FULL RESEARCH PAPER

ENVPOL-D-16-01809

**Identifying Chemicals of Concern in
Hydraulic Fracturing Fluids Used for Oil Production**

by:

William T. Stringfellow^{a,b,*}, Mary Kay Camarillo^b, Jeremy K. Domen^b, Whitney L. Sandelin^b, Charuleka Varadharajan^a, Preston D. Jordan^a, Matthew T. Reagan^a, Heather Cooley^c, Matthew G. Heberger^c, and Jens T. Birkholzer^a

^aEarth & Environmental Sciences Area, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, 1 Cyclotron Road, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA.

^bEcological Engineering Research Program, School of Engineering & Computer Science, University of the Pacific, 3601 Pacific Avenue, Stockton, CA 95211, USA.

^cPacific Institute, 654 13th Street, Preservation Park, Oakland, CA 94612, USA.

* corresponding author: wstringfellow@lbl.gov, (510) 486-7903

Prepared for submission to:

Environmental Pollution

July 2016

Revised: September 2016

ABSTRACT

Chemical additives used for hydraulic fracturing and matrix acidizing of oil reservoirs were reviewed and priority chemicals of concern needing further environmental risk assessment, treatment demonstration, or evaluation of occupational hazards were identified. We evaluated chemical additives used for well stimulation in California, the third largest oil producing state in the USA, by the mass and frequency of use, as well as toxicity. The most frequently used chemical additives in oil development were gelling agents, cross-linkers, breakers, clay control agents, iron and scale control agents, corrosion inhibitors, biocides, and various impurities and product stabilizers used as part of commercial mixtures. Hydrochloric and hydrofluoric acids, used for matrix acidizing and other purposes, were reported infrequently. A large number and mass of solvents and surface active agents were used, including quaternary ammonia compounds (QACs) and nonionic surfactants. Acute toxicity was evaluated and many chemicals with low hazard to mammals were identified as potentially hazardous to aquatic environments. Based on an analysis of quantities used, toxicity, and lack of adequate hazard evaluation, QACs, biocides, and corrosion inhibitors were identified as priority chemicals of concern that deserve further investigation.

CAPSULE ABSTRACT: Hydraulic fracturing in oil fields use different chemicals than in gas fields and chemicals of most concern from a human and environmental health perspective are identified.

KEYWORDS: hydraulic fracturing; produced water; well stimulation; oil production; biocides; corrosion inhibitors;

INTRODUCTION

Hydraulic fracturing and other types of well stimulation treatments, such as acid stimulation and acid fracturing, are being used extensively throughout the U.S. and globally to increase oil and gas production and extract resources that would otherwise be inaccessible [1-3]. These well stimulation treatments, collectively referred to as unconventional oil and gas development, use a wide variety of chemical additives [2, 4, 5] and can cause both direct and indirect impacts on the environment and human health [6-9]. Potential direct impacts may include a hydraulic fracture extending into protected groundwater, accidental spills of fluids containing hydraulic fracturing chemicals, or inappropriate disposal or reuse of produced water containing hydraulic fracturing chemicals [10, 11]. Indirect impacts are impacts not specific to the activity of well-stimulation, but are impacts associated with all oil and gas production that also occur at production sites enabled by unconventional methods. Impacts that are independent of well-stimulation, such as long-term emissions of volatile hydrocarbon air pollutants, fugitive methane emissions, groundwater contamination from produced water spills or casing failures, etc., will occur as part of all oil and gas development and can occur whether or not a well was completed using stimulation technology[6]. Most of the direct impacts of unconventional oil and gas development can be attributed to chemical use during well-stimulation [6].

In order to understand the direct impacts of unconventional oil and gas development, it is therefor necessary to understand and evaluate the types and amounts of chemicals used during well-stimulation. Hydraulic fracturing practices and chemical-use varies by region of the USA and hydraulic fracturing is most frequently used for production of natural-gas from shale and similar source rock formations [3, 12, 13]. Previous studies have evaluated and characterized

chemical additives in fracturing fluids based on use nationally [4, 5, 12, 17-19] and these analysis of chemical-use are therefor weighted toward chemical-use for natural-gas development.

