

Water Supply and Wastewater Challenges in Marcellus Shale Development

R. Timothy Weston
K&L Gates LLP
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Synopsis

§ 15.01.	Introduction to the Dual Water Supply and Wastewater Challenge	505
§ 15.02.	The Water Resource Challenge in Perspective	506
§ 15.03.	Water Rights and Water Withdrawal Regulation	512
	[1] — Overview — What Is the Meaning of Water Rights?	513
	[2] — “Water Rights” Granted Under Mineral Leases	515
	[3] — Basis of “Water Rights” Under State Law — Common Law and Regulatory Programs	515
	[4] — Common Law Principles Applicable to Water Withdrawals	516
	[a] — Classifications of Water	516
	[b] — Riparian Rights in Surface Streams, Lakes and Subterranean Streams.....	518
	[i] — Measure of a Riparian Right — How Much Water Can Be Used?	519
	[ii] — Can Water Be Transferred Off Riparian Land?.....	522
	[c] — Common Law Rights in Percolating Groundwater	523
	[d] — The Restatement Rules for Surface Water and Groundwater	526
	[e] — Interaction Between Surface and Ground Water	527
	[5] — Regulated Riparian Regimes	531
	[a] — Kentucky	532
	[i] — Permit System for Water Withdrawals.....	533
	[ii] — Criteria for Granting Permits	533
	[b] — New York	533
	[i] — Limited Statewide Permit Program for Certain Water Withdrawals.....	533
	[ii] — Regional Permit Programs.....	534

- [c] — Ohio..... 535
 - [i] — Common Law with Legislative Guidance 535
 - [ii] — Limited Regulatory Programs 536
- [d] — Pennsylvania 537
 - [i] — 1939 Water Rights Act 538
 - [ii] — Safe Drinking Water Act 538
 - [iii] — Water Well Drillers License Act..... 539
 - [iv] — Water Resources Planning Act..... 539
 - [v] — Regulation of Marcellus Shale Water Use Via the Oil & Gas Act and Clean Streams Law 543
- [e] — Virginia 545
 - [i] — Statewide Permit Program for Surface Water Withdrawals..... 545
 - [ii] — Permit Program for Surface Water Withdrawals from Designated Water Management Areas 546
 - [iii] — Permit Program for Groundwater Withdrawals from Designated Water Management Areas 547
- [f] — West Virginia 548
- [g] — The Delaware River Basin Commission (DRBC)..... 549
 - [i] — Delaware River Basic Compact 549
 - [ii] — DRBC Project Review 550
- [h] — Susquehanna River Basin Commission 555
 - [i] — Susquehanna River Basin Compact..... 555
 - [ii] — Project Review and Regulatory Powers..... 556
 - [iii] — Passby Flow and Conservation Release Requirements 559
 - [iv] — Enforcement and Sanctions..... 562
- [i] — Great Lakes — St. Lawrence River Basin Water Resources Compact 562

§ 15.04. Liability of Gas Well Operators for Impacts on Other Water Users..... 565

- [1] — Liability for Impacts Caused by Water Supply Development 565
- [2] — Liability for Impacts Caused by Gas Well Development and Operation..... 566
 - [a] — Common Law Liabilities 566

	[b] — Special Statutory and Regulatory Requirements.....	566
	[i] — The Pennsylvania Oil & Gas Act — Water Supply Protection Provisions	566
	[ii] — West Virginia’s Water Protection Regulations.....	568
	[iii] — Ohio’s Water Protection Requirements.....	569
§ 15.05.	The Flowback / Wastewater Challenge	570
	[1] — Scope of the Challenge.....	570
	[2] — Overview of Wastewater Management Issues.....	572
	[3] — Requirements for Characterizing Flowback Wastewater	572
	[4] — Assuring Delivery to Appropriate Facilities	574
	[5] — Treatment, Reuse and Disposal Technology Choices.....	575
	[a] — Natural Pond Evaporation.....	576
	[b] — Direct Reuse for Drilling and Fracing	576
	[c] — Underground Injection of Flowback and Production Brines.....	576
	[d] — Conventional Treatment Technologies.....	576
	[e] — TDS Reduction Via Reverse Osmosis.....	577
	[f] — TDS Reduction Via Evaporation	578
	[g] — TDS Reduction Via Crystallization	579
	[h] — Key Regulatory Questions Affecting Selection	580
	[6] — Regulatory Drivers to Technology Selection — Impending Restrictions on Surface Water Discharges.....	581
	[a] — Overview	581
	[b] — The Pennsylvania TDS Strategy	581
	[i] — Proposed Treatment Standards	581
	[ii] — Potential Instream Criteria.....	582
	[iii] — New Facilities Under the Pennsylvania TDS Strategy.....	582
	[iv] — Existing Facilities Under the PA TDS Strategy	583
	[v] — Strategy for POTWs	583
§ 15.06.	Legal and Regulatory Issues in Implementing Treatment and Disposal Facilities.....	584
	[1] — Treatment Facility Siting.....	584

