

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

April 30, 2012

Review of DRAFT: Investigation of Ground Water Contamination near Pavillion Wyoming

Prepared by the Environmental Protection Agency, Ada OK

Prepared by: Tom Myers, Ph.D.

Hydrologic Consultant

Reno NV

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

After consideration of the evidence presented in the EPA report and in URS (2009 and 2010), it is clear that hydraulic fracturing (fracking (Kramer 2011)) has caused pollution of the Wind River formation and aquifer. The EPA documents that pollution with up to four sample events in the domestic water wells and two sample events in two monitoring well constructed by the EPA between the level of the domestic water wells and the gas production zone. The EPA's conclusion is sound.

Three factors combine to make Pavillion-area aquifers especially vulnerable to vertical contaminant transport from the gas production zone or the gas wells – the geology, the well design, and the well construction. Natural flow barriers are not prevalent in this area, so there are likely many pathways for gas and contaminants to move to the surface, regardless of the source. There is also a vertical gradient, evidenced by flowing water wells, although its magnitude and extend are undefined, to drive advective vertical transport. The entire formation is considered an underground source of drinking water, but 169 gas wells have been constructed into it; this is fracking fluid injection directly into an underground source of drinking water.

The well design is poor because the surface casing does not extend below the level of the water wells, as is required in many other states, and because the wells contain substantial borehole lengths without surface casing or cement between the production casing and the edge of the borehole. This allows vertical transport of gas and fluids and decreases the protection against leakage during fracking or gas production. Third, the EPA documented many instances of sporadic bonding, which simply means the cement does not completely seal the annulus between the production casing and the edge of the borehole. This provides pathways which could allow gas and contaminant transport along the well bore.

The EPA also appropriately accounted for the potential that their monitoring well construction could have explained the contamination. "Since inorganic and organic concentration patterns measured in the drilling additives do not match patterns observed in the deep monitoring wells and because large volumes of ground water were extracted from the wells during development and prior to sampling, it is unlikely that ground-water chemistry was at all impacted by drilling additives."(EPA, 2011, p 7).

The EPA also demonstrated that the inorganic geochemistry in the monitoring wells is substantially different than that which would occur naturally in the area, and that the enrichment of numerous constituents is most likely due to the interaction of fracking fluid with the groundwater near the sampled well. This is particularly true for the elevated levels of potassium, chloride, and pH.

Any of the three contaminant transport pathways suggested by the EPA could be responsible for the contamination moving from the fracking zone to the drinking water wells. The EPA has also presented evidence that contamination in surface ponds has not caused the contamination in the water wells or their monitoring wells.

The situation at Pavillion is not an analogue for other gas plays because the geology and regulatory framework may be different. The vertical distance between water wells and fracking wells is much less at Pavillion than in other areas, so the transport time through the pathways may also be low compared to other gas plays. It is important, however, to consider that the pathways identified at Pavillion could be applicable elsewhere (Myers, 2012; Osborn et al, 2011). In addition to improving and enforcing the relevant regulations, monitoring the pathways between the target formation and aquifers should be standard at all gas plays with fracking.

The following recommendations would improve the analysis and continue the study into the future made throughout this review.

1. The EPA should continue data collection to better verify the sources and map the potential contaminant plumes.
2. EPA should map the gas production wells according to their construction date. The EPA should also compare the locations of observed contamination with the nearby well construction dates to estimate the travel times from the sources to the well receptors.
3. The EPA should map the depth to water prior to sampling in the water wells. Using this, they should map vertical gradients and correlate these gradients to areas with contaminants most likely sourced to deep aquifers.
4. The EPA should install deeper monitoring wells near the shallow pits to better map the depth of the plume emanating from those pits.
5. Data collection should continue so the results can be replicated. An additional, deeper monitoring well should be constructed in the gas production zone between the existing monitoring wells to determine the vertical gradient and estimate the rate of vertical flow.
6. The EPA presents no evidence regarding the extent that fracturing extends above targeted formations. It may not be possible to prove whether this occurred at this site, but the EPA should at least discuss the possibility. It would be useful to perform some simple testing to map the extent of fractures, as described by Fisher and Warpinski (2010).

INTRODUCTION

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has released a study of groundwater contamination in the Pavillion gas play in west-central Wyoming. Their preliminary conclusion is that gas well development and hydraulic fracturing (fracking (Kramer, 2011)) has caused the contamination. The EPA report is in draft form and is open for comment until March 12, 2012. This technical memorandum reviews the EPA report. This review was prepared with support from the Natural Resources Defense Council, Wyoming Outdoor Council, Earthworks, Oil and Gas Accountability Project and Sierra Club.

This review discusses in detail the appropriateness of the study design, methodology, execution, results, and interpretation and the reasonableness of the conclusions. It specifically follows and considers the EPA's "lines of reasoning" approach used to reach its conclusion.

