) linked to fracking in wells. Thyne (2008) had found bromide in wells 100s of feet above the fracked zone. The EPA (1987) documented fracking fluid moving into a 416-foot deep water well in West Virginia; the gas well was less than 1000 feet horizontally from the water well, but the report does not indicate the gas-bearing formation. There is also recent evidence of fracking fluid reaching several domestic drinking water wells near Pavillon, WY from a deep source in a sedimentary sandstone and shale formation (Diquilio et al 2011). Deep monitoring wells (depth not specified) have detected synthetic organic compounds including glycols, alcohols, and 2-butoxyethanol, BTEX (including benzene at 50 times the MCL), phenols, trimethylbenzenes, and DRO. Dissolved methane was found at near-saturation levels with an isotopic signature similar to production gas. The EPA identified three pathways for fluid movement. One was nearby wellbores. The second was fluid movement from low permeability sandstone into more conductive sandstone nearby. Third was out-of-formation fractures forcing fracking fluid into overlying formations. NYSDEC should consider this example as a cautionary tale of the potential for vertical movement of fracking fluid to near-surface aquifers.

Methane contamination has been observed to occur in many areas near fracking operations. The RDSGEIS acknowledges that gas migration occurs (RDSGEIS, p. 6-42), but suggests it is limited to well construction problems. This assumption ignores the studies which link the source to much deeper formations (Osborn et al 2011, Thyne 2008). Myers (in review) and Osborn et al (2011) indicate that gas transport could indicate pathways which could also be longer-term fluid pathways; if there is a pathway for gas, there is also a pathway for water.

The RDSGEIS dismisses diffusion of chemicals from the shale to the surface because this would dilute their concentrations; this is correct, but diffusion is only a minor process in the movement of chemicals to the surface and is the wrong process to analyze for consideration of

whether vertical transport could occur. Contaminants move by advection, dispersion, and diffusion, with the latter being a minor component. Advection would be the most likely transport process (Myers in review). Upward movement of chemicals could occur by advection wherever there is an upward vertical component to the hydraulic gradient; fractures and faults would enhance that flow. Myers (in review) simulated transport through the bulk media as requiring from 100s to 1000s of years, depending on hydraulic properties and gradient; fractures substantially decreased that simulated time.

The RDSGEIS relies on an analysis by ICF (2009), included in the RDSGEIS as Appendix 11, for its dismissal of potential vertical contaminant transport. Dismissing the potential for such transport based on the gradient occurring just for the time of fracking simply illustrates a lack of understanding of the process and associated groundwater and contaminant flow. ICF (2009) had been part of the 2009 version of the DSGEIS. Appendix A of this technical memorandum reviews ICF (2009) again in detail and Appendix B presents a copy of a journal article (Myers in review), which analyzes in detail the potential for transport from the shale to the surface.

The RDSGEIS should reconsider some of its assumptions and implement several regulatory changes, as specified here:

- *ICF (2009) should be removed in its entirety and substituted with an analysis that at least acknowledges the potential risk for long-term contaminant transport from the shale to the surface. All citations to and conclusions based on ICF (2009) should also be removed from the RDSGEIS.*
- *The RDSGEIS should include the foregoing recommendations concerning hydrogeology, and regulations should be promulgated specifically requiring the delineation of properties of the geologic formations above the shale, the locations of fractures, and mapping of the hydraulic gradients near the proposed drillsites.*
- *The RDSGEIS and regulations should require driller to implement a long-term monitoring plan with wells established to monitor for long-term upward contaminant transport, as described below in the section concerning groundwater monitoring.*

Other Pathways for Groundwater Contamination

Section 2.4.5 incorrectly claims that “[i]mproperly constructed water wells can allow for easy transport of contaminants to the well...” (RDSGEIS, p. 2-22). Transport “to the well” depends on flowpaths and gradients near the well which would only marginally be affected by well construction. Improper water well construction does allow transport of contaminants along the casing which could allow contaminants to move among aquifers, once the contaminants reach

the well. Improperly constructed wells can allow contaminants from aquifer layers which were not intended to be screened to transport to the producing layers.

Flowback and produced water are important potential contaminants, primarily in the potential for blowouts or spills just after fracking and in the potential for leaks from the well bore. Estimates are that from 9 to 35% of the injected fracking fluid, expected to vary from 2.4 to 7.8 million gallons per well, would return as flowback (RDSGEIS, p. 5-99). This is a total flowback of 216,000 to 2.7 million gallons per well (Id.). Estimates also indicate that up 60 percent of the flowback would return within the first four days after fracking ceases (RDSGEIS, p. 5-100). The upper estimate based on these ranges is that 60 percent of 2.7 million gallons, or 1.62 million gallons of flowback will occur within four days of the cessation of fracking. Modeling in Myers (in review) confirms both the relative proportion of injected fluid that becomes flowback and the rapid rate.