[a] — Zoning and Land Development Regulations	584
[b] — State Siting Restrictions for Certain Treatment Facilities	585
[2] — National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit Issues	586
[a] — Establishing Effluent Limits	587
[i] — Technology-based Effluent Limitations	587
[ii] — Water Quality Based Effluent Limits	588
[b] — Special Protection Waters	588
[c] — Impaired Waters	590
[3] — Water Quality Construction Permits for Wastewater Facilities	591
[a] — Pennsylvania	591
[b] — Ohio	592
[c] — Delaware River Basin Commission	592
[4] — Air Emission Issues for Water Treatment Facilities	593
[a] — What Counts as a “Source” in Defining “Major Source”	594
[b] — Potentially Applicable Air Emission Regulations	594
[5] — Underground Injection of Wastewater or Treatment Residuals	596
[a] — Acquiring Rights to Allow Underground Injection	597
[b] — Federal Safe Drinking Water Act — Underground Injection Control (UIC) Program	598
[c] — Pennsylvania	599
[d] — Ohio	601
[e] — West Virginia	602
[f] — New York	602
[g] — DRBC	603
[6] — Residuals Management and Disposition	603
[a] — What Are the Treatment Residuals?	603
[b] — Categorization of Residuals	604
[c] — State Regulation of Residual or Industrial Waste or Beneficial Reuse of Residuals	604
[i] — Pennsylvania	604
[ii] — West Virginia	606

	[7] — Implementing Wastewater Projects	
	— Transactional Issues.....	607
§ 15.07.	Summarizing Key Challenges to Wastewater Management	607
§ 15.08.	Final Words	609

§ 15.01. Introduction to the Dual Water Supply and Wastewater Challenge.

Development of the extensive natural gas reserves contained in the Marcellus Shale deposits promises to be one of the most important opportunities for the United States for the next several decades. At the same time, exploitation of this gas resource poses interesting water resource, water supply, and wastewater challenges which the oil and gas industry has rarely faced in the Appalachian Basin.

While some traditional oil and gas development has utilized, to a modest extent, water supplies in the drilling and fracing processes, Marcellus Shale exploitation involves orders of magnitude greater water resource requirements. Horizontal drilling techniques, coupled with hydraulic fracturing of deep horizontal extensions, entails water use multiple times greater than traditional wells.

Based on experience in the Barnett Shale and developing experience in the Marcellus play, approximately one- to five-million gallons of water are required for fracing each gas well, with slickwater frac techniques utilizing as much as 500,000 to 1,000,000 gallons of fluid in each of multiple stages. To be sure, recycling of flowback water will likely be utilized to reduce disposal requirements, thereby reducing somewhat the draft on freshwater supplies. But the technology allowing for large-scale reuse of water has encountered some limitations, such that even in water-challenged jurisdictions such as Texas, only a relatively small percentage of water needed for frac operations (typically 10 to 15 percent) is derived from recycled water. Thus, the challenge will be to secure adequate and reliable sources of water with appropriate quality characteristics in reasonable proximity to proposed well sites to meet the gas well development requirements.