STUDY AREA

The study area is in the Pavillion gas field in west-central Wyoming. It lies northeast of the Wind River Range. The general geology for uppermost 1000 meters (m) is the Eocene-aged ((56 to 34 million years before present) Wind River Formation, which is interbedded sandstone and shale with coarse-grained meandering stream channel deposits. The presence of stream channel deposits indicates that the formation has been carved by river beds which left fluvial deposits interspersed among formation layers. These fluvial deposits often provide connectivity among formation layers and can fragment otherwise continuous sedimentary layers.

The area has experienced gas development since the 1960s, with 169 gas wells constructed in the study area. EPA Figure 2 shows the gas well construction chronology. There were three main periods of construction – 1963-65, 1975-83, and 1998 – 2006, with each subsequent period having more new wells constructed than the previous period. EPA does not specify when fracking first occurred, however.

Recommendation: Add a map of gas production wells coded for the year or time period during which the well was completed (or fracking occurred if substantially different). This would allow an assessment of travel time for contaminants to flow from production zones to the monitoring wells and domestic wells.

The US Geological Survey studied the water resources on the Wind River Reservation (Daddow 1996), which surround this study area (but does not include it). The Wind River Formation is the primary source of drinking water on the reservation. Daddow's (1996) description of the formation indicates that the formation consists of interbedded shale and sandstone with extremely variable permeability that could lead to highly variable contaminant loads throughout the formation (Osiensky et al 1984).

Recommendation: A more detailed description of the geology and hydrogeology of the area, perhaps based on the relevant Geological Survey reports would provide more insight regarding geochemical trends as found by the USGS.

STUDY LAYOUT AND DESIGN

EPA started this study in response to citizen complaints regarding contamination in their water wells. EPA established dedicated monitoring wells after two rounds of sampling various water wells rather than prior to construction of the gas wells. For much of their study data, the EPA had to use sample data collected from existing water wells. Water wells are not the best tool for monitoring groundwater quality because, even if the well construction is of similar quality to a dedicated monitoring well, water wells have much longer screens, or open intervals, than do monitoring wells. They screen the most productive formation layers, usually based on observations made during drilling, to maximize the pumping rate while minimizing the drawdown. Wells drilled specifically for monitoring wells also screen productive zones, but target the screen to a specific zone, usually 20 feet or less thick, so that the sample represents a given aquifer level.

Samples from water wells are therefore a mixture of water from all productive zones of the entire open interval, weighted according to the transmissivity of each zone. A domestic water well sample is useful for determining whether a contaminant exists at some point in the aquifer, but a dedicated monitoring well is necessary to determine which layer is contaminated.

EPA established two dedicated monitoring wells to supplement the data obtained from the water wells. The new monitoring wells were primarily screened below the level of the water wells (Figure 1) and above the gas production wells to “differentiate potential deep (e.g., gas production related) versus shallow (e.g., pits) sources of groundwater contamination” (EPA p 5). The EPA established just two monitoring wells due to a limited budget (Id.). EPA placed the monitoring wells’ screened interval along the conceptualized vertical pathway between the potential contaminant source (i.e. the production wells and/or zone) and the water wells. The monitoring wells were designed appropriately to detect and monitor contaminant movement upward from the production zone to the water wells; if the monitoring wells had been constructed at the same depth as the water wells, they would not have added substantial useful information.

Figure 1 (EPA Figure 3) shows that domestic water wells in the regions are screened at all levels down to about 250 m, or more than 800 feet, with half of the wells being deeper than 300 feet, similar to the depths found by Daddow (1996) in other areas of the aquifer. However, the EPA states the information source was from the State Engineer *and* homeowner interviews (EPA p 2). It is unclear whether both were used for each well. It is my experience that homeowners have a poor concept of the depth of their well unless they have paperwork that documents it.

Recommendation: The EPA should provide more information about the source of its water well construction data, showing it in EPA Table A1.

The following table summarizes in general terms the wells that were sampled during each sampling phase (other media were also sampled but not included in this table). It is apparent that the wells sampled in phases subsequent to the first phase depended in part on the results of the prior phases.

Phase	Date	Domestic and Stock Wells	Municipal Wells	Stock Wells	Monitoring Wells	Comments
I	3/09	35	2	0	0	
II	1/10	17 (10 previously sampled)	2	4	0	This phase came about because EPA had detected methane and dissolved hydrocarbons during Phase I.
III	10/10	3 (2 previously sampled)	0	0	2	Gas samples also collected from the well casing of EPA's two deep monitoring wells.
IV	4/11	8 previously sampled	0	3 previously sampled	2	Added glycols, alcohols, low molecular weight acids




Figure 1: Snapshot from EPA (2011) Figure 3 showing frequency of depth for gas wells (top), surface casing for gas wells, and base of domestic wells.

