

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FROM THE DEVELOPMENT OF UNCONVENTIONAL OIL AND GAS RESERVES

The development of unconventional oil and gas shales using hydraulic fracturing and directional drilling is currently a focal point of energy and climate change discussions. While this technology has provided access to substantial reserves of oil and gas, the need for large quantities of water, emissions, and infrastructure raises concerns over the environmental impacts. Written by an international consortium of experts, this book provides a comprehensive overview of the extraction from unconventional reservoirs, providing clear explanations of the technology and processes involved. Each chapter is devoted to different aspects including global reserves, the status of their development and regulatory framework, water management and contamination, air quality, earthquakes, radioactivity, isotope geochemistry, microbiology, and climate change. Case studies present baseline studies, water monitoring efforts, and habitat destruction. This book is accessible to a wide audience, from academics to industry professionals and policymakers interested in environmental pollution and petroleum exploration.

JOHN F. STOLZ is a professor in the Department of Biological Sciences and Director of the Center for Environmental Research and Education at Duquesne University, Pittsburgh. He is a geomicrobiologist best known for his research on the biogeochemical cycles of arsenic and selenium and the biogenesis of microbialites. He has published 96 journal articles, 40 book chapters, and edited 2 books. He received the Clean Water Action Dewey Award for environmental stewardship in 2020.

DANIEL J. BAIN is an associate professor of geology and environmental science at the University of Pittsburgh. His main research interests are urban systems, energy production landscapes, and trace metals in environmental systems. He has authored 51 peer-reviewed papers and 2 book chapters.

DR. W. MICHAEL GRIFFIN was Executive Director of the Green Design Institute at CMU. Previously, he was President of GMS Technologies, Vice President for Research and Development at Applied CarboChemicals Inc., Research Director at CHMR and NETAC, and a research scientist at BP America. He has published work on energy and environmental policy, and systems analysis of energy production.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FROM THE DEVELOPMENT OF UNCONVENTIONAL OIL AND GAS RESERVES

Edited by

JOHN F. STOLZ

Duquesne University

DANIEL J. BAIN

University of Pittsburgh

W. MICHAEL GRIFFIN

Carnegie Mellon University



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press & Assessment

978-1-108-48919-5 — Environmental Impacts from the Development of Unconventional Oil and Gas Reserves

Edited by John Stolz, Daniel Bain, Michael Griffin

Frontmatter

[More Information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre, New Delhi – 110025, India

103 Penang Road, #05-06/07, Visioncrest Commercial, Singapore 238467

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108489195

DOI: 10.1017/9781108774178

© Cambridge University Press 2022

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2022

Printed in the United Kingdom by TJ Books Limited, Padstow Cornwall

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Stolz, John F., editor. | Bain, Daniel J., editor. | Griffin, Michael (Michael W.), editor.

Title: Environmental impacts from the development of unconventional oil and gas reserves / edited by John F. Stolz, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Daniel J. Bain, University of Pittsburgh, Michael W. Griffin, Carnegie Mellon University, Pennsylvania.

Description: First edition. | Cambridge ; New York : Cambridge University Press, 2022. | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2021051814 (print) | LCCN 2021051815 (ebook) | ISBN 9781108489195 (hardback) | ISBN 9781108774178 (epub)

Subjects: LCSH: Oil fields—Production methods—Environmental aspects. | Gas fields—Production methods—Environmental aspects.

Classification: LCC TD195.P4 E5567 2022 (print) | LCC TD195.P4 (ebook) | DDC 363.6—dc23/eng/20211207

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2021051814>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2021051815>

ISBN 978-1-108-48919-5 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	page ix
<i>List of Tables</i>	xxi
<i>List of Contributors</i>	xxiii
<i>Preface</i>	xxvii

JOHN F. STOLZ, W. MICHAEL GRIFFIN, DANIEL J. BAIN

Part I Overview

1	Global Unconventional Oil and Gas Reserves and Their Development	3
	JOHN F. STOLZ, CASSANDRA ZIEGLER, AND W. MICHAEL GRIFFIN	
2	Unconventional Shale Gas and Oil Extraction in the Appalachian Basin	19
	JOHN F. STOLZ AND W. MICHAEL GRIFFIN	
3	An Overview of Unconventional Gas Extraction in Australia: The First Decade	44
	GERALYN MCCARRON AND SHAY DOUGALL	
4	The Governance of Fracking: History, Differences, and Trends	79
	JOHN D. GRAHAM AND JOHN A. RUPP	

Part II Environmental Analysis

5	Air Quality	105
	ALBERT A. PRESTO AND XIANG LI	
6	Methane and Climate Change	132
	ROBERT W. HOWARTH	

vi	<i>Contents</i>	
7	Water Usage and Management JESSICA M. WILSON AND JEANNE M. VANBRIESEN	150
8	Seismicity Induced by the Development of Unconventional Oil and Gas Resources DAVID W. EATON	173
9	Naturally Occurring Radioactive Material (NORM) NATHANIEL R. WARNER, MOSES A. AJEMIGBITSE, KATHARINA PANKRATZ, AND BONNIE MCDEVITT	214
10	Metal Isotope Signatures as Tracers for Unconventional Oil and Gas Fluids BRIAN W. STEWART AND ROSEMARY C. CAPO	246
11	Isotopes as Tracers of Atmospheric and Groundwater Methane Sources AMY TOWNSEND-SMALL	272
12	The Microbiology of Shale Gas Extraction SOPHIE L. NIXON	292
Part III Case Studies		
13	Evaluation of Potential Water Quality Impacts in Unconventional Oil and Gas Extraction: The Application of Elemental Ratio Approaches to Pennsylvania Pre-Drill Data DANIEL J. BAIN, TETIANA CANTLAY, REBECCA TISHERMAN, AND JOHN F. STOLZ	313
14	A Baseline Ecological Study of Tributaries in the Tenmile Creek Watershed, Southwest Pennsylvania BRADY PORTER, ELIZABETH DAKIN, SARAH WOODLEY, AND JOHN F. STOLZ	340
15	The Effects of Shale Gas Development on Forest Landscapes and Ecosystems in the Appalachian Basin MARGARET C. BRITTINGHAM AND PATRICK J. DROHAN	363