Flowback is a mixture of returning fracking fluid and formation fluid, but the limited chemistry data presented in the RDSGEIS suffers from being a single sample per well (RDSGEIS, p. 5-105). The RDSGEIS states that some of the data was provided by the Marcellus Shale Coalition, an industry group, but without reference or actually providing the data; it is not possible for the reader to assess or draw independent conclusions that might differ from the statements in the RDSGEIS. The available data does not apparently allow an assessment of the proportion of shale to injected water. For example, samples with very high salt content probably consist more of shale brine than fracking fluid. RDSGEIS Table 5.10 demonstrates, by its illustration of poor water quality, that the water must be contained. The minimum, median, and maximum for TDS, at 1530, 63,800, and 337,000 mg/l, respectively, suggests the proportions vary widely but that more than half of them are saltier than ocean water. The range in chemicals such as benzene, at 15.7, 479.5, and 1950 ug/l, shows that some flowback could be extremely toxic; the NY MCL for benzene is 5 ug/l, thus most of the samples above detect exceed the standard for this contaminant. Because of the toxic chemistry of flowback water, much more data is necessary, as specified here:

- *The RDSGEIS should present temporal flowback data from specific wells, in tabular or graphical form.*
- *The RDSGEIS should present an appendix with raw data provided by the Marcellus Shale Coalition or link to the data on the internet.*
- *Table 5.10 could be made more understandable by including the detect and MCL levels.*

The RDSGEIS promises that flowback would be contained in “water-tight tanks” for onsite handling (Id.), but the document does not discuss the sizing of the tanks. The proposed regulations address flowback and requirements for capturing it at many points (6 NYCRR §560),

but also fails to specify a size. For example, the operator must include “ the number and total capacity of receiving tanks for flowback water” (6 NYCRR § 560.3(a)(12)), and must have secondary containment, “as deemed appropriate by the department” ...”sufficient to contain 110 percent of the total capacity of the single largest container or tank within a common containment area” (6 NYCRR § 560.6(x)(26)(i)). Because there are no specifications for the size of the “single largest container”, the required secondary containment sizing is not useful.

- *The RDSGEIS and proposed regulations must specify the necessary total capacity for tanks to contain flowback. The required capacity must reasonably exceed the expected flowback as discussed above. It must be able to capture within four days, 60 percent of the 35 percent of the maximum amount of fluid to be injected for fracking.*

RDSGEIS Chapter 5 lists many chemicals that could be used in fracking fluid, but does not list any properties of these chemicals which could affect their flow through soils or through groundwater. The RDSGEIS does not provide data regarding whether and how much they will be attenuated. However, the RDSGEIS inappropriately relies on attenuation (p. 6-53) to mitigate against the potential for long-distance transport.

- *The RDSGEIS should either provide data concerning the transport properties of the various chemicals or not rely on attenuation as a means of mitigating the transport which could results from spills and leaks.*

Groundwater Quality Monitoring

The previous sections of this report have highlighted the poor water quality of fluids associated with fracking operations – the fracking fluid itself and the produced shale-bed water – and the various pathways for aquifers to be contaminated. Small quantities of either of these fluids can significantly pollute groundwater and surface water. The RDSGEIS provides some setbacks in an attempt to protect various receptors – wells, aquifers, or streams – and the adequacy of these is discussed below. With the potential for spills and leaks from multiple sources associated with these operations, the requirements for groundwater quality monitoring in the RDSGEIS and the regulations is paltry and insufficient, as described here.

The proposed monitoring consists only of testing existing private water wells within 1000 ft of the drill site, or to 2000 ft if none are located within 1000 ft (RDSGEIS, p. 1-10, 7-44). While this is necessary for the protection of the well owner, it is insufficient for the long-term protection of the aquifer. Domestic wells have not been designed to function as water quality monitoring wells which causes many problems in sampling and interpreting the data. Thyne explains clearly why domestic wells are poor monitoring wells:

First, the number of domestic well sample points is far exceeded by the potential point sources (gas wells). Domestic wells are much less than ideal for sampling purposes. Domestic wells are not placed to determine sources of contamination in groundwater. They are not evenly spaced around gas wells or within close enough proximity to determine the presence of chemicals associated with methane that degrade rapidly. Domestic wells are generally screened over large intervals making vertical spatial resolution for samples difficult nor are the wells are not constructed to facilitate measurement of water table elevation or downhole sampling. This forces sampling to occur at the surface after pumping raising the possibility of sampling artifacts. In addition, since domestic wells are the sole source of drinking water for individual properties, it is difficult to arrange access to take samples due to privacy issues, and the County may bear potential liability for damage during sampling and interruption of water supply. (Thyne 2008, p 10-11)