EPA Table A1 lists the wells and the phase during which they were sampled, broken into eight data types.

1. anions and alkalinity
2. metals
3. alcohols and VOCs
4. low molecular weight acids and glycols
5. semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs), pesticides, PCBs, and tentatively identified compounds (TICs);

6. gas/diesel related compounds, and hydrocarbons
7. bacteria
8. fixed gases, heavy hydrocarbons, dissolved carbon, and gas and water isotopic ratios

EPA Table A2a presents the geochemical results – anions, cations, and alkalinity. Unfortunately, this table does not consistently state in which phase the initial sample was taken. Additional samples are identified with a suffix on the sample number. The other data tables in Appendix A provide results by phase, but some results are found only in other reports, including URS (2009 and 2010).

URS (2009) reports the Phase 1 sampling (water wells only) in their Table 9, which shows concentration of SVOC contaminants, including caprolactam at 1.4 ug/l at PGDW20, dimethylphthalate detected at nine wells, and Bis (2-ethylhexyl)phthata at 9.8, 6.4 and 12 ug/l in PGDW25, -20 and -14¹, respectively, and detect levels at ten other wells. Total purgeable hydrocarbons were 26 and 25 ug/l in wells PGDW05 and PGDW30, respectively. Measurable methane concentrations were found in 8 wells. Total purgeable organics are generally gasoline and diesel range organics. PGDW25 is one of the deeper wells at 243.8 m below ground surface (bgs) and PGDW05 and -30 are at 64.0 and 79.2 m bgs, respectively. URS (2010) reports the Phase 2 sampling in more detail. It shows more than 20 wells with detectable levels of a variety of semi-volatile organics (URS 2010, Table 9). The report does not assess these detects with the depth of the well, but a quick glance suggests that most of them are on the deeper half of the domestic wells. An exception is PGDW39, reported to be just 6.1 m deep, although the EPA should consider whether “6.1” is correct because if so it would be tens of meters shallower than any other water well in the aquifer.

Recommendation: The EPA should present and discuss the correlation of contaminant detects in the domestic wells with depth.

EPA based this study on four sample events including various subsets of domestic, municipal, and stock wells and two sample events in the monitoring wells. A reasonable question is whether the number of samples is sufficient for developing an opinion? A time series would help to identify a trend, but is not necessary to establish presence/absence. Objections to this data on the basis of there being just two samples are without merit – simple presence of a substance that would not naturally occur in the aquifer, if other causes can be eliminated, is sufficient to reach a preliminary conclusion that fracking fluid has affected the aquifer. However, the EPA should continue the sampling to determine whether the concentrations are trending higher, or not, and determine how or whether the plume expands.

TRANSPORT PATHWAYS

The EPA identifies three potential pathways for contaminants to reach the water wells from the fracking (EPA, p 32).

- Fluid and gas movement up compromised gas wells.

¹ The table did not highlight the values at PGDW14 and -20 as being exceedences.

- Fluid excursion from thin discontinuous tight sandstone units into sandstone units of greater permeability.
- Out-of-formation fracking, whereby new fractures are created or existing fractures are enlarged above the target formation, increasing the connectivity of the fracture system.

The EPA does not conclude which or whether any of these pathways actually facilitated the contamination at Pavillion, although arguments throughout the document (and reviewed in this report) support the potential for any of them. EPA correctly notes that for all three pathways there would be a correlation between the concentration of gas in the water wells and the proximity to gas well, as found by Osborn et al (2011) in the Marcellus shale in Pennsylvania. They also note that for all three pathways, “advective/dispersive transport would be accompanied by degradation causing a vertical chemical gradient” (EPA, p 32) as discussed in other portions of the report. In other words, with increasing distance from the source, both vertical and horizontal, the contaminant concentration would decrease. This would be due in part to chemical degradation, dispersion of a finite mass over a larger volume, attenuation due to chemicals adsorbing to soil particles, and dilution by mixing with groundwater..

The following sections consider evidence from various aspects of the EPA report in context of the pathways.

Lithologic Barriers

Very low permeability layers can prevent or impede the upward movement of fluid or gas from depth to the water well zone, which in the Wind River Formation is the upper 250 meters (based on the reported water well depth). Extensive layers of shale are often sources of gas and/or capstones, which prevent gas in underlying sandstone from escaping to the surface. However, the shale must be horizontally extensive and not fractured to be an effective seal, which is not the situation in the Pavillion field as quoted above. The formation is most productive (for gas) at its base with gas trapping occurring in “localized stratigraphic sandstone pinchouts on the crest and along flanks of a broad dome” (EPA p 2).