In this review we examine the use of chemicals for hydraulic fracturing in the context of oil development. In California, hydraulic fracturing is exclusively used for oil production and it is estimated that approximately 20% of oil production in California is dependent on unconventional oil recovery, predominately acidizing and hydraulic fracturing in diatomite formations [3]. California is the third largest producer of oil in the USA and hydraulic fracturing has occurred in both onshore and offshore oil fields [3, 14, 15]. We evaluate chemical additives used for hydraulic fracturing and acidizing of oil reservoirs in California, with the objective of obtaining a better understanding of the types and amounts of chemicals used in oil production. In an effort to demystify the often confusing use of chemicals in well-stimulation, we evaluate mass and frequency of use by both functionality and chemical classification. Our goal is to understand the significance of individual chemicals and chemical mixtures, the amounts at which they are being used, the purpose of their use, the class of chemical to which they belong, and other distinguishing characteristics. We use a rational approach, identifying the chemicals used most frequently and in the highest mass and cross reference these materials with toxicity analysis, to create a priority chemical list for further investigation and regulation.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Data on chemicals, concentrations, and water volumes used in hydraulic fracturing were obtained from the FracFocus database (versions 1 and 2) for hydraulic fracturing operations conducted in California between January 30, 2011 and May 19, 2014 [16]. The FracFocus database was started in 2011 and contains voluntarily disclosed data on hydraulic fracturing treatments. Entries in the FracFocus database were edited to standardize chemical names and to

validate the assigned Chemical Abstracts Services Registry Number (CASRN). Masses of chemicals per treatment were only calculated for complete records where both volume and concentrations data were provided and where the sum of reported mass percentages was between 95% and 105%.

Data on acidizing treatments, including matrix acidizing, were compiled from data collected by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for treatments conducted between June 5, 2013 and February 3, 2015 [17]. The SCAQMD includes the counties of San Bernardino, Orange, Riverside, and Los Angeles, including the City of Los Angeles. The SCAQMD does not include the San Joaquin Valley nor Kern County, where the majority of hydraulic fracturing takes place in California [3, 18]. Operators and chemical suppliers working in the SCAQMD must disclose chemical and materials used for drilling, hydraulic fracturing, and acidizing in that district. The SCAQMD data started being collected in 2013 [17].

Toxicity data were collected from chemical databases and references [19-27]. Rat and mouse oral toxicity data were collected to represent mammalian toxicity. Environmental toxicity data were collected for water flea (*Daphnia magna*), fathead minnow (*Pimephales promelas*), and trout (Rainbow Trout, *Oncorhynchus mykiss* and Brook Trout, *Salvelinus fontinalis*). Data on median lethal dose (LD50) were compiled for mammals, while data on median lethal concentration (LC50) and median effective concentration (EC50) were compiled for aquatic species. Toxicity ratings for chemical additives were assigned using the United Nations Globally Harmonized System (GHS) of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals [28]. In the GHS system, lower numbers indicate higher toxicity, with a designation of “1” indicating the most toxic category. Chemicals for which the LD50 or EC50 exceeded the least toxic GHS category were classified as non-toxic.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Chemicals used in hydraulic fracturing and matrix acidizing

Using data collected from FracFocus, we identified 1,623 individual hydraulic fracturing operations conducted in California between January 30, 2011 and May 19, 2014. During this time period, there were an estimated 5,000 to 7,000 hydraulic fracturing treatments in California [3], suggesting that the voluntary dataset represents one-third to one-fifth of the total hydraulic fracturing treatments. From these 1,623 treatments, we identified 338 unique additives based on name and CASRN combinations, of which 228 were reported with a CASRN and 110 were identified by chemical or common name only or had proprietary designations. The additives included chemicals, mineral proppants and carriers, and base fluids consisting of water, salt, and brine solutions. There were 327 unique additive names in the database. Some additives—e.g. hemicellulose enzyme—had multiple CASRN and/or were identified by CASRN in some entries and proprietary designations in other entries. Of the 45,058 entries for additives, 3,071 entries did not report CASRN under various claims for proprietary information (e.g. trade secret, confidential business information).