A monitoring well system should be designed so that a contaminant plume will neither pass horizontally between the monitoring wells nor above or below the screened interval. The best way to be certain of intercepting a contaminant passing a point in an aquifer is to span the entire aquifer with well screen. A long screen may increase the chances of detecting the presence of a potential contaminant which may indicate the site being monitored has developed a leak, but will dilute the concentration by mixing contaminated water with cleaner water. A sample extracted from such a well will be a conglomerate of the chemistry of the entire screen thickness; if the screen spans multiple lithologies, the water within the well bore will not be representative of any lithology (Shosky, 1987). It can only be effective only for substances which do NOT naturally exist in the region of the aquifer. Monitoring with long screens is good only for presence/absence determinations.

Concentrations vary throughout an aquifer, both vertically and horizontally. The concentration determined from any well will represent an average over the entire screen length. Therefore, to monitor trends in concentration, screens should span representative vertical sections

The spatial layout of the monitoring well system should be based on the conceptual flow and transport model for flow from the gas well through the aquifer, which includes flow pathways and possible contaminant dispersion. Monitoring wells should be placed as close to the expected flow path as possible, where the concentration will be highest. However, because of uncertainty in the prediction of the flow path, monitoring wells should also be spaced laterally away from the expected flow path. These lateral wells should detect lower concentrations than the one in the predicted flow path. If the lateral wells actually have higher concentration, the predicted flow path may be incorrect and monitoring wells should be added further from the predicted flow path to improve the understanding of the flow and movement of the contaminant plume.

Monitoring wells or piezometers should be placed close to the potential source for early detection, but also at a distance from the source to increase the chances that they will intercept the contaminant and to assess the rate of contaminant movement. If many wells detect the contaminant, the concentration variation would indicate the degree of dispersion. Denser well networks will have a better chance of detecting the contaminant and providing accurate description of its dispersal.

Considering the above fundamentals of a monitoring system, the following recommendations, in addition to sampling the existing private wells, should be added to the RDSGEIS and partly replace proposed regulations in 6 NYCRR §560.5(d)

- *The operator should prepare a conceptual flow path model for groundwater and contaminant transport from the drill pad to and through nearby aquifers.*
- *As part of the conceptual model, the operator should estimate the distance that a contaminant would travel from the well pad in various time periods, including one month, six months, one year, and five years.*
- *Dedicated groundwater monitoring wells should be reasonably located along and perpendicular to the projected flow path out to the five-year travel distance. At a minimum, there should be a transect of monitoring wells/piezometers at the one-month travel distance from the well and halfway between the well and important receptors, meaning wells or discharge points such as springs or streams.*
- *Monitor wells should span the surface aquifer and piezometers should have multiport sampling capabilities for twenty foot intervals at the top of the saturated zone and every 100 feet to the bottom of the freshwater zone. This will help establish vertical concentration and hydraulic gradients.*
- *The monitoring system should be established to establish baseline data including seasonal variability for at least one year prior to drilling and fracking.*

Monitoring transport from the deep shale is more difficult because a substantial flux of contaminants could be released from most anywhere in the fractured shale as a result of oil and gas development. Time intervals for transport could be more than 100 years, but fractures could decrease the time frame to as short a time as a few years. Fracture zones therefore could be monitored, but if they are known the industry should avoid fracking near them, both to avoid vertical transport and induced seismicity. It is therefore reasonable to require a dedicated monitoring well in the middle of each well pad wherever there is an upward flow gradient.

- *Industry should establish a multiport piezometer system from the shale to the bottom of the freshwater zone in the center of all well pads.*

- *The industry should provide the funding to maintain the piezometers system for at least 100 years beyond the end of gas production, to account for the long potential travel times.*

WATER RESOURCES

This section concerns primarily the controls on making water withdrawals for fracking. The section focuses on surface water diversions but also considers diversions from aquifers.

The RDSGEIS notes correctly that without proper controls, the withdrawals of water from streams and aquifers to use in fracking could have significant ecologic and hydrologic impacts (RDSGEIS, p. 6-2). The “natural flow paradigm” is a good description of the interdependencies of the stream ecology with all of the hydrologic regimes (RDSGEIS, p. 6-4). The description of the depletion to an aquifer and the interconnection of aquifers with surface water (RDSGEIS, p. 6-5) is also good. Treating the withdrawals as consumptively lost to the system (RDSGEIS, p. 6-9) is appropriate because in essence, with recycling of flowback, the water will not return to the system. These are acknowledgements which should lead to good regulation of withdrawals, if properly considered in the rulemaking.