Hypothesis: The lithology in the Pavillion area does not prevent the vertical movement of gas or contaminants to the surface because it is either not sufficiently extensive or impervious. EPA claims there is no “lithologic barrier ... to stop upward vertical migration” (EPA p viii) and also that “there is little lateral and vertical continuity of hydraulically fractured tight sandstones” (Id.).

Evidence: EPA presented a lithologic cross-section (Figure 20) showing mapped shale layers, production, water, and monitoring wells and the points where the production wells had been fracked. EPA found that the lithology is “highly variable and difficult to correlate from borehole to borehole” (EPA p 15). “Sandstone and shale layers appeared thin and of limited lateral extent” (Id.). Pathways could go around the intermittent shale so that contaminants in a given monitoring well may not result from the nearest production well. Pathways for movement through sandstone could be tortuous (EPA p 37); vertical pathways through sandstone could be more tortuous than horizontal pathways because the particles in sandstone tend to be elongated with the longer side being horizontal.

Fracking has occurred for up to 45 years, so there is potential for many pathways from various sources to a receptor well. The travel time to a given point could be any time period up to 45 years. Additionally, out-of-formation fracking occurring at any time could have shortened the pathway.

Conclusion: The lithology in most areas would not prevent the vertical movement of contaminants to the water wells because of the lateral variation.

Vertical flow and gradient

In order for contaminants to move from the fracked zones or from deep well bores to surface aquifers, there should be a vertical hydraulic gradient. Lacking such a gradient, movement could still be possible due to lateral dispersion and upward concentration gradients, but it would be much slower.

Hypothesis: There is upward flow in the Pavillion gas field that would support advection of contaminants associated with fracking fluids to the monitoring and water wells.

Evidence: In the Pavillion area, there are flowing wells, which would indicate an upward gradient, at least at depth, which could drive vertical advection, or contaminant transport with the groundwater flow. Daddow (1996) also documented flowing wells in other areas of the Wind River Range, with the depth range from 225 to 450 feet bgs. EPA uses PGDW44 as an example (p 36). This water well lies near the middle of the field near MW01. MW01 showed a depth to water equal to 61.2 m at the beginning of a purge for sampling (p 11 and Figure 8). MW02 had depth to water of 80.5 m (p 12). The depth to water in the monitoring wells does not support the idea of an upward gradient, but being the only wells at that depth, the data is not conclusive. Table A1 reports the PGDW44 well depth is 228.6 m; PGDW25 is deeper, at 243.8 m bgs. MW01 is just 10 m deeper. There is apparently an upward gradient at that point because the well is flowing, but the analysis could be improved, as follows.

EPA documents that the shallower monitoring well has more natural breakdown products of the organic contaminant like BTEX or glycol that are found in the deeper monitoring well and in fracking fluids (p 36). It suggests that the contaminants in the shallow well are derived from the natural breakdown of the contaminants found in the deeper well. This could only occur if the wells represent a vertical flow path, which they do and therefore these findings support the hypothesis of upward movement.

The gas found in the deep Wind River Formation is chemically similar to gas in the underlying Fort Union Formation suggesting that gas in the Wind River Formation has naturally moved upward until captured in localized capstones, or “localized stratigraphic sandstone pinchouts” (EPA, p 2). EPA concludes that differences in gas composition and isotopes support the hypothesis of upward migration through the various layers in the Wind River formation (p 29). The fraction of ethane and propane in the gas from domestic wells is mostly less than in the produced gas, but the isotopic composition is clearly thermogenic, which suggest there is an ongoing “preferential loss of ethane and propane relative to methane” (p 29, 38). This evidence supports the hypothesis of upward fluid and gas movement.

Vertical movement could occur in the absence of a vertical gradient, if the pressurization caused by the fracking is sufficient and there is a poorly developed well bore nearby. Contaminants can migrate

quickly upward through a leaky borehole due to the transient pressure gradient across an aquitard created by the fracking pressure (Lacombe et al, 1995).

Conclusion: There is evidence to support the concept of upward movement in the area, but it is not conclusive. The EPA should complete more studies documenting the vertical hydraulic gradient throughout the area.

Recommendation: The EPA report should document the depth to water in the domestic wells prior to sampling so that they could map water levels for different well depths and determine the zones of upward gradient.

Contamination from shallow pits

The presence of shallow disposal pits is an alternative source of contamination. EPA notes that there are 33 shallow pits that had been used for the “storage/disposal of drilling wastes, produced water, and flowback fluids in the area of investigation” (EPA p 17). As part of this study, the EPA communicated with stakeholders to further determine the location of pits. Shallow monitoring wells have found very high concentrations of several contaminants that were also found in deeper water wells and the EPA monitoring wells. These pits could have received the detritus of fracking operations in the past.