	<i>Contents</i>	vii
16	Managing TDS and Sulfate in the Monongahela River Three Rivers QUEST	386
	PAUL ZIEMKIEWICZ, MELISSA O'NEAL, TAMARA VANDIVORT, JOSEPH KINGSBURY, AND RACHEL PELL	
	<i>Index</i>	411
	<i>Colour Plates section to be found between pp. 290 and 291</i>	

Figures

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------------|
| 1.1 | Global distribution of tight oil and gas reserves (US EIA 2014) (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.) | <i>page 11</i> |
| 2.1 | Map of United States shale plays in the lower 48 states (US EIA 2016) (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.) | 22 |
| 2.2 | Well location plat pages from a conditional use permit for a mega pad with 42 wells in Southwestern Pennsylvania. (A) map of the location of the proposal well pad in relation to other nearby surface structures including information of landowners, (B) map showing lateral for one of the wells (MON404H1) and the number of wells on the pad (upper righthand corner), (C) diagram of the well bore showing specifics such as top hole, kick off point, and bottom hole with depths and lengths | 26 |
| 2.3 | Trucks and equipment associated with unconventional drilling. (A) a caravan of thumper trucks for seismic testing, (B) water tanks at a watering station at the edge of the Monongahela River (note hose leading to the river – arrow), (C) “Sand king” proppant truck, (D) sand (proppant) truck, (E) pressure pump truck, (F) chemical mixing truck, (G) kettle truck for mixing cement, and (H) brine (residual waste) truck. A, C, D, G, and H courtesy of Robert Donnan; E and F courtesy of Bill Hughes; B the author (JFS) | 27 |
| 2.4 | Stages in the development of a well pad. (A) Impoundment for fresh water (note the white pipeline that goes to the adjacent well pad, middle center of the image), (B) Pad preparation with liners in place and cellars for eight wells (w). (C) Drilling has commenced with a “triple” rig. The pad is surrounded by a sound dampening barrier, the drilling rig is in the center, and an impoundment (arrow) for drilling fluids and waste is to the left of the rig. (D) The completed well site with remaining infrastructure; (w) well heads cordoned off by jersey barriers, (s) separators, and (c) condensate tanks. (E) Close up of a well head (note how the cellar can fill with water). B, C, and D, courtesy of Robert Donnan; A and E, the author (JFS) | 28 |
| 2.5 | The well pad during the hydraulic fracturing of the well. (A) well pad in Ohio with some permanent infrastructure already in place, (s) separators, | |

- (c) condensate tanks, (cn) conditioners. (B) closer look at a well pad in Amwell Pennsylvania (cc) control center, (b) blenders, (wt) water tanks, (p) pressure pumps, (pp) proppant (sand) containers and trucks. Courtesy of Robert Donnan 31
- 2.6 Ancillary infrastructure associated with unconventional shale gas and oil development. (A) impoundment for water, (B) transmission pipeline, (C) compressor station in West Virginia with 12 compressors under construction, (D) compressor station across the street from a farmhouse in Ohio, with six compressors, (E) pigging station in Ohio. Courtesy of Robert Donnan 34
- 2.7 Infrastructure for processing oil and wet gas. (A) Blue Racer Midstream in Proctor, West Virginia, (B) Midstream processing facility near Moundsville, West Virginia, (C) Midstream processing facility Mobley, West Virginia, (D) propane (left) and butane (right) storage tanks at a facility in Cadiz, Ohio. Courtesy of Robert Donnan 35
- 2.8 Processing plants for oil and wet gas. (A) Seneca, Sommerville Ohio, (B) Fort Beeler, West Virginia, (C) Mobley, West Virginia, and (D) Sherwood, West Virginia. Courtesy of Robert Donnan 36
- 2.9 Shell ethane cracker facility under construction, Beaver, PA. Courtesy of Robert Donnan 37
- 3.1 Estimates of conventional and unconventional gas reserves, and production in 2014 (tcf) (Geoscience Australia, 2019) (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.) 45
- 3.2 Prospective conventional and unconventional gas resources (tcf) (Geoscience Australia, 2018) (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.) 46
- 3.3 Oil and gas tenements (areas with a permit or authority from the government and under the relevant legislation to allow exploration or production of oil and gas) (Energy Resource Insights, 2020) (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.) 47
- 3.4 Workforce by subdivision in Queensland (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2018) 54
- 3.5 Spillover job impacts per coal seam gas (CSG) job (data sourced from Ogge, 2015) 54
- 3.6 Revenues created across industries (data sourced from Chang, 2019) 55
- 3.7 QGC Kenya Water Treatment Facility Storage Ponds (Wieambilla, Queensland), (Dean Draper, used with permission) 61
- 5.1 Map of unconventional oil and gas wells in Pennsylvania (map generated May 14, 2020). As in other states, unconventional oil and gas infrastructure is located away from major population centers in Allegheny County (Pittsburgh) and Philadelphia County. Source: PA DEP Oil and Gas Mapping tool (www.dep.gis.state.pa.us/PaOilAndGasMapping/, 2020) 108
- 5.2 Daily maximum NO₂ concentrations measured in (A) Allegheny County (Pittsburgh, Latitude: 40.617488, Longitude: -79.727664) and (B) Beaver County (Latitude: 40.747796, Longitude: -80.316442) from January 1, 2005 to September 30, 2019. Annual averages are shown as black dots centered on June 1 of each year. The black vertical line denotes the end date of the data shown in Carlton et al. (2014) 109