The discussion and comparison of the withdrawals for fracking with statewide water uses (Withdrawals for High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing, RDSGEIS, p 6-9 thru 6-13) are scientifically unsupported and irrelevant;. The potential impacts of withdrawals are a matter of scale and depend on their size, the size of the stream, and antecedent moisture conditions.

Much of the regulation of withdrawals from streams focuses on passby flows. The RDSGEIS defines a passby flow as “a prescribed quantity of flow that must be allowed to pass an intake when withdrawal is occurring” (RDSGEIS, p 2-30) which also specifies a low flow condition “during which no water can be withdrawn” (Id.). Specific definitions will be discussed below, but in reality the lower specified values can allow significant damage to occur to streams, especially smaller ones. If the required passby flow is small compared to the average, meaning it has a long return interval, it will only rarely restrict water withdrawals. If flows on the river can be reduced to a low passby flow, then diversions can reduce the flow to low, long return interval rates much more frequently; this is tantamount to imposing low-frequency, high-damaging, drought on the streams much more frequently.

The Delaware River Basin Commission (DRBC) does not have a specific passby flow requirement and usually uses the 7Q10 flow, the seven-day low flow with a ten-year return interval, for water resources evaluation (RDSGEIS, p. 7-13). The RDSGEIS indicates this is not protective (Id.) and as described in the previous paragraph, it would allow the 10-year low flow to manifest

much more frequently. The Susquehanna River Basin Commission (SRBC) regulations are more complicated, but generally use the 7Q10 or from 15 to 25 percent of the average daily flow (RDSGEIS, p 7-15, 16). Neither is protective and the NYSDEC proposes to use the natural flow regime method (NFRM) method for all regions (RDSGEIS, p 7-16).

The RDSGEIS expresses the intent to use the NFRM only in permit conditions, however, as the document acknowledges that guidance has not yet been completed (RDSGEIS, p. 7-3). As authority, the RDSGEIS cites 6 NYCRR § 703.2, which states that “[n]o alteration that will impair the waters for their best usages” will be allowed. “For the purpose of this revised draft SGEIS only, the Department proposes to employ the NFRM via permit conditions as a protection measure pending completion of guidance.” (Id.). NYSDEC also indicates that the requirement could be “imposed via permit condition and/or regulation” (RDSGEIS, p. 7-22).

- *NYSDEC must include the requirement for using the NFRM in the regulations if it is to be consistently enforceable; the proposed regulations do not currently require use of the NFRM to establish the requisite passby flow in a stream.*

The NFRM attempts to protect the distinctive flow patterns for each stream, including the “variable magnitude, duration, timing, and rate of change of flow rates and water levels” (RDSGEIS, p 7-18). The RDSGEIS proposes to use the “Q75 and/or Q60 monthly exceedance values for establishing passby flows” (Id.). An Qx exceedance value is the flow rate which is exceeded x percent of the time. Another way of considering the Q75 and Q60 exceedance values is that the passby flow would be greater than the flow which the stream exceeds 25 or 40 percent of the time. This is much higher than a 7Q10 flow. However, in a small stream, diversions could change a flow regime from wet (higher than average) to significantly below average.

NYSDEC appears to intend that if the watershed exceeds 50 square miles, the passby flow will be Q75 for the winter/spring months of October through June and Q60 for the summer months of July through September, whereas for smaller watersheds (Area<50 sq miles), the Q60 value applies all year (RDSGEIS, p 7-19). NYSDEC at least recognizes that small streams need more protection and that low flows can be more critical during the summer when temperatures are higher. This means that at least 40 percent of the time, withdrawals will not be allowed. For another short time period (up to the time for which the actual streamflow and the required passby flow is less than the preferred withdrawal rate), withdrawals will be limited to prevent the streamflow from being reduced to below the passby flow.

The RDSGEIS does not discuss how the recommended passby flows were chosen, in terms of habitat protected. There is an implication that Q60 and/or Q75 mean the same amount of

habitat would be protected; this may simply be incorrect because streams are not created equal. The NYSDEC should apply a second filter and actually require a determination of the habitat at Q60 and limit the change in habitat. This is one advantage of the Susquehanna River Basin Commission method (RDSGEIS, p 7-15, -16).

The flow estimation method assumes a linear relation between baseflow and drainage area (RDSGEIS, p 7-19). The assumption is that streamflow increases consistently in a downstream direction in proportion to the contributing drainage area. Because it is essential to the method, the RDSGEIS should present data to justify their assumptions. Analyzing streams with two or more gages, the Qx flow at one would be calculated according to the area proportionality relationship with the other gage; the RDSGEIS should present this type of verification to prove the method is suitable.