Hypothesis: Contaminated water seeping from these pits could be responsible for the observed contamination.

Evidence: Shallow monitoring wells that had been installed previously for reasons not associated with this project (EPA, p 11) are reported to have very high contaminant concentrations, although this data is not well summarized in the report. The shallow monitoring wells are only 4.6 m bgs (EPA p 17), so there is little information about how deep the contamination extends beneath the pits. Assuming the pits are some distance away from homes and people avoided them when constructing their water wells, it is possible the shallow disposal pits are sources of contamination beyond the level the EPA considers shallow, or 31 m bgs (Id.).

Irrigation could help to contain the contamination near the shallow pits because they would be located in low recharge areas, either by design or in comparison with irrigated fields. It would be unlikely that the pits would have been constructed within irrigated fields, so the seepage from the pits may be much less than the seepage beneath irrigated fields because of the continuous application of water to the field, and for a much shorter time period. Irrigation water would have seeped deeper and faster due to the likely higher rate of application and effectively diluted or prevented the deeper circulation of seepage from the pit.

Conclusion: The EPA concludes that these shallow pits are not the source of contaminants found in deeper water wells. Because there is little contamination in intermediate-depth wells, their conclusion is sound, but the document would benefit from more analysis and discussion.

Recommendation: The EPA should document more fully the contaminant plumes near the pits. Specifically, deeper monitoring wells near the pits should be constructed to construct a contamination

profile beneath the pits. Better investigation of the pits as a source would also facilitate the remediation of the groundwater near those pits.

LINES OF REASONING

The EPA used a line of reasoning analysis regarding the presence of fracking fluid constituents and gas in monitoring wells in support of their preliminary conclusion that fracking has contaminated aquifers in Pavillion Wyoming. This is critical because the conclusion is not just that leakage from the wells or spills caused contamination, but that the fracking process itself caused the contamination. EPA deemed the multiple lines of reasoning approach necessary due to the complexity in detecting contaminants in groundwater from deep sources. This section critically reviews each of the EPA's lines of reasoning.

High pH Values

The EPA monitoring wells both have very high pH, ranging from 11.2 to 12.0, which is much higher than the level seen in the domestic water wells in the Wind River formation. EPA concluded the high pH was due to hydroxide (OH) which indicated the addition of a strong base to the background water (EPA p xii). EPA's reaction path modeling suggested that the addition of just a small amount of potassium hydroxide to the sodium-sulfate waters typical of deep portions of the Wind River formation would cause such a pH change; EPA concludes from the modeling that the typical groundwater in the Pavillion aquifer "is especially vulnerable to the addition of a strong base" (EPA p 20).

Potassium hydroxide was used as a crosslinker and solvent for fracking the production wells in the area (EPA p 33), which could be a source of the OH to increase the pH of the water in the area of the production wells.

The use of soda ash as a drilling additive when drilling the monitoring wells, often to control the pH, is a possible alternate explanation for the elevated pH². Soda ash is 100% Na₂CO₃. At a 1:100 mixing ratio with water, the pH of dense soda ash was 11.2 (EPA Table 2). The recommended ratio for use in fracking fluid is 1:100 to 1:50 (EPA Table 1). The pH of drilling mud varied between 8 and 9. The concentrations of neither sodium nor carbonate are abnormal in the monitoring wells. If the soda ash did separate from the drilling mud, mixing with background groundwater would further dilute it so that the pH would be less than observed at the 1:100 mixing ratio.

EPA Figure 12 verifies these pH values are higher than in the domestic wells, but also shows they fall on the general trend of pH with elevation of the well open interval. Based on this information, it is not possible to conclude that the high pH is not natural, but the EPA's conclusion appears to be justified based cumulatively on all of the facts concerning pH. EPA should consider geophysical logging completed by the industry if it includes pH logs to improve their analysis; such logs could provide pH values for deeper areas that could be compared with the pH values for their monitoring wells.

² <http://www.halliburton.com/ps/default.aspx?navid=125&pageid=60&prodgrpid=MSE%3a%3a1053024648177449>, visited 1/13/12

Chemistry in the shallow wells has been affected by irrigation with Wind River water. This irrigation water has very low total dissolved solids (TDS) and neutral pH (<8) (EPA Figure 11) but the other shallow groundwater wells show that the irrigation water picks up contaminants as it seeps.

The methods used to collect samples probably minimized contamination causing high pH in the monitoring wells. EPA purged the monitor wells until pH stabilized, a process which would minimize the potential that any residual contamination from well development would have been sampled.

EPA's analysis associated with Figures 11 and 12, explaining the shallow water geochemistry, is accurate and useful. It utilizes data from all of the wells in the area and surface waters to show water chemistry trends through the study area. It also shows how EPA's monitoring wells differ substantially from the general trends, supporting the conclusion that elevated pH in water samples from EPA's deep monitoring wells was likely caused by contamination with hydraulic fracturing chemicals.

