



Identifying potential contaminants of concern and how to manage them

Sarah Scott
Senior Technical Specialist - Hydrogeology
January 2015

Aims

- ➔ What are the potential contaminants in fracturing fluid, flowback water?
- ➔ How do we access these?
- ➔ Source – Pathways - Receptors
- ➔ Developing a framework to manage and reduce contamination
- ➔ Conclusions

Hydraulic Fracturing Fluid

- ➔ Water and friction reducer - polyacrylamide.
- ➔ Gelling agents – Guar Gum
- ➔ Cross linkers – Borate
- ➔ Breakers -
- ➔ Biocides - gluteraldehyde.



Hydraulic Fracturing Fluid

- ➔ In UK operators have to disclose the ingredient list and maximum concentrations to obtain a permit.
- ➔ The ingredients must be non-hazardous as defined by the Groundwater Directive 2006 (2006/118/EC)

What is Hazardous?

- ➔ Hazardous substances are defined in the Directive as any substances or group of substances that are:
 - ➔ Toxic
 - ➔ Persistent
 - ➔ Liable to bioaccumulate.

- ➔ Any substance previously class as List1

What is Non-Hazardous?

- ➔ The EPR 2010 defines non-hazardous pollutants as any substance other than a hazardous substance.
- ➔ Any substance previously classed as List 2 but also lots of other pollutants, eg nitrate.

What does this mean?

- ➔ The Water Framework Directive and EPR 2010 state that hazardous substances must be prevented from entering groundwater.
- ➔ The input to groundwater of non-hazardous pollutants must be limited to avoid pollution.

Who is responsible for classification?

- ➔ In England the EA, the decision is reviewed by The Joint Agency Groundwater Advisory Group – JAGDAG
- ➔ JAGDAG = EA, SEPA, NIEA and EPA (Ireland) with DEFRA, WAG, HPA and industry representatives.
- ➔ Requests received for consideration undergo stakeholder consultation prior to final agreement.

Interim determination

Substance	CAS	Interim
Acrylamide	76-06-1	Hazardous
Anionic Polyacrylamide	9003-05-8	Non-hazardous
Gluteraldehyde	111-30-8	Non-hazardous
Hydrotreated light distillate (StimLubeW)	64742-47-8	Non-hazardous

Managing Fracturing Fluid

- ➔ Must be disclosed on the permit application
- ➔ Permitted to use only those agreed in writing
- ➔ Must be classed as non-hazardous to GW
- ➔ Stored appropriately on site –bunding etc
- ➔ Monitored in the flowback fluid where appropriate
- ➔ Monitored in the environmental monitoring.

Contaminants in Flowback water

➔ Preese Hall, Lancashire:

➔ High salinity

➔ Sodium – 28400 mg/l

➔ Chloride – 75000 mg/l

➔ Metals

➔ Iron – 112000 ug/l

➔ Magnesium – 1350 mg/l

➔ Mercury – 0.012 ug/l (1 of 4)

➔ NORM

Managing Flowback Fluid

- ➔ Contained at surface in closed systems
- ➔ Monitored to assess chemical composition and ensure fit for reuse where appropriate.
- ➔ When no longer useful removed from site by registered carriers to licensed waste facility for treatment and disposal.
- ➔ Substances included in environmental monitoring

Drilling Additives

- ➔ Lots of additives to allow for the variety of geological conditions that may be encountered.
- ➔ Brines
- ➔ Glycol fluids
- ➔ Silicate fluids
- ➔ Barite (marble)
- ➔ Bentonite
- ➔ Xanthan gum
- ➔ Gypsum
- ➔ Cellulose

Managing Drilling Additives

- ➔ Must be disclosed in the permit application.
- ➔ Do not require recipe just the ingredients list and maximum concentrations.
- ➔ May accept LTOBM below any sensitive receptors
- ➔ Operators notifications to HSE
- ➔ May consider a GW activity permit in very sensitive locations
- ➔ Appropriate waste management arrangements

Managing Drilling Wastes

- ➔ Contained on site
- ➔ Transferred by registered carriers
- ➔ Treated and disposed of at licensed waste sites
- ➔ OBM returned to supplier for recycling.

Managing Drilling Wastes

➔ Not this



Managing Drilling Wastes



Managing Drilling Wastes



Understanding the Risks

- ➔ Conceptual understanding of the site is paramount.
- ➔ An assessment of all sources pathways and receptors is necessary
- ➔ A detailed risk assessment based on these will identify the mitigation measures required for any site.

The EPR Permit

➔ Includes

- ➔ conditions to ensure that indentified mitigation is in place
- ➔ A site condition report to set out the quality of the environment prior to activity.
- ➔ A waste management plan
- ➔ A monitoring plan
- ➔ Pre-operational conditions

Baseline monitoring

- ➔ Expected as the default on any well to be fractured.
- ➔ Sets out the quality of the environment before any activity.
- ➔ Is important for operator
- ➔ Is important for the regulator
- ➔ Is important for the public

Baseline monitoring

- ➔ Should be based on the conceptual understanding of the location
- ➔ Should include all potential receptors
- ➔ Should also take into account any possible existing contamination sources that could impact the site.
- ➔ Will provide a sound database for determining what needs to be monitored during operations.
- ➔ Will enable triggers to be set where necessary

Conclusions

- Protecting groundwater from contamination is not new.
- We have a tried and tested risk based approach.
- Many of the risks are not unique to the industry.
- Importance of a good conceptual understanding cannot be overestimated.
- Providing a comprehensive baseline data set is essential to prove mitigation measures are working.