On streams without gages, the RDSGEIS indicates that NYSDEC will use factors developed from regression equations based on their location in New York (RDSGEIS, Fig 7.1, Table 7.2). The table provides coefficients in cfs/sq mi for the passby flow for the different geographic zone by month. Presumably, they are based on basin areas as discussed above, with different requirements for greater than and less than 50 sq miles. The RDSGEIS should compare values determined with Table 7.2 with the actual value determined for gaged streams to verify the table. Statements such as “[t]he passby flow requirement ... would fully mitigate any significant adverse impact from water withdrawals” (RDSGEIS, p 7-22) are unsubstantiated and unjustified.

The passby flow requirements effectively ignore the potential cumulative impacts, irrespective of the following sentence: “The application of the NFRM to all water withdrawals to support the subject hydraulic fracturing operations would comprehensively address cumulative impacts on stream flows because it will ensure a specified minimum passby flow, regardless of the number of water withdrawals taking place at one time” (RDSGEIS, p. 7-25). The RDSGEIS continues by indicating that “significant adverse cumulative impacts would be addressed by the NFRM ... because each operator ... would be required, via permit condition and/or regulation, to estimate or report the maximum withdrawal rate and measure the actual passby flow for any period of withdrawal” (RDSGEIS, p. 7-25, -26). The RDSGEIS analysis of the prevention of cumulative flow impacts appears limited to these statements. Clearly, several concurrent withdrawals along a stream reach could cumulatively decrease the flow at the more downstream sites to less than the passby flow, if the timing of withdrawals is not controlled and if there are not adequate measurements ongoing at the site which compare the actual flow to the required passby flow. Short of establishing a gaging station with flow/stage relationship, it is difficult to measure flows frequently enough to monitor short-term flow changes, therefore it is unlikely that an operator would be able to react sufficiently to preserve the passby flow.

The following are recommendations for improving the passby flow requirement to be used by NYSDEC

- *The program must be codified into regulations.*
- *The methods for estimating passby flows at ungaged sites must be verified as to their accuracy.*
- *NYSDEC should coordinate operators so their withdrawals do not cumulatively cause flows to drop below the required passby flows at any point along the stream.*
- *The operator should establish a temporary flow/stage relationship with at least a staff gage that should be monitored.*
- *Passby flows should be maintained with consideration to the measurement error inherent in the technique. The operator should assume that the measurement method is overestimating flow and therefore maintain a flow greater than the passby flow by as much as the error estimate.*

NYSDEC recognizes that groundwater pumping could deplete streams and also recognizes that pumping effects on the aquifers must be limited (RDSGEIS, pp 6-5, -6). Regarding groundwater pumping, the “Department proposes to impose requirements regarding passby flows as stated in this document” (RDSGEIS, p 7-25). The RDSGEIS does not discuss how the potential impacts to a stream will be estimated or how passby flows will be maintained, especially considering the lag time between groundwater pumping and the time for effects to manifest in the streams.

- *NYSDEC should prohibit groundwater pumping in tributary watersheds when analysis indicates that the time for a pumping effect to reach the stream is less than 30 days.*
- *NYSDEC should require a suitable groundwater analysis to estimate the effect on groundwater discharge to streams.*

The RDSGEIS indicates that industry has begun recycling more of its wastewater (RDSGEIS, p. 1-2). Recycling flowback water is good for reducing the amount of water to be disposed of, but it will not significantly decrease the water volume needed for fracking because the amount recovered as flowback is just 10 to 30 percent of the amount originally injected. Tracking the flowback to be recycled should be part of the new “Drilling and Production Waste Tracking” process (RDSGEIS, p. 1-13).

PROJECT MITIGATION MEASURES

The primary mitigation schemes proposed in the RDSGEIS are setbacks, which the RDSGEIS treats as additional precautionary measures (RDSGEIS, p. 1-11). This section considers whether

the setbacks are sufficient or arbitrary. A list in section 1.8 introduces additional precautionary measures; they are repeated in section 3.2.4. The following lists the proposed mitigation setbacks from the RDSGEIS and provides brief comment:

“Well pads for high-volume hydraulic fracturing would be prohibited in the NYC and Syracuse watersheds, and within a 4,000-foot buffer around those watersheds.”

The primary pathway if wells are prohibited within 4000 feet of the watershed boundary would be underground, since topography would cause contaminants to flow away from the watershed boundary, assuming this coincides with a topographic divide. In general, 4000 feet is probably sufficient, but a site specific consideration of the geology should be included to ascertain that the groundwater divide would not place the well within the watershed and that geologic formations are not dipping in the direction of the watershed.