Elevated potassium and chloride

The monitoring wells both have concentrations of K and Cl much higher, 14 to 18 times, than the domestic water wells (EPA p 34). Potassium concentration ranged from 43.6 to 53.9 mg/l and Cl concentration averaged 466 mg/l (Id.). The drilling additives reported by EPA to have been used at Pavillion had a much lower concentration for both anions. The fracking fluid contained several compounds with high concentrations of both ions (Id.). Therefore, the high concentrations of K and Cl suggest contamination with fracking fluid.

The chloride concentration data plotted in EPA Figure 12 shows clearly that Cl concentration in two of the three samples from EPA's deep monitoring wells are much higher than those in domestic wells, and EPA correctly assesses there must be a cause other than natural variation for the high concentrations. However, in this case I disagree with EPA's assessment that "regional anion trends tend to show decreasing Cl concentrations with depth" (EPA p 19) because EPA Figure 12 shows little variation with depth although there are a couple of high concentration outliers near the surface. Regardless of the interpretation of trend, concentrations from the EPA monitoring wells plot far higher than the Cl data from domestic wells.

The chloride concentrations reported from the EPA monitoring wells are also much higher than reported by the USGS in their Wind River study (Daddow 1996). He describes the formation water as having TDS concentration as high as 5000 mg/l, but Cl is a small proportion of that. He also reported that the highest Cl concentration on surface water sites was less than about 30 mg/l, so assuming the river recharges the alluvial aquifer, the source of the groundwater is relatively clean with respect to chloride. Cl concentrations at EPA's monitoring wells are much higher than the regional values reported by USGS in either ground or surface water on the Wind River Reservation, and are unlikely to be properly considered "naturally occurring".

For potassium, it is much clearer that the monitoring well concentrations exceed the domestic water well concentrations by many times (EPA Figure 12, p 20).

There is too little of either K or Cl in drilling mud or additives for it to have been the source or cause of the enrichment in the monitoring wells. Also, purging prior to sampling occurred until the specific conductivity (SC) of the purged water reached a relative steady state (EPA Figure 9). K and Cl both contribute to the SC of the water being sampled. Any potential contamination due to well construction or development has most likely been purged from the system.

The high K and Cl concentrations are clearly present in the formation water near the monitoring wells. Without a natural source as explanation, the mostly likely source is the fracking fluid which used compounds that have high concentrations of both anions. EPA has reasonably concluded the most likely source of elevated K and Cl is fracking fluid.

Detection of synthetic organic compounds

The EPA found in the monitoring wells significant concentrations of isopropanol, diethylene glycol, triethylene glycol, and tert-butyl alcohol (TBA) (in MW02). TBA was not directly used as a fracking fluid, but “is a known breakdown product of methyl tert-butyl ether and tert-butyl hydroperoxide”. The first three products are found in fracking fluid based on the material safety data sheets (MSDSs) analyzed by EPA, but the parent compounds of TBA have not been reported as such; importantly, MSDSs, which are the source of the fracking fluid additives lists in the report, do not list all chemicals because the formulas are proprietary. That a chemical is missing from the list of additives is not evidence they were never in fracking fluid.

Isopropanol was found in “concentrated solutions of drilling additives” at concentrations much lower than detected in the monitoring wells (EPA p 35) and the others, glycols and alcohols, were not used for drilling.

None of these compounds naturally occur in groundwater. The EPA is correct in its conclusion that there is no acceptable alternative explanation and the most likely source of these contaminants is fracking fluid.

Detection of petroleum hydrocarbons

EPA detected benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes (BTEX), trimethylbenzenes, and naphthalene at MW02 (EPA, p 35). They detected gasoline and diesel range organics at both monitoring wells (Id.). These are not found in drilling additives, but the MSDSs showed a long list of additives in the fracking fluid that could be the source of the contamination just cited (EPA p 35, 36). For example, a BTEX mixture had been used in the fracking fluid as a breaker and a diesel oil mixture was used in guar polymer slurry (Id.).

EPA rejects alternative explanations that claim that substances, used on the well or pump, caused these contaminant detections. Specifically, the agency points out that the contact time for water with the well or pump during purging and sampling would be so low that contamination would be unlikely, especially after purging. This would be especially true for the Phase 4 sampling which would have occurred after

the well had been purged for sampling twice and had several months of natural groundwater flow through it.