List of Figures

xi

- 5.3 The extent of the study area (within 2 km of a sampled point) is shown as shaded. In the left panel, areas within 2 km of a conventional or unconventional well are shown in blue or yellow, respectively. Areas within 2 km of both types of wells are shown in green. Areas within 2 km of any well are classified as “near-well.” In the right panel, average traffic density increases as the color gets darker. In general, more heavily traveled roads occur near Pittsburgh (in the center of Allegheny County) and on interstate highways. AADT = Annual Average Daily Traffic reported by Pennsylvania Spatial Data Access (www.pasda.psu.edu/, 2015) (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.)
Map generated in ESRI ArcGIS Pro 111
- 5.4 Background and near-well measurements for low and high traffic volumes. The amount of traffic on the roads significantly affects the underlying sampled distribution for both black carbon (left) and PAHs (right) (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.) 112
- 5.5 VOC (in ppb) and methane concentrations (in ppm) measured in (a) the Denver-Julesburg Basin, (b) the Uintah Basin, and (c) Northeastern PA Marcellus Shale (NEPA). Box-and-whisker plots represent distribution of measurements at gas production facilities. The red line in the middle of the box represents the median concentration; the top and the bottom of the box represent 75th and 25th percentile, respectively. The background measurements of each basin are shown as green crosses (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.) 118
- 5.6 Comparison of the VOC concentration measured in this study with (a) VOC measured in 28 US cities (Baker et al. 2008), (b) VOC measured at Boulder Atmospheric Observatory (BAO) (Gilman et al. 2013), and (c) VOC measured in Horse Pool in winter 2012 and winter 2013 (Helmig et al. 2014). Data from this study are presented using box-whisker plots, and data from previous studies are presented as symbols with standard deviation indicated by the error bars (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.) 120
- 5.7 Facility-level VOC emission rates measured at (a) gas wells in the Denver-Julesburg Basin, (b) gas wells in the Uintah Basin, (c) compressor stations in the Uintah Basin, and (d) gas wells in NEPA. The emission rates of each VOC species are presented with box-whisker plots. The red line in the middle of the box represents the median emission rate; the top and the bottom of the box represent 75th and 25th percentile, respectively 121
- 6.1 Greenhouse gas footprint of natural gas (including shale gas), diesel oil, and coal per unit of heat energy released as the fuels are burned. Direct emissions of carbon dioxide are shown in light gray. Methane emissions expressed as carbon dioxide equivalents are shown in dark gray. As discussed in the text, the methane emission rate used here for natural gas, 3.2% of production, is conservative. Emission estimates are from Howarth (2020) 141

- 6.2 Stylized comparison of the global temperature response over time from carbon dioxide and methane emitted for a one-year pulse of each gas at time zero. Top shows area under curve integrated for the time zero to year 20 time period, with methane shown solid gray and carbon dioxide as striped. Bottom panel is the same except through the 100-year time period. Note that the integrated area for carbon dioxide in both panels also underlies the area for methane, except for the extreme left-handed side of the curves. Adapted from IPCC (2013) and based on the absolute global temperature change potential. Reprinted from Howarth (2020) 143
- 7.1 Water use and wastewater generation in the development of oil and gas resources. Specific activities in the “Wastewater disposal and reuse” inset are: (a) disposal via injection well, (b) wastewater treatment with reuse or discharge, and (c) evaporation or percolation pit disposal (US EPA 2015) (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.) 151
- 7.2 Increasing publications related to “oil and gas” and “water” over the past 50 years. Figure courtesy Xiaoju (Julie) Chen (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.) 151
- 7.3 Hydraulic fracturing water use per well. Figure shows average of the data (ISH Energy, 2014) within 1st–99th percentile of water volumes used per well from Jan. 2011 to Aug. 2014 in watershed (8 HUCs) with at least two wells reporting water use. (Reproduced with permission from Gallegos et al. 2015) 153
- 7.4 Volume of produced water by state for 2007, 2012, and 2017. Boxed inset focuses on those states not in the top 10 produced water generators (note x-axis scale). Data from Clark and Veil (2009); Veil (2015); Veil (2020) (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.) 155
- 7.5 Produced water per well in various US shale plays. (Reproduced with permission from Kondash et al. 2017) 156
- 7.6 Volume of produced water from conventional (light gray) and unconventional (dark gray) natural gas development in Pennsylvania 157
- 7.7 Salinity of produced waters in the United States (Allison and Mandler 2018) (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.) 158
- 7.8 Produced water quality (TDS, chloride, and bromide) in Pennsylvania from conventional (blue) and unconventional (orange) wells. Data from Hayes (2009) (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.) 159
- 7.9 Onsite and offsite management of produced water from shale gas development. Modified VanBriesen and Hammer (2012) 161
- 7.10 Produced water management practices for 2007, 2012, and 2017. (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.) Data from Clark and Veil (2009); Veil (2015); Veil (2020) 162
- 7.11 Produced water management options used in Pennsylvania 2010–2012. Data from PA DEP (2018) 163

List of Figures

xiii

7.12	Observed changes in chloride (a) and bromide (b) loads in the Monongahela River during 2009–2012. Data from Wilson and VanBriesen (2013)	165
8.1	Locations of seismicity induced by saltwater disposal and hydraulic fracturing (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.)	175
8.2	Schematic diagram illustrating basic earthquake terminology (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.)	176
8.3	Magnitude-frequency diagrams for Oklahoma, Alberta and northeastern British Columbia (NE BC)	179
8.4	World stress map (Heidbach 2016) showing direction of SHmax, stress regime and method of stress determination, with overlay showing selected focal mechanisms for injection-induced events (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.)	181
8.5	Graphs illustrating the calculation of a 1-D effective vertical stress (S'_v) profile for a hypothetical sedimentary basin. Symbols are defined in the text. (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.)	182
8.6	Mohr diagrams for depths of 1.0 km, 2.5 km, and 5.0 km	184
8.7	Schematic illustration (not to scale) of three proposed mechanisms of fault activation by fluid injection	187
8.8	$M \geq 2.5$ earthquakes in Oklahoma (OK) and adjacent states including Texas (TX) and Kansas (KS) (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.)	190
8.9	$M \geq 2.5$ earthquakes (red circles) in central Alberta, Canada (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.)	193
8.10	$M \geq 2.5$ earthquakes (red circles) in northeastern British Columbia (BC), Canada (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.)	195
8.11	Variability in input parameters (left) and tornado plot (right) showing sensitivity of fault B (Figure 9.6) to input parameters for Monte Carlo fault slip potential analysis	199
8.12	Probability of nominal pore-pressure increase required to exceed Mohr-Coulomb criterion on faults A and B (Figure 9.6), at 5.0 km depth	200
8.13	Maximum seismic moment (M_0) versus injected volume (V) for some reported cases of large-volume waste brine disposal and hydraulic-fracturing induced seismicity	202
9.1	Three types of radioactivity that originate in the nucleus of an atom; alpha, a particle with two protons and two neutrons, beta, a negatively charged particle that changes a neutron to a proton, and gamma an electromagnetic energy that originates from the nucleus (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.)	215
9.2	^{226}Ra and ^{228}Ra decay chains showing the primordial parent nuclides, ^{238}U and ^{232}Th . Adapted from Nelson et al. (2015) (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.)	217