- *This setback is not specified in the regulations, but should be.*
- *The operator should be required to analyze the local geology to determine whether the groundwater divide would allow transport into the prohibited watershed.*

“Well pads for high-volume hydraulic fracturing would be prohibited within 500 feet of primary aquifers (6 NYCCR §560.4(a)(2),(subject to reconsideration 2 years after issuance of the first permit for high-volume hydraulic fracturing)”

The implication of only a 500 –ft setback is that there is no groundwater connection, but if groundwater in the bedrock connects with the aquifer, there is a potential for a rapid transport of contaminants from a spill through fractures to the aquifer. Contamination will easily spread through the highly conductive aquifer (RDSGEIS, p. 6-37). The risk to the aquifer would be the same as to the prohibited watersheds, so there is no reason the distance should be different. If the ground surface slopes from the well to the primary aquifer, there is a significant risk of a spill reaching the aquifer through surface channels.

- *The prohibition in 6 NYCCR §560.4(a)(2) should be increased to 4000 feet, unless a site specific analysis demonstrates there are no fractures connecting the bedrock with the aquifer and there are no obvious surface water pathways.*
- *Additionally, the RDSGEIS should publish the area the Marcellus shale zone overlapped by primary aquifers and the area that would be included as buffer; this would help the public to understand how much land the prohibition affects.*

“Well pads for high-volume hydraulic fracturing would be prohibited within 2,000 feet of public water supply wells, river or stream intakes and reservoirs (6 NYCCR

§560.4(a)(4)) (subject to reconsideration 3 years after issuance of the first permit for high-volume hydraulic fracturing)”

Essentially, there is no reason for this offset to be less than the offset from a primary aquifer. Considering a public water supply well, the operator should be required to perform a capture zone analysis for the well, and if the well could draw contaminants from a spill to the well, the gas well should not be permitted in that location.

- *The setback for public water supply wells should also be 4000 feet.*
- *Additionally, the operator should identify the capture zone for flow to the well and identify the five year transport distance contour.*

“The Department would not issue permits for proposed high-volume hydraulic fracturing at any well pad in 100-year floodplains”. (6 NYCRR §560.4(a)(4))

For wells that might operate for 30 years, there is a 26% chance² of a 100-year flood occurring during the period the well would be operated.

- *Wells should be prohibited within at least the 500 year return interval floodplain, because the damages from significant flooding could be very substantial.*

“The Department would not issue permits for proposed high-volume hydraulic fracturing at any proposed well pad within 500 feet of a private water well or domestic use spring, *unless waived by the owner.*” (6 NYCRR §560.4(a)(4)), emphasis added.)

NYSDEC should not allow the owner to waive this requirement because health and safety are at risk. More than just the “owner” may use the source, and the owner could sell to someone who does not understand the situation.

- *6 NYCRR §560.4(a)(1) should be changed to remove the waiver from the water well owner unless the owner is required to disclose the waiver to a future buyer in perpetuity.*

In general, some of the points discussed above mention that NYSDEC will revisit the need for the setback in the future. These reconsiderations are not part of the regulations. If so, the NYSDEC should specify in detail the performance standards that must be met in order for the setback requirement to be relaxed, and should acknowledge that a supplemental EIS would be completed to consider those changes.

² The probability that a event with a p probability will occur during n observations (years) may be determined with a binomial distribution.

The RDSGEIS also specified the following factors which would require site-specific SEQRA analysis.

1) Any proposed high-volume hydraulic fracturing where the top of the target fracture zone is shallower than 2,000 feet along any part of the proposed length of the wellbore.

2) Any proposed high-volume hydraulic fracturing where the top of the target fracture zone at any point along any part of the proposed length of the wellbore is less than 1,000 feet below the base of a known fresh water supply.

These requirements should be considered together – if the top of the shale is less than 2000 feet bgs or 1000 feet below the bottom of the aquifer, a site-specific SEQRA review will be required. The depths seem arbitrary, and must be based on a perceived potential for vertical transport from the shale to the receptor.

3) Any proposed well pad within 500 feet of a principal aquifer:

The only difference between a primary and principal aquifer is the number of people potentially using the aquifer. Principal aquifers are thought to be productive enough to be an important source and contamination with fracking fluid or flowback could render them unusable without substantial remediation. Wells near principal aquifers should be subject to the same setback as well near a primary aquifer.

4) Any proposed well pad within 150 feet of a perennial or intermittent stream, storm drain, lake or pond:

Again, rather than allowing development subject to a site-specific study, development within 150 feet of these streams should be prohibited. It is difficult to imagine how study will prevent a spill which is, by its nature, unexpected.