An alternate explanation considered by EPA is that the constituents are due to the groundwater being above a natural gas field. In fact, the EPA has noted that historically some wells encountered gas at levels shallower than the monitoring wells. EPA encountered methane while logging MW01 (EPA p 11). EPA notes that the gas from the Wind River formation is “dry and unlikely to yield liquid condensates” (EPA p 36). They also argue that the monitoring wells have substantially different compositions of liquid condensates, which would not result if they came from a common source of gas. The explanation is reasonable, unless there is a variation with depth. Because these contaminants occur only at low concentrations in the deepest domestic wells, the data does not rule out a natural gradient from the gas sources at depth to the shallower zones of the formation. However, the EPA explanation is supported by the fact that the monitoring wells are far enough apart, more than a mile, that they must have different gas well sources and represent different pathways..

Recommendation: To further decrease the uncertainty, the EPA should complete an additional sampling event with more domestic wells sampled. It would also be desirable to have another monitor well screened at the level of the gas wells. The EPA could then develop a concentration profile as a function of depth and formation layer.

Breakdown products of organic compounds

EPA verified a vertical pathway by showing that organic compounds in the shallower monitoring wells are daughter products of the organic compounds found in the deeper monitoring wells. This supports the concept of upward migration with ongoing biologic transformation or natural degradation. It supports the concept of an upward flow gradient. It cannot be asserted that the EPA monitoring wells are on the same flow pathway, as they are more than a mile apart, therefore, the presence of contaminants in the monitoring wells is evidence that there are multiple sources of contaminants at the level of the gas production wells.

As part of this line of reasoning, the EPA presents the “hypothetical conceptual model” that “highly concentrated contaminant plumes exist within the zone of injection with dispersed lower concentration areas vertically and laterally distant from the injection points”. This refers to how the fracking fluids, once injected, simply disperse in all directions because there are no confinements, similar to how they disperse from coal seam fracking. It is consistent with the lower concentrations found further from the source.

EPA’s hypothesis is reasonable and explains the vertical movement of contaminants from a broad zone of production wells. Its simplicity indicates that fracking in such a formation will eventually lead to contamination moving vertically from the gas wells – it is only a matter of time (Myers, 2012).

Sporadic bonding outside of production casing and hydraulic fracturing in thin discontinuous sandstone

The last two lines of reasoning are considered together because they describe two pathways for fracking fluid to get into the aquifer. The fracking that occurs in the Pavillion gas field directly injects fracking fluid into an underground source of drinking water. Fracking occurs as little as 150 m below the bottom of the deeper water wells. The sandstone and intervening shale zones are discontinuous, which suggests there are no significant continuous barriers to a vertical component of flow and contaminant movement. Fracking has also occurred for up to 40 years, so the pathways could have required up to 40 years for transport. Sporadic bonding above the zone being fracked basically means the annulus between the production zone and surface casing may not be fully sealed with cement which may allow gas or fluids to move vertically among formation layers. During fracking, the high pressure could force some of the fracking fluid through improperly sealed well bores to contaminate formations nearer the water wells.

Both of these lines of reasoning correctly describe potential pathways and sources of fluids in the aquifer. The EPA's conclusions in this regard are reasonable and appropriate and conform to the available facts and data.

Gas in Monitoring and Shallow Wells

Many shallow water wells have gas concentrations that exceed expected background levels. EPA also uses several lines of reasoning to conclude that gas has migrated to domestic wells from the fracked zones, in addition to or instead of it occurring naturally in those wells.

Isotopic composition of gas samples from shallow wells, deeper monitoring wells and produced gas are all similar in that all have a thermogenic origin. However, the shallower domestic water wells have very little higher chain carbon-based gas, which suggests some dispersion and decomposition with vertical movement (ethane and propane degrade faster). The isotopic composition of most wells is thermogenic and indicative of a deep source; URS (2010) noted that methane in one domestic well of eight sampled with measurable methane had biogenic origins.

EPA also found that the concentration of methane in domestic water wells was generally higher in areas of higher gas production, as counted by the number of gas wells. Although it could be coincidental because more gas wells are constructed where more gas naturally occurs, this seems unlikely because the presence of gas in domestic water wells shows that gas is occurring outside of the production zones deep in the Wind River Formation or high in the underlying Fort Union Formation. Gas would only move naturally from depth to areas near the surface if there is a lack of containment which would have depleted the gas source at some point in the last 40,000,000 years. Thus, the gas wells have apparently provided a migration pathway for gas released by fracking into overlying formations; this migration occurred at a rate sufficient to allow gas to accumulate to a concentration capable of causing a blowout at 159 m bgs near well PDGW05.

The area also generally has gas well designs that are below current industry standards in some states, with surface casing not extending below the maximum depth of water wells and with a "lack of cement or sporadic bonding of cement outside of production casing" (EPA p 38). This would provide a pathway from depth to at least the bottom of the surface casing, and allow gas leakage to higher levels in the

aquifer. Many states and areas require surface casing to extend below the maximum depth of USDWs (a USDW must generally have TDS less than 10,000 mg/l). The gas well design in Pavillion appears to be below industry standards because the surface casing does not extend even below the bottom of the zone of domestic wells. The pathways discussed above for fluid movement would also facilitate gas movement (Id.).