- 9.3a Map of the continental United States with published NORM data for produced water. Note the wide range in values reported in (pCi/L) but also the lack of publicly available data for many oil and gas basins. Most data is sourced from the USGS PW database and Fisher 1998 (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.) 223
- 9.3b There are over 100,000 oil and gas wells with published Chloride (Cl) data available in the USGS PW database. Using the relationship between Cl and radium-226 described by Fisher (1998) for PW from Texas, an estimate of the radium 226 in other basins can be calculated (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.) 223
- 9.3c There are over 100,000 oil and gas wells with published TDS data available in the USGS PW database. Using the relationship between TDS and radium-226 described by Fisher (1998) for PW from Texas, an estimate of the radium 226 in other basins can be calculated (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.) 224
- 9.4 Top 10 states of oil and gas produced water volume generation (in barrels/year for 2012) (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.) 225
- 9.5 Produced water management for 2007 (based on Clark and Veil 2015) (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.) 226
- 9.6 Depiction of NORM management and disposal. Reprinted with permission from Center for Coal Field Justice (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.) 227
- 10.1 Simple major element mixing curves for the cases of mixing produced water from (a) hydraulically fractured Marcellus Shale gas wells and (b) Upper Devonian conventional wells with adjacent shallow ground water. The enrichment of each element relative to the uncontaminated ground water is plotted as a function of the mixing ratio. All data are from a site in Greene County, Pennsylvania, reported by Kolesar Kohl et al. (2014) 250
- 10.2 Ca/Sr vs. Ca/Mg of groundwater and conventional (Upper Devonian) and unconventional (Marcellus) produced water from a single site in Greene County, Pennsylvania. (a) The three data clusters define a linear trend. (b) Mixing curves between the groundwater and each of the produced water types. Labeled percentages on the curve are the % produced water needed to move the mixture to the indicated point on the curve. The limit of resolution is the approximate zone above which the two produced waters cannot be differentiated from each other in the mixture. Data are from Kolesar Kohl et al. (2014) 252
- 10.3 Strontium isotope mixing diagram for groundwater contamination with either Marcellus or Upper Devonian produced water for the Greene County, Pennsylvania site. The labeled percentages on the mixing lines indicate the % of each produced water needed to shift the mixture to the indicated point. Because the isotopic compositions of the two produced water sources fall

List of Figures

xv

- on opposite sides of that of the groundwater, the direction of mixing (black arrows) allows this method to effectively discriminate between sources. Data are from Kolesar Kohl et al. (2014) 253
- 10.4 Comparison of the sensitivity of individual element concentrations and Sr isotope ratios to mixing of groundwater with Upper Devonian and Marcellus produced water at the Greene County, Pennsylvania site. Major element concentrations in the groundwater increase significantly with contamination from either produced water source, and could be detectable with, for example, a TDS meter. The Sr isotope data provide information about which produced water source is the contaminant, even at very low levels of contamination (relative to measurement uncertainty). Data are from Kolesar Kohl et al. (2014) 254
- 10.5 Mixing diagram for hypothetical Appalachian Basin stream water contaminated by either Marcellus Shale produced water (values shown here for four different counties in Pennsylvania), Upper Devonian conventional well produced water (endmember values far off scale), or acid mine drainage from SW Pennsylvania. The numbers indicated on the mixing curves are the percent of contaminant added to the stream water. Note that even in this worst-case scenario where the stream isotope composition falls wholly within the Marcellus field, it is still possible to differentiate among contamination sources. Data are from Chapman et al. (2012) (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.) 256
- 10.6 Time series data for Sr concentrations and isotope compositions from hydraulically fractured Marcellus Shale gas wells from three locations in Greene County, southwestern Pennsylvania. Data are from Chapman et al. (2012) and Capo et al. (2014) 257
- 10.7 Range of $\delta^7\text{Li}$ values measured in oil and gas produced waters from throughout the world (modified from Pfister et al. 2017). Data are from Chan et al. (2002), Millot et al. (2011), Macpherson et al. (2014), Warner et al. (2014), Phan et al. (2016), and Pfister et al. (2017) 259
- 10.8 Li-Sr isotope mixing diagram for a freshwater source mixing with unconventional Marcellus Shale and conventional Upper Devonian produced water in the Appalachian Basin. The percentage values labeled on the curves indicate the amount of produced water contaminant added to the fresh water. The freshwater Sr endmember is the spring sample from Kolesar Kohl et al. (2014) and the Li endmember is the global average value for rivers. Produced water Sr data are from Chapman et al. (2012), Kolesar Kohl et al. (2014), and Capo et al. (2014), with corresponding Li data from Phan et al. (2016) 260
- 10.9 Barium isotope mixing diagram for river water (Ohio River, SW Pennsylvania) contaminated with produced water, using average values for Marcellus Shale and Upper Devonian produced waters. Individual data points represent samples collected throughout the Appalachian Basin. The values on the curves indicate the percentage of produced water mixed in to achieve the observed offset. Data are from Tieman et al. (2020) (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.) 263