Matrix acidizing treatments applied in California involve the use of strong acids, including hydrochloric and hydrofluoric acid [3, 29]. Information concerning chemical use during matrix acidizing is not generally available, but the SCAQMD requires operators to report chemical use during acid treatments, which includes both routine well maintenance and matrix acidizing treatments. We analyzed the use of chemicals in conjunction with all acid treatments in the SCAQMD reporting area, which is limited to parts of Southern California (see methods). In the SCAQMD, we only examined chemicals reported with a valid CASRN. There were 78 chemicals identified as being used during acid treatments, of which 24 were not reported to the

FracFocus disclosure registry (Table S1). Although this data is restricted to one region, the SCAQMD data was, to our knowledge, the only public source of high quality data on acid treatments available during this study.

The results of this analysis indicate that well over 300 chemicals have been used for hydraulic fracturing in California and that, based on reporting in only one region of California, an additional two dozen chemical additives are also used during matrix acidizing treatments (Table S1). Since common names were sometimes used for chemical additives on the disclosures (e.g., surfactant mixture, salt), reporting before January 2014 was voluntary, and chemical names are not definitive identifiers of chemical additives, any enumeration of the total number of chemicals used in well stimulation should be considered approximate.

The dependence of data from voluntary reporting, the bias of that reporting for hydraulic fracturing operations, and the limited data available on matrix acidizing treatments means that the list of chemicals used for well stimulation in California is incomplete; however, the list of chemicals is believed to be representative of well-stimulation practices in California. The disclosures we examined include the major producers and service companies operating in California, including Baker Hughes, Schlumberger, and Halliburton. The chemical additives listed in the voluntary disclosures were consistent with additives described in information available from mandatory reporting, industry literature, patents, scientific publications, and other sources, such as government reports [e.g. 4, 30, 31, 32].

Functions of Chemical Additives

Given the large number of chemicals that have been used for well stimulation in California, it is useful to evaluate the chemical additives by function. Unfortunately, although chemical function is often reported, the assigned function for a chemical is frequently inaccurate.

For example, solvents, such as methanol, and surfactants used for formulating corrosion inhibitor mixtures [33, 34] are frequently reported as being corrosion inhibitors. Another common example is the reporting of magnesium nitrate and magnesium chloride as biocides, where in fact these chemicals are residuals from the manufacturing of isothiazolone biocides [35, 36]. Using a combination of patent literature, manufacturing information, and journal articles, we were able to positively identify function for the majority of the chemical additives (Table 1). Some chemicals had multiple functions and were assigned to more than one category.

Many of the chemicals on the list were so-called “impurities” and product-stabilizers found in chemical additive formulations. Product-stabilizers and impurities include solvents, surfactants, carriers, and salts that are added to chemical blends to improve their handling characteristics, provide product stability, enhance the effectiveness of the primary ingredients, or are residuals of manufacturing processes. For example, sulfate and phosphate salts can be added as allosteric effectors for enzymatic breakers [37] and thiosulfate can be added as a stabilizing agent to guar gum mixtures [38, 39]. Carriers include ingredients added as solid sorbents to biocides, corrosion inhibitors, and other products that improve stability or effect dissolution kinetics, allowing the active ingredient to be released in the formation or at other appropriate times and locations [40, 41]. Carriers include diatomaceous earth and other silicates [40-42], which are often misidentified as proppants. These compounds are typically added in small percentages, but can still occur in significant mass (see below).

Frequency of use of chemical additives

Although over 300 chemicals were identified as being used in California for hydraulic fracturing between 2011 and 2014, many of these compounds were reported as used only infrequently. In the 1,623 treatments, 153 of the compounds were reported as used 10 times or

less, 283 compounds were used less than 100 times, and 305 compounds were used in less than 163 times (or 10% of applications). Breakers, proppants, gelling agents, biocides, carriers, and crosslinkers were added to more than 90% of the 1,623 total treatments (Table 1). Friction reducers, diverting agents, and antifoam agents appear to be used infrequently (identified in less than 3% of all treatments, Table 1).

In Table S2, we report the chemical additives used in more than 10% of the reported hydraulic fracturing treatments. Table S2 does not include mineral proppants, mineral solids identified as carriers, and base fluids. The most commonly reported chemical additives are typical of gel-based treatments [2, 4]. Guar gum is a gelling agent to increase viscosity; boron compounds are used as cross-linkers to further increase viscosity; enzymes and ammonium persulfate are breakers used to reduce viscosity after treatment (Tables 1 and S2). The frequent use of guar gum supports previous reports that hydraulic fracturing in California is primarily conducted using gelled treatments as opposed to other parts of the U.S., where slick-water treatments are common [3, 12, 43].