5) A proposed surface water withdrawal that is found not to be consistent with the Department's preferred passby flow methodology as described in Chapter 7;
Revised Draft SGEIS 2011, Page 3-16

6) Any proposed water withdrawal from a pond or lake;

7) Any proposed ground water withdrawal within 500 feet of a private well;

8) Any proposed ground water withdrawal within 500 feet of a wetland that pump test data shows would have an influence on the wetland:

Requirements 5 through 8 are acceptable limits for requiring site-specific study.

9) Any proposed well location determined by NYCDEP to be within 1,000 feet of its subsurface water supply infrastructure

This applies to areas outside the NYC watershed that contain NYC infrastructure (RDSGEIS, p 6-1). It is unclear whether there is any infrastructure that would actually be affected by fracking outside of the watershed. Fracking should not be allowed within 1000 feet of any NYC water supply infrastructure to prevent damage.

Acid Rock Drainage

The RDSGEIS refers in several locations to an acid rock drainage (ARD) mitigation plan which would be required for the on-site burial of Marcellus Shale cuttings (RDSGEIS, p 7-67). In general, our recommendation is that on-site burial not be allowed (see the report by Harvey Consulting, LLC). NYSDEC does not describe an adequate mitigation plan to prevent the leaching of ARD into groundwater. It does not specify testing which is essential to know how much neutralizing rock must be supplied.

For each well, prior to disposal of the cuttings, an adequate set of samples should be collected from the cuttings to test for acid generation. Adequate sampling would be representatively spaced along the horizontal well bore; initially, many samples would be needed to determine the variability among samples; samples every 100 feet would be desirable until sufficient data is collected from New York shales to characterize the variability along the horizontal well bore.

At least three types of testing should be completed:

- Acid base accounting – Modified Sobek procedure
- Net acid/alkaline production
- Meteoric water mobility testing – ASTM E-2242-02

These tests should provide adequate information to determine the amount of neutralizing rock which should be added to the cuttings to prevent ARD from leaching through the waste. Ideally, if the rock is potentially acid generating (PAG), kinetic tests should be completed to better assess the PAG potential, but this may not be possible in a timely fashion. The regulations should reflect these testing requirements. Final disposal must include adequate encapsulation to assure neutralization in perpetuity. It must also include adequate monitoring to assure that ARD does not leach into the underlying groundwater. A mitigation plan must be in place to remediate any disposal sites that do leak ARD.

COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC PROPOSED REGULATIONS

The proposed regulations increase the overlap lengths for cement plugs in abandoned O&G wells from 15 to 50 feet at several locations (6 NYCRR§ 555.5(a)). This increase in plug length is an improvement but not sufficient or well planned in all locations. Rather than filling “with

cement from total depth to at least 50 feet above the top of the shallowest formation from which the production of oil or gas has ever been obtained in the vicinity” (6 NYCRR§ 555.5(a)(1)), the regulation requiring cementing to 50 feet above the top of the shallowest formation in which gas has been observed; not all gas pockets have actually produced gas but could cause methane contamination if they are not already sealed off by casing. The regulations should specify that the cement plug “below the deepest potable fresh water level” should overlap the transition than be just below it because even a short section of uncased well bore open to the salt water could mix into the well and to above the fresh water line (6 NYCRR§ 555.5(a)(3)).

The definition of “public water supply” (6NYCRR§ 560.2(19)) appears to include only groundwater by referring to “a...well system which provides piped water”. However, the definition of “reservoir” (6NYCRR§ 560.2(20)) includes “waterbody designated for use as a dedicated public water supply”. The regulations must clear up this inconsistency by making clear that a “public water supply” includes ground- and surface water.

Operators must include in their applications various items (6NYCRR§ 560.3). The following address some of these requirements by number (the setback requirements were addressed above in the section concerning setbacks).

(2): The estimated maximum depth and elevation of bottom of potential freshwater: The operator should also be required to complete geophysical logging including conductivity measurements to verify the depth, unless it had been based on “previous drilling on the well pad”.

(3): The “proposed volume of water to be used in hydraulic fracturing”: The operator should also be required to discuss and specify how the estimated volume was determined.

(5), (6): The two parts specify that the application will provide the distance to various features but only if they are within a given specific distance. With current geographic information systems technology, there is no difficulty in obtaining these distances. The application should provide the distance to the water supply features in (5) and the aquifer and stream features in (6) if they are within two miles.

Mapping requirements for the application are specified in 6 NYCCR § 560.3(b). The topographic map requirements (6 NYCCR § 560.3(b)(2)) require essentially a site map within 2640 feet of the proposed surface location (RDSGEIS, p. 3-9). This should be increased to 1 mile from the site, so that the map would be two by two miles centered on the proposed well pad. The map should include locations of all aquifers, water wells, stream channels, and other water features. The map should also include surface geology including faults. If fractures dominate the surface bedrock, contaminants can move quickly to wells. Contaminant pathways for transport from

the pad should be identified on the map. Contaminants would not move far upgradient, so the NYSDEC should focus downgradient. The following recommendations should be included in regulations regarding the requirements of well drillers to take steps to protect nearby wells.