At the same time, the fracture stimulation of Marcellus Shale wells results in substantial volumes of flowback wastewaters containing high salt contents and other constituents of potential concern. Of the volumes pumped downhole for fracing, a portion (ranging from 25 to 50 percent) emerges

from the well over time as flowback water, followed by additional production brines. Efforts to obtain representative characterization of Marcellus Shale flowback and produced waters are still underway, but not complete. Generally, such flowback waters contain four to 25 percent salts (including constituents from the underground formations), plus oil and gas, and chemicals added during the frac. Typical total dissolved solids (TDS) concentrations may exceed 100,000 milligrams per liter (mg/l) — higher than experienced in some other regions and shale plays.

These high-TDS wastewaters pose a substantial challenge, both in terms of volume and concentrations. A number of eastern streams are already burdened with high TDS concentrations, largely from abandoned mines and acid mine drainage, with limited capacity to assimilate additional loadings, particularly during low flow periods. Other streams, particularly in rural watersheds across the northern portions of Pennsylvania and southern New York, are subject to special protection for their high quality, with discharges strictly regulated under “anti-degradation” standards. Some states, such as Pennsylvania, have moved to impose stringent restrictions on new or increased loadings of TDS from Marcellus Shale development, pointing the way to effective “zero discharge” scenarios for wastewater management. At the same time, environmental organizations have petitioned the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to base introduction of gas well wastewaters from publicly-owned treatment works (that is, sewage treatment plants) and to establish new effluent guidelines for the oil and gas sector, establishing a no discharge limit for central wastewater treatment facilities receiving oil or gas-related wastewaters.¹

Thus, the entire “water balance” of Marcellus Shale development is a critical element to successful pursuit of this play. Concurrently, the acquisition

¹ Letter from EarthJustice, *et al.*, to Carey A. Johnston, Water Docket, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, re: Comments on Final 2008 Effluent Guidelines Program Plan and Suggestions for the 2009 Annual Review: Oil and Gas Exploration, Stimulation, and Extraction, Docket EPA-HQ-OW-2008-0517 (April 7, 2009).

of adequate and reliable supplies of water, coupled with the treatment, reuse and disposition of wastewater, pose key technical, regulatory and legal challenges requiring concerted attention.

§ 15.02. The Water Resource Challenge in Perspective.

From a statewide or basin perspective, water requirements for Marcellus Shale development might appear comparatively modest. The Susquehanna River Basin Commission, for example, estimates that annual consumptive water use for all gas well development, once full-scale development has been reached, will equate to approximately 28 million gallons per day (mgd),² representing approximately three percent of total basin consumptive water use.³ By comparison, the total Marcellus Shale gas well water demand equates to about one-half the basin-wide water use by the recreational sector (golf courses and ski resorts), and less than one nuclear power plant.⁴ However, in some basins, cumulative consumptive water use (from all uses) poses concerns during drought and low flow events, as eastern states and water management agencies attempt to balance demands by upstream users versus needs for downstream flows to maintain wastewater assimilative capacity, fisheries, salinity control in estuaries, and other environmental conditions.⁵ At the same time, much of the Marcellus Shale development occurs in areas with smaller headwater streams, many with high quality

² Thomas R. Beauduy, *Accommodating a New Straw in the Water: Extracting Natural Gas from the Marcellus Shale in the Susquehanna River Basin*, SRBC White Paper, Feb. 2009, available at <http://www.srbc.net/programs/projreviewmarcellus.htm>.

³ SRBC reports that current “approved” consumptive use totals approximately 563 mgd (*id.*), but the total current maximum consumptive use in the basin (including both grandfathered uses and those approved by SRBC) has been estimated 882.5 mgd. SRBC, *Consumptive Use Mitigation Plan*, SRBC Pub. No. 253 (March 2008) at 5, available at <http://www.srbc.net/planning/CUMP.htm>.

⁴ T. R. Beauduy, *supra* note 2.

⁵ The Susquehanna River Basin likewise faces challenges in balancing growing consumptive water use with maintenance of flows in the lower river and into the upper Chesapeake Bay, where such flows are important to both migratory fish habitat and Bay salinity. SRBC, *Consumptive Use Mitigation Plan*, SRBC Pub. No. 253 (March 2008).