The most commonly used biocide in California is the combination of 2-methyl-3(2H)-isothiazolone and 5-chloro-2-methyl-3(2H)-isothiazolone (Table S2). The use of isothiazolones as biocides is characteristic of hydraulic fracturing in California, as these biocides are applied less frequently in other states [12, 43, 44]. Other biocides used in California include glutaraldehyde, DBNPA (2,2-dibromo-3-nitrilopropionamide), and tetrakis hydroxymethyl-phosphonium sulfate. The chemical 1,2-ethanediaminium, N1,N2-bis[2-[bis(2-hydroxyethyl)methylammonio]ethyl]-N1,N2-bis(2-hydroxyethyl)-N1,N2-dimethyl-chloride (1:4) is a polymeric quaternary ammonium compound that is used as a clay control agent [45, 46]. Two phosphonic acids are listed in Table S2, which are used as scale inhibitors [40, 47, 48].

Petroleum distillates and the additives ethylene glycol, 2-butoxypropan-1-ol, 1-butoxypropan-2-ol, and ethoxylated isotridecanol are used to formulate guar gum and other mixtures [49, 50]. Sodium hydroxide is also one of the most commonly used additives, presumably for pH adjustment [47]. Phenol polymer with formaldehyde is a resin used to coat sand proppant to increase hardness [51-53].

The number of unique hydraulic fracturing fluid components applied per treatment—using complete records--varied from 8 to 68 with a median value of 23 (Figure 1). The median number of components used is slightly higher in this study than in a recent US EPA survey [12], which reported a median of 19 chemicals per treatment in California, because the US EPA analysis did not include base fluids and proppants and a smaller data set was reviewed in that study. Since proppants such as quartz sand, impurities such as methanol and nitrate, and carriers such as diatomaceous earth, may have environmental or human health importance, these components were included in our analysis. Base fluids may be brines, salt solutions, or produced water, but are most frequently fresh water. Water use ranged from 23 to 16,666 m³ per treatment with a median value of 280 m³ per treatment (Figure 2). This analysis confirms previous studies indicating hydraulic fracturing operations in California requires less water than in other regions [2, 43, 54, 55].

Characterization by Chemical Class

We grouped the chemicals by chemical class (Table 2) to gain a better understanding of the general hazards associated with the chemicals used for hydraulic fracturing in California. Some categories consist of only a few types of chemicals (e.g., five types of enzymes were used). Other categories were populated with many chemical types for example 50 solvents and 84 surfactants were identified (Tables 3 and 4). Of the 338 additives evaluated, most (304) could be

placed in one primary category, but 34 fell into in two categories. For example, QACs (15 compounds) are categorized as both ammonium compounds and surfactants, eight chelating agents are also categorized as amine/amides (5) or carboxylic acids (3) and three compounds were both phosphonic acids and amine/amides. Twelve classes of components were used in over 90% of all treatments: mineral solids, solvents, carbohydrates, water, surfactants, ammonium compounds, boron compounds, oxidizing agents, amines and amides, strong bases, mineral salts, and enzymes (Table 2).

The number of chemical additives used, as characterized by chemical type, per treatment varies (Figure 3). For example, typically only one ammonium compound is added per treatment, while four to five different mineral solids and solvents are added. Up to 17 different types of surfactants are added in a single treatment. Notable results from this analysis include the occurrence of a large number of ammonium compounds, which are predominantly QACs, but including some poly-quaternary ammonium clay control agents; the large number of solvents, which includes both hydrocarbon and alcohol solvents (Table 3); and the large number of surfactants (Table 4), which includes some cationic surfactant QACs. A further analysis by category shows that most applications use an oxidizing agent, phosphorous compounds, only one surfactant, but a variety of solvents per treatment or application (Figure 3).