- 11.1 Monthly average methane concentrations as measured at the Mauna Loa Observatory in Hawaii since 1983.
Source: www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/ccgg/trends_ch4/ 274
- 11.2 Carbon and hydrogen stable isotopic composition of methane collected from various sources in southern California. Solid symbols represent fossil-derived CH₄, and open symbols represent biological sources. Isotope ratios represent source signatures corrected for the presence of background air. (Townsend-Small et al. 2012) 275
- 11.3 Methane concentrations in air observed at Mount Wilson Observatory (a) as measured continuously with TLS (black dotted line) and in discrete samples with GC-FID (red points). Also shown is the approximate concentration of CH₄ in unpolluted air (1.82 ppm) as measured at Trinidad Head, California, by the NOAA flask sampling network. Shown are (b) $\delta^{13}\text{C}$, (c) δD , and (d) $\Delta^{14}\text{C}$ in discrete samples, shown with CH₄ concentrations measured by TLS. (Townsend-Small et al. 2012) 276
- 11.4 Keeling plots of 1/CH₄ concentration versus (a) $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CH}_4$ and (b) $\delta\text{D}\text{-CH}_4$. (Townsend-Small et al. 2012) 277
- 11.5 Keeling plots of $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^2\text{H}$ composition of CH₄ versus 1/CH₄ (ppm⁻¹) collected downwind of (a and b) oil and gas, (c and d) landfill, and (e and f) cattle sources in the Denver-Julesburg basin. Each point represents an individual sample. (Townsend-Small et al. 2016) 279
- 11.6 Keeling plots of $\delta^2\text{H}$ composition of CH₄ at three ground sites (a-c) in the Front Range. (d) $\delta^2\text{H}\text{-CH}_4$ for samples taken during aircraft flights within the Front Range. All flights shown are significant at $p < 0.05$. Flight tracks can be viewed using the following link: www-air.larc.nasa.gov/missions/discover-aq/kmz/FRAPPE_C130_2014_ALL_July26-August18.kmz. (Townsend-Small et al. 2016) 280
- 11.7 Carbon and hydrogen stable isotopic composition of methane from potential groundwater contamination sources, including agricultural and landfill sources as well as oil and gas sources. The isotopic composition of atmospheric methane is also shown. Theoretical range of values of methane sources shown in black and dotted lines from Whiticar (1999). Data are from Townsend-Small et al. (2016); Sherwood et al. (2017); Botner et al. (2018) (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.) 282
- 11.8 Time-series map of Ohio counties where sampling occurred. Red circles are active natural gas wells. Blue diamonds are sites where time series groundwater samples were taken, and light blue circles represent sites where single sample groundwater measurements were made. Groundwater sample locations are noted when samples were taken between the years noted in each map. There was a large increase in active natural gas wells from 2013 to 2014. (Botner et al. 2018) (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.) 283
- 11.9 Carbon stable isotopic composition of CH₄ versus CH₄ concentration in samples collected along the time series. Each symbol represents a different groundwater well. Also included are measurements of the $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ of CH₄ from

List of Figures

xvii

- a shale gas well (− 47.3‰) and a conventional gas well (− 41.3‰) in the study area for comparison. The radiocarbon content of CH₄ ($\Delta^{14}\text{C-CH}_4$) and radiocarbon age (in years bp) of four water samples is also shown. (Botner et al. 2018) 284
- 11.10 (a) Relationship of dissolved CH₄ concentration with distance from the nearest active shale gas well in groundwater wells sampled only once. (b) Carbon stable isotopic composition of CH₄ in the same samples. (Botner et al. 2018) 285
- 11.11 Carbon and hydrogen isotopic compositions of groundwater samples taken during this study, along with isotopic composition of several sources (value for background air is from Townsend-Small et al. (2016)). Also shown are approximate literature values for different endmembers of CH₄ sources from Whiticar (1999). Groundwater samples are shown in blue circles, for time series samples, and purple diamonds, for single samples, with shading corresponding to sample CH₄ concentration, with increasing shading corresponding to increasing concentration. (Botner et al. 2018) (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.) 286
- 12.1 (A) Global location of shale formations with assessed resource estimations (dark red) and those with resources yet to be estimated (light brown). Shale formations where microbiology investigations have been assessed are marked with yellow circles (adapted from Mouser et al. 2016), and the numbers refer to the following references (full details in reference list at the end of the chapter): [1] Zhong et al. 2019; [2] Strong et al. 2013; [3] Lipus et al. 2018; [4] Wang et al. 2017 [5] Struchtemeyer et al. 2011; [6] Davis et al. 2012; [7] Struchtemeyer and Elshahed 2012; [8] Santillan et al. 2015; [9] Fichter et al. 2012; [10] Schlegel et al. 2011; [11] Daly et al. 2016; [12] Booker et al. 2017; [13] Murali Mohan et al. 2013a; [14] Murali Mohan et al. 2013b [15] Cluff et al. 2014; [16] Akob et al. 2015; [17] Tucker et al. 2015; [18] Vikram et al. 2016; [19] Lipus et al. 2017b; [20] Nixon et al. 2019; [21] Wuchter et al. 2013; [22] Kirk et al. 2012; [23] Zhang et al. 2017. Base map modified from the US Energy Information Services Assessed Resources Basin Map, 2013 (public domain). (B) Number of microbiology studies conducted for each formation, where a survey of the population size, composition, or both, has been carried out (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.) 295
- 13.1 Chemistries of “Pre-drill” data reported to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection by oil and gas companies prior to hydraulic fracturing (likely all wells within 762 meters (2,500 feet) and others at the operator’s discretion (58 Pa. C. S. §§ 3218(c)) plotted in Br/SO₄ vs Ba/Cl ratio space (Brantley et al. 2014). Pre-drill groundwater water samples are shown as grey symbols and surface water samples as black symbols. Lines show areas where various end members are expected to plot (see Brantley et al. (2014)). Ellipsis surrounding the clusters (areas) of different sources of contamination and ground and surface water samples were done using the 2D Confidence Ellipse application in OriginPro software (OriginLab, Northampton, Massachusetts) 320