- *The operator should complete site specific geology/hydrogeology studies to map the potential flow paths for contaminants released from the well pad or the well bore.*
- *All wells within a five-year transport zone should be located and included in sampling plans discussed below. Additionally, dedicated monitoring wells should be established within this zone, also as described below.*

The regulations require the operator to record and report the depths and flow rates where “freshwater, brine, oil and/or gas were encountered or circulation was lost during drilling operations” (6 NYCCR 560.6(c)(22)). The operator should identify these areas with specific conductivity logging. The regulations do not specify any limits or actions that the operator should take if certain flow or losses were recorded; they do not specify what the department will do with this information.

The required treatment plan “must include a profile showing anticipated pressures and volumes of fluid for pumping the first stage” (6 NYCCR 560.6(c)(22)). The operator also “must make and maintain a complete record of its hydraulic fracturing operation including the flowback phase” (6 NYCCR 560.6(c)(26)viii). The operator should compare the “anticipated pressures and volumes” with the actual values.

The operator must suspend operations immediately “if any anomalous pressure and/or flow conditions is indicated or occurring which is a significant deviation from either the treatment plan” (6 NYCCR 560.6(c)(26)vii). This is good, but the regulations do not define anomalous or what a significant deviation from the treatment plan would be, or what the follow-up action would be to assess and remedy damages.

Also, the required record of the fracking operation, 6 NYCCR 560.6(c)(26)viii, includes rates, volumes, and pressures of all injected and flowback fluids to the well. The department only requires a synopsis be provided to the department. There is no description what a synopsis should include. Instead, the department should require the full record be provided to the department, and this record should be made publically available online.

The regulations allow a well owner to waive setback requirements (6NYCRR§ 560.4(a)(1)). This should not be allowed unless there is also a requirement to inform potential purchasers of the well in the future of the waiver.

REFERENCES

- Alley, W. M., T. E. Reilly, and O. E. Franke. (1999). Sustainability of groundwater resources. U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1186, Denver, Colorado, 79 p.
- (EPA) Environmental Protection Agency. 1987. *Report to Congress, Management of Wastes from the Exploration, Development, and Production of Crude Oil, Natural Gas, and Geothermal Energy, Volume 1 of 3, Oil and Gas*. Washington, D.C.
- Fisher, K., 2010, Data confirm safety of well fracturing: The American Oil and Gas Reporter, July 2010, http://www.fidelityepco.com/Documents/OilGasRept_072010.pdf.
- Heisig, P.M., and K.D. Knutson. 1997. Borehole Geophysical Data from Bedrock Wells at Windham, New York. U.S. Geological Survey Open – File Report 97-42. Troy, N.Y.
- Isachsen, Y.W., McKendree, W., 1977, Preliminary brittle structure map of New York, 1:250,000 and 1:500,000 and generalized map of recorded joint systems in New York, 1: 1,000,000: New York State Museum and Science Service Map and Chart Series No. 31.
- Jacobi, R.D., 2002, Basement faults and seismicity in the Appalachian Basin of New York State: *Tectonophysics*, v. 353, Issues 1-4, 23 August 2002, p. 75-113.
- Krisanne, E.L., and S. Weisset. 2011. Marcellus shale hydraulic fracturing and optimal well spacing to maximize recovery and control costs. *SPE Hydraulic Fracturing Technology Conference*, 24-26 January 2011, The Woodlands, TX.
- Myers, T., in review. Potential contaminant pathways from hydraulically fractured shale to aquifers.
- Schulze-Makuch, D., D.A. Carlson, D.S. Cherkauer, and P. Malik. 1999. Scale dependence of hydraulic conductivity in heterogeneous media. *Ground Water* 37, no. 6: 904-919
- Soeder, D.J.. 1988. Porosity and permeability of eastern Devonian gas shale. *SPE Formation Evaluation* (March) 116-125.
- Thyne, G., 2008. Review of Phase II Hydrogeologic Study. Prepared for Garfield County.
- Williams, J.H., 2010, Evaluation of well logs for determining the presence of freshwater, saltwater, and gas above the Marcellus Shale in Chemung, Tioga, and Broome Counties, New York: U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 2010–5224, 27 p., at <http://pubs.usgs.gov/sir/2010/5224/>.
- Williams, J.H., Taylor, L.E., and Low, D.J. 1998, Hydrogeology and groundwater quality of the glaciated valleys of Bradford, Tioga, and Potter Counties, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania Topographic and Geologic Survey Water Resources Report 68, 89 p.