Many of the environmental and health hazards associated with oil field chemical additives are due to the physical and chemical properties of solvents, surfactants, and QACs [56-60]. QACs are difficult to categorize as they are used for a variety of purposes on oil fields and often the functional use is not reported by the operator. When a specific use was reported, the most commonly reported functions for QACs were for surfactants and clay control, followed by use as biocides and corrosion inhibitors. QACs in particular are known to pose environmental

hazards [61]. Approximately half of the QACs were reported without a corresponding CASRN, but the entries “oxyalkylated amine quat,” “oxyalkylated amine,” “quaternary amine,” and “quaternary ammonium compound”, all indicate that these additives are unspecified QACs. Similarly, many of the general names suggest that the proprietary additives are surfactants (e.g. “ethoxylated alcohol,” “surfactant mixture,” etc.) that are widely used in the industry [47]. The chemical additives not identified by CASRN were not included in the toxicity analysis (below), but many solvents, surfactants, and QACs have similar mechanisms of toxicity, especially to aquatic organisms, and are presumed to be toxic to aquatic life.

Masses of chemical additives used per treatment

Analysis of chemical mass applied per treatment is an important criterion for evaluating hazard and can identify major ingredients from impurities, which can occur frequently but in small quantities. As expected, proppant, typically sand, and the carrier fluid, typically fresh-water, are applied in large quantities (see above). Approximately 87% of the records (1,406 treatments) reported sufficient information to calculate the chemical mass used for materials in addition to proppants and carrier fluids (see methods). The additives used in the largest masses per treatment were in many cases used infrequently (Table S3). Of the top twenty chemicals ranked by mass used per treatment, these chemicals were typically used in less than 250 out of 1,406 treatments (Table S3). Notably, of the chemical additives used in the largest masses per treatment, eight were reported without a CASRN and therefore could not be definitively identified. The chemical additive used in the largest mass per treatment was a proprietary phosphonate compound used for scale control. Hydrochloric acid was used in large quantities when it was used and, to a lesser extent, so was hydrofluoric acid (Table S3). Some of the chemical additives used in the largest quantities (Table S3) are also those used most frequently

(Table S2). There are several petroleum products, salts, and carbohydrates on both lists.

Prominently present on the list of chemicals used in the largest quantities are surfactants, while one of the chemicals used in the largest quantity was unidentified and labeled “unknown” in the database. Large mass applications of undefined chemicals raises concerns, especially in the absence of mandatory reporting.

Toxicity of chemical additives

Acute toxicity is a fundamental parameter for the classification of chemical hazards. Typically, data on acute toxicity are collected before analysis of chronic toxicity or other long-term effects are conducted [23, 60, 62]. In this study we examined what was known about the acute aquatic and mammalian toxicity of compounds used for hydraulic fracturing in California. As was found in previous studies, there are significant data gaps concerning what is known about the acute toxicity of chemicals used in the oil and gas industry [4, 29, 43, 55, 63, 64]. Toxicity data were not found for five of the most frequently used chemicals, and in many cases, a complete set of mammalian and aquatic acute toxicity measurements were not available (Table S2). In this study, we only assigned toxicity results to chemicals identified by CASRN, so many of the 20 the chemicals used in highest mass, which were reported by name only, are of unknown toxicity (Table S3). In other studies that were not limited to chemicals identified by CASRN, it was still found that significant data gaps concerning the understanding of chemical toxicity remained [43, 65].

Of the compounds for which CASRN and publically-available acute mammalian oral toxicity data were available, no compounds were identified as GHS category 1, which indicate the most toxic compounds. However, four compounds were identified as having a GHS category ranking of 2 and 18 compounds were identified as having a GHS category ranking of 3 for at

least one mammalian species (Table S4). Table S4 includes aldehydes, acids, bases, amines, and amides. Many of the additives in Table S4, including 2,2-dibromo-3-nitrilopropionamide and formaldehyde, are specifically added as biocides [44] and are therefore required to have toxicity testing under current regulation. Tetrakis hydroxymethyl-phosphonium sulfate is used to control sulfur reducing bacteria that induce production of corrosive hydrogen sulfide gas [44, 66]. Propargyl alcohol is widely used in oil and gas development as a corrosion inhibitor [33, 34, 67]. The majority of chemicals for which there were data fall into categories greater than GHS category 4 for acute oral toxicity to mammals, suggesting they are of lower priority for hazard and risk evaluation than the more toxic chemicals in Table S