- 13.2 Chemistries of “Pre-drill” data reported to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection by oil and gas companies prior to hydraulic fracturing (likely all wells within 762 meters (2,500 feet) and others at the operator’s discretion (58 Pa. C. S. §§ 3218(c)) plotted in Ca/Mg vs Ca/Sr ratio space (Tisherman and Bain 2019). Pre-drill groundwater water samples are shown as grey stars and surface water samples as black stars. Ellipsis surrounding the clusters (areas) of different sources of contamination and ground and surface water samples were done using the 2D Confidence Ellipse application in OriginPro software (OriginLab, Northampton, Massachusetts) 321
- 13.3 Chemistries of “Pre-drill” data reported to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection by oil and gas companies prior to hydraulic fracturing (likely all wells within 762 meters (2,500 feet) and others at the operator’s discretion (58 Pa. C. S. §§ 3218(c)) plotted in List of Br/SO₄ vs Mg/Li ratio space (Cantlay et al. 2020b). Pre-drill groundwater water samples are shown as grey stars and surface water samples as black stars. Ellipses show areas where various end members plot as summarized and reported in Cantlay et al. (2020b). Only Bradford County data could be plotted here owing to limited Br and Li data 322
- 13.4 Chemistries of “Pre-drill” data reported to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection by oil and gas companies prior to hydraulic fracturing (likely all wells within 762 meters (2,500 feet) and others at the operator’s discretion (58 Pa. C. S. §§ 3218(c)) plotted in SO₄/Cl vs Mg/Li ratio space (Cantlay et al. 2020b). Pre-drill groundwater water samples are shown as grey stars and surface water samples as black stars. Ellipses show areas where various end members plot as summarized and reported in Cantlay et al. (2020a, 2020b, 2020c). Only Bradford County data could be plotted here owing to limited data for Li 323
- 13.5 Chemistries of “Pre-drill” data reported to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection by oil and gas companies prior to hydraulic fracturing (likely all wells within 762 meters (2,500 feet) and others at the operator’s discretion (58 Pa. C. S. §§ 3218(c)) plotted in Mg/Na vs SO₄/Cl ratio space (Cantlay et al. 2020b). Pre-drill groundwater water samples are shown as grey stars and surface water samples as black stars. Ellipses show areas where various end members plot as summarized and reported in Cantlay et al. (2020a, 2020b, 2020c) 324
- 13.6 PADEP pre-drill data plotted in the Ca/Mg vs Ca/Sr ratio space (Tisherman and Bain 2019) for the three counties (Bradford, Lycoming, and Mercer) with available data. Important differences to note: Bradford County groundwaters plot densely even in ratio space areas characteristic of unconventional brines. Some Lycoming County groundwaters plot in those mixing regions, but the majority of the data are >100 Ca:Sr, or typical of waters not impacted by O&G activities. In Mercer County, almost all these data plot in the “unimpacted portion of the ratio space” 325
- 13.7 PADEP pre-drill data plotted in the Mg/Na vs SO₄/Cl ratio space (Cantlay et al. 2020b) for the two counties (Bradford and Lycoming) with available data. Note the strong excursion toward lower Mg/Na ratios in the Bradford County data relative to Lycoming County 326

<i>List of Figures</i>		xix
13.8	Map of Pennsylvania Counties discussed in this chapter	328
13.9	Groundwater chemistry data from the Bradford (Williams et al. 1998), Lycoming (Lloyd, Jr. and Carswell 1981), and Greene (Stoner 1987) county groundwater reports plotted in the a) Ca/Mg vs Ca/Sr and b) Mg/Na vs SO ₄ /Cl ratio spaces. All these chemistries were measured long before unconventional extraction activities began. There were insufficient Br and Li data in these reports to evaluate the other ratio spaces	329
13.10	Data collected from Tenmile Creek (Greene County, PA) between 2010 and 2012. Individual samples collected through time are shown with start and end dates and arrows indicating direction for the (a) Ca/Mg vs Ca/Sr, (b) Mg/Na vs SO ₄ /Cl, and (c) SO ₄ /Cl vs Mg/Li ratio spaces. Note, these plots show a small portion of the spaces shown in the rest of the chapter, blown up to allow visualization of the water chemistry evolution	331
13.11	Surface water chemistry evolution in New York/Pennsylvania in streams influenced by road salting and salt springs. Stream water chemistry as reported in Johnson et al. (2015) for Silver Creek (reference conditions), Apalachin-D (road salt), Fall Brook (salt spring), and Wilkes (salt spring). Begin and end dates are shown, and arrows indicate direction of movement	334
14.1	Tenmile Creek basin with candidate small watershed-pairs indicated with hatching. Shading indicates the density of Marcellus wells (SPUDs/km ²) in the basin and circles indicate existing permits granted as of 2009. Triangles and squares indicate sites previously sampled by Kimmel and Argent (2010, 2012) for fish and macroinvertebrates. The selected Bates Fork and Fonner Run stream-pair is delineated inside the box. Figure by Dan Bain with permission (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.)	343
14.2	Genetic diversity (average observed and expected heterozygosity, effective number of alleles, and allelic richness) of fantail darter (<i>Etheostoma flabellare</i>) and Johnny darter (<i>E. nigrum</i>) populations in Fonner Run and Bates Fork	353
15.1	Forest cover (green) overlaying Marcellus (blue) and Utica (red) shale plays with wells drilled in PA as of 2019 (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.)	364
15.2	Combined abundance of 13 forest interior specialists based on abundance data from the second breeding bird atlas (Shen 2015, top figure). Abundance is greatest in dark red blocks. Bottom shows the blocks which support the greatest abundance of forest interior specialists above the Marcellus shale layer (A black and white version of this figure will appear in some formats. For the colour version, refer to the plate section.)	372
16.1	Timeline of significant events relating to total dissolved solids in the Upper Ohio River Basin from 2008 to present	388
16.2	TDS concentrations for all Monongahela River mainstem sampling locations (river miles 11, 23, 61, 82, 89, and 102) and discharge (cfs) at USGS gage 03072655 at river mile 82 near Masontown, PA, from 2009 through 2021.	