The EPA acknowledges that poorly sealed domestic wells could also be a pathway (EPA p 38-39). This is true but not a relevant argument because the gas wells are much deeper and actually tap formation layers with gas. Once gas reaches a domestic well, it is possible that the well provides an additional pathway, but it is not the source of the contamination or the primary pathway from the gas source zone to the aquifers.

The EPA also references the fact of citizen's complaints (EPA p 39) as an indicator that gas contamination started after fracking. Citizens do not complain until a problem occurs. Assuming their water well was initially acceptable, they would complain when they noticed a change.

DISCUSSION OF CONTAMINANT TRANSPORT PATHWAYS

The general dispersion of contaminants upward from the fracking zone would result from either well bore transport or transport through overlying higher permeability sandstone. Transport through wellbores that cross multiple aquifer layers, as the gas wells do near Pavillion, would allow contaminants to reach the different levels. However, the concentration reaching shallower formations would be much less because the contaminants bleed off to the deeper aquifer zones (Nordbotten et al 2004). Fracking could also create the vertical gradient to temporarily cause contaminants to move vertically upward through wellbores to contaminate shallower aquifer layers (Lacombe et al 1995).

Because there are not any significant horizontal confining units within the Pavillion Field, the upward vertical contaminant transport is partially due to dispersion through relatively porous media. In areas with extensive horizontal confining layers, such as the Marcellus shale areas, transport through vertical fractures, similar to that through wellbores, could transport substantial contaminant mass through the impervious zones (Myers, 2012). If the bulk media bounding the fractures have conductivity less than one hundredth that in the fracture, the contaminants will transport with little dispersion, or loss, into the bulk media (Zheng and Gorelick, 2003).

This appears to be the case in the Pavillion Field, given the existing geology. Thus, unless fracking is very carefully done, and well bores are solidly (not intermittently) bonded, this result is to be expected. In the case of the Pavillion Field, sporadic bonding is revealed and reported for 9 of the wells that EPA examined well bore data made available to them. To the extent that this is indicative of the entire field, it would greatly increase the likelihood that transport of contaminants from the gas wells to the water wells of the rural Pavillion residents would occur.

REFERENCES

- Daddow, R.L. 1996. Water Resources of the Wind River Indian Reservation, Wyoming. U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 95-4223.
- Fisher, K, and N. Warpinski. 2010. Hydraulic fracture-height growth: real data. Paper SPE 145949 presented at the Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition held in Denver, CO, October 30 – November 2, 2011. Doi: 10.2118/145949-MS
- Kramer, D. 2011. Shale-gas extraction faces growing public and regulatory challenges. *Physics Today* 64, no. 7: 23-25.
- Lacombe, S., E.A. Sudicky, S.K. Frapce, and A.J.A. Unger. 1995. Influence of leaky boreholes on cross-formational groundwater flow and contaminant transport. *Water Resources Research* 31(8):1871-1882.
- Myers, T. 2012. Potential contaminant pathways from hydraulically fractured shale to aquifers. *Ground Water*, doi: 10.1111/j.1745-6584.2012.00933.x.
- Nordbotten, J.M., M.A. Celia, and S. Bachu. 2004. Analytical solutions for leakage rates through abandoned wells. *Water Resources Research* v 40, W04204.
- Osborn S.G., Vengosh, A., Warner, N.R., and Jackson, R.B. (2011). Methane contamination of drinking water accompanying gas-well drilling and hydraulic fracturing. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, v. 108, p. 8172-8176.
- Osiensky, J.L., G.V. Winter, R.E. Williams. 1984. Monitoring and mathematical modeling of contaminated ground-water plumes in fluvial environments. *Ground Water* 22, no. 3: 298-307.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2011. Draft, Investigation of Ground Water Contamination near Pavillion, Wyoming. Office of Research and Development, Ada, OK.
- URS Operating Services, Inc. (URS) 2010. Expanded Site Investigation – Analytical Results Report, Pavillion Area Groundwater Investigation, Pavillion, Fremont County, Wyoming, CERCLIS ID # WYN000802835. Denver, CO.
- URS Operating Services, Inc. (URS) 2009. Site Inspection – Analytical Results Report, Pavillion Area Groundwater Investigation Site, CERCLIS ID# WYN000802735. File Pavillion_GWInvestigationARRTestAndMaps.pdf. Denver, CO
- Zheng, C., and S. M. Gorelick 2003. Analysis of solute transport in flow fields influenced by preferential flowpaths at the decimeter scale. *Ground Water* 41, no. 2: 142-155.