	The vertical dotted lines represent: long dash = initiation of the discharge management plan in January 2010; medium dash = Pennsylvania restricted flowback water at Public Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) in May 2011; short dash = CONSOL Energy's reverse osmosis plant went online in May 2013	390
16.3	Sulfate concentrations for all Monongahela River mainstem sampling locations (river miles 11, 23, 61, 82, 89, and 102) and discharge (cfs) at USGS gage 03072655 at river mile 82 near Masontown, PA, from 2009 through 2021. The vertical dotted lines represent: long dash = initiation of the discharge management plan in January 2010; medium dash = Pennsylvania restricted flowback water at Public Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) in May 2011; short dash = CONSOL Energy's reverse osmosis plant went online in May 2013	391
16.4	The Three Rivers QUEST coverage of the Upper Ohio River Basin covering parts of Maryland, Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia	392
16.5	A complete diagram of all sites and the relative inputs related to each site. The Allegheny and the Monongahela converge within the city of Pittsburgh, PA, to form the Ohio River	393
16.6	3RQ sampling sites within the Monongahela River Basin	396
16.7	3RQ sampling sites within the Allegheny River Basin	397
16.8	3RQ sampling sites within the Ohio River Basin	398
16.9	The average chloride (Cl) to sulfate (SO ₄) ratios in mmol/L between July 2009 and March 2021 in the Monongahela River Basin	399
16.10	Total dissolved solids and flow for the mainstem sampling stations; dots represent TDS (mg/L), solid line represents flow (cfs). (A) Monongahela River from 2009 to 2021 (M11, M23, M61, M82, M89, M102), (B) Allegheny River (A6, A30, A45, A83) from 2013 to 2021, (C) Ohio River from 2013 to 2020 (O12 and O85)	400
16.11	Compilation of TDS _{sd} (mg/L) and flow (cfs) correlation for (A) Monongahela River mainstem sampling locations (M11, M23, M61, M82, M89, M102) from 2009 to 2021, (B) Allegheny River mainstem sampling locations (A6, A30, A45, A83) from 2013 to 2021, (C) Ohio River mainstem sampling locations (O12 and O85) from 2013 to 2020	401
16.12	Compilation of sulfate (mg/L) and flow (cfs) correlation for (A) Monongahela River mainstem sampling locations (M11, M23, M61, M82, M89, M102) from 2009 to 2021, (B) Allegheny River from mainstem sampling locations (A6, A30, A45, A83) from 2013 to 2021, (C) Ohio River mainstem sampling locations (O12 and O85) from 2013 to 2020	403

Tables

1.1 Global distribution of tight oil and gas reserves and the current status of development (US EIA 2015a)	<i>page</i> 4
2.1 Shale plays in the United States	21
2.2 Upstream, midstream, and downstream processes and products	24
3.1 Percentage splits of gas consumption by sector (not including UAFG) in 2018 (AEMO 2019)	46
3.2 Inquiries and status of moratorium on UG industry in Australia	56
3.3 Data gaps in PM2.5 monitoring program	66
5.1 Hazard Ratio (HR) of VOC measured downwind of two high emitters in Denver-Julesburg basin. Bold values indicate HR > 1	122
6.1 Top-down estimates for upstream emissions of methane from natural gas systems, including studies based on aircraft flyovers and satellite remote-sensing data. Estimates are the percentage of the methane in natural gas that is produced	135
6.2 Shale gas production and upstream methane emissions from various major shale gas producing fields in 2015	136
11.1 Properties of C and H isotopes and IAEA standards	273
12.1 A summary of key microbiology studies carried out on shale gas wells in formations in the USA, Canada, and China, including information on formation age, well depths, sample types and age since hydraulic fracturing, maximum salinity, and dominant microorganisms. Locations of formations are given in Figure 12.1	296
13.1 Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection Pre-Drill prefixes inferred from Shale Network HIS source description and used in this analysis	318
13.2 Counts of all data points (i.e., individual measurement of an individual constituent) per county or region (SWPA, NE-non-brad, NWPA are regions designated in the Shale Network HIS)	324
13.3 Bromide detection limits reported in shale network PADEP pre-drill data	334
14.1 Summary of fish survey data from Bates Fork and Fonner Run across five sample dates with IBI scores and designations for both the Ohio Headwater IBI (Ohio EPA 1987) and Monongahela IBI (Kimmel and Argent 2007) and Tolerance Indicator Values for chloride (Meador and Carlisle 2007)	348

14.2	Microsatellite markers tested in fantail and Johnny darters for inclusion in the study. Markers used in this study for a given species are marked “Y,” while those that failed to amplify in more than 33% of individuals were not included in the analysis	351
14.3	Locus-specific and overall genetic characteristics of fantail darter populations in Fonner Run and Bates Fork. Observed (H_o) and expected (H_e) heterozygosity, alleles per locus (A), allelic richness (A_r), effective number of alleles per locus (A_e), and genetic differentiation between populations (F_{st})	352
14.4	Locus-specific and overall genetic characteristics of Johnny darter populations in Fonner Run and Bates Fork. Observed (H_o) and expected (H_e) heterozygosity, alleles per locus (A), allelic richness (A_r), effective number of alleles per locus (A_e), and genetic differentiation between populations (F_{st})	352
14.5	Number of Two-lined Salamanders (<i>Eurycea bislineata</i>) captured at Bates Fork and Fonner Run on seven surveys of three quadrats at each stream. In each cell, the first number indicates Bates Fork and the second number indicates values at Fonner Run. See Pascuzzi 2012 for quadrat GPS coordinates	354
16.1	Example of the Monongahela River Basin TDS model output for dry (left) and wet (right) periods	387
16.2	Site code and site descriptions by river basin	394

Contributors

Moses A. Ajemigitse, AquaBlok Ltd, Swanton, Ohio

Daniel J. Bain, Geology and Environmental Science, University of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Margaret C. Brittingham, Department of Ecosystem Science and Management, Penn State University

Tetiana Cantlay, Department of Biological Sciences, and the Center for Environmental Research and Education, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Rosemary C. Capo, Geology and Environmental Science, University of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Elizabeth Dakin, Department of Biological Sciences, and the Center for Environmental Research and Education, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Shay Dougall, Molliwell, Brisbane, Queensland

Patrick J. Drohan, Department of Ecosystem Science and Management, Penn State University, Pennsylvania

David W. Eaton, Department of Geoscience, University of Calgary, Alberta

John D. Graham, Paul H. O'Neill School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Indiana University

W. Michael Griffin, Engineering and Public Policy, Carnegie Mellon University, Pennsylvania

Robert W. Howarth, Ecology and Environmental Biology, Corson Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY

Joseph Kingsbury, Water Resources Institute, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV

Xiang Li, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Diamond Bar, CA

Geralyn McCarron, Fellow of the Australian College of General Practitioners, Castle Hill Medical Centre, Murrumba Downs, Queensland

Bonnie McDevitt, U.S. Geological Survey, Reston, VA

Sophie L. Nixon, Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Manchester Institute of Biotechnology, The University of Manchester, Manchester, UK

Melissa O'Neal, Water Resources Institute, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV

Katharina Pankratz, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Penn State University, University Park, PA

Rachel Pell, Water Resources Institute, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV

Brady Porter, Department of Biological Sciences, and the Center for Environmental Research and Education, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, PA

Albert A. Presto, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA

John A. Rupp, Indiana University, Paul H. O'Neill School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Bloomington, IN

Brian W. Stewart, Geology and Environmental Science, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA

John F. Stolz, Department of Biological Sciences, and the Center for Environmental Research and Education, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, PA

Rebecca Tisherman, Geology and Environmental Science, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA

Amy Townsend-Small, Department of Geology and Geography, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH

Jeanne M. VanBriesen, Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering and Department of Engineering and Public Policy, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA

Tamara Vandivort, Water Resources Institute, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV

List of Contributors

xxv

Nathaniel R. Warner, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Penn State University, University Park, PA

Jessica M. Wilson, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Manhattan College, Riverdale, NY

Sarah Woodley, Department of Biological Sciences, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, PA

Cassandra Ziegler, Center for Environmental Research and Education, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, PA

Paul Ziemkiewicz, Water Resources Institute, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV

Preface

The combination of directional (e.g., horizontal) drilling and hydraulic fracturing (“fracking”) has revolutionized oil and gas exploration, especially in the last two decades. They have been applied to conventional reserves, allowing for greater recovery, and for the development of “tight” deposits, primarily shales, releasing previously untapped reserves. The Energy Information Administration (EIA) has estimated that globally, shale gas reserves may contain 7,577 Tcf (trillion cubic feet) and shale oil reserves may contain 419 billion bbl (barrels). Unconventional shale extraction has reached commercial-level production in the United States and Canada, while increasing development is happening in China and Argentina. Australia has been developing its coal bed methane deposits, especially in Queensland, and there has been exploratory drilling in England (Bowland Basin), Germany (Niedersachsen), and Poland. At the same time Scotland, France, and parts of Australia have a moratorium or outright ban on the process. While many celebrate the potential economic benefits, concerns about environmental impacts that include water contamination, air quality degradation, habitat fragmentation, and the continued contribution to climate change have been raised. The “slick water” stimulation and “fracking” rely on a complicated mix of chemicals and “proppant” (fine grained silica sand), while the shales themselves contain salt brines (e.g., sodium, chloride, bromide), distinct trace element content (e.g., barium, strontium), and heavy metals including naturally occurring radioactive materials (NORMs). The extraction and distribution operations depend on complex infrastructure such as compressor stations, cryogenic processing plants, and an extensive network of pipelines for water and gas (e.g., gathering lines, transmission lines). Solid and liquid waste disposal has also presented challenges, with some solutions resulting in unexpected adverse consequences such as the generation of trihalomethanes in municipal water and radium (^{226}Ra) contamination as a result of road brining. Climate change has also put the focus on the global impacts of continued extraction and use of fossil fuels, with many nations signing the Paris Climate Agreement of 2016, promising significant carbon dioxide emissions reductions.

Despite the global expansion of unconventional oil and gas exploration, the literature has been scrambling to keep pace. There are numerous popular books providing some of the history behind it, personal stories, and even fiction. There are also a number of industry-published books that delve into the technical aspects such as proppant and fluid

characterization. We realized there was a need and interest in a volume that addressed the environmental impacts. The impetus for this book initially came out of a two-day conference held at Duquesne University in November 2013 (“Facing the Challenges: research on shale gas extraction symposium”). There were twenty-two scholarly presentations covering a broad range of topics, the majority of which dealt with the environmental impacts. While a few of these presentations were published as a special issue of the journal *Environmental Science and Health, Part A* (2015, volume 50, issue 5), the symposium provided a framework for a comprehensive compendium and a potential list of contributors. We also reached out to other colleagues working in the field, especially several outside the United States to include contributions from Europe, Canada, and Australia. The Marcellus and Utica Shales of the Appalachian Basin have been, in many respects, the testing grounds for unconventional shale development in other parts of the country and the world. The authors we have solicited chapters from are known for their pioneering work. In the end we compiled 16 contributions. The book is divided into three sections: Overview, Environmental Analysis, and Case Studies. The Overview comprises four chapters. Chapter 1 provides an overview of the global unconventional oil and gas reserves and the status of their development at the time of this publication. Chapter 2 is an introduction to the development of unconventional oil and gas reserves based primarily on experience with the Appalachian Basin. Chapter 3 covers developments in Australia, where both gas shales and coal bed methane deposits are being tapped. Chapter 4 looks at the trends and challenges in governance, addressing issues related to mineral rights ownership, royalties, and regulations. The Environmental Analysis section, the bulk of the book, comprises nine chapters. Chapter 5 covers air quality issues. Chapter 6 tackles fugitive methane and its impact on climate change and lifecycle assessment. Chapter 7 provides a comprehensive look at water usage and management. Induced seismicity, as a result of hydraulic stimulation and waste injection facilities, is addressed in Chapter 8. Both drill cuttings and produced water from shales are known to contain naturally occurring radioactive materials (NORMs), a subject covered in Chapter 9. The next two chapters focus on the use of isotopes as tracers to identify sources, namely metal isotopes (Chapter 10) and methane isotopes (Chapter 11). The last chapter in this section discusses the microbiology (Chapter 12). The last section, Case Studies, provides assessments from a more holistic approach. The first chapter in this section evaluates water chemistry using mass ratio analyses to identify potential sources of contamination (Chapter 13). The second is a baseline study of a paired stream system in southwestern Pennsylvania, which was completed early on in the development of the Marcellus shale (Chapter 14). The next chapter (Chapter 15) addresses the effects of shale gas development on forest landscapes and ecosystems. The final chapter reports on the activities of the Three Rivers Quest Project, a consortium of several regional universities that have been monitoring the water quality of the three rivers of the Ohio River Basin (Allegheny, Monongahela, Ohio) for the last decade (Chapter 16).

In putting together this volume our goal was to present a broad picture of the development of unconventional oil and gas shales. Without this background it will be difficult to address the challenges, especially considering the legacy of environmental impacts from

Preface

xxix

conventional oil and gas extraction. It is our hope that this book will be accessible to a wide audience of readers, from industry to academics, as well as laypersons interested in the subject matter. The authors would like to thank all the contributors, as well as the Colcom Foundation and Heinz Endowments for support over the years. A special thanks to Robert Donnan for his amazing photographs, and to Dr. David Kahler whose assistance with the formatting of the equation-heavy chapters was greatly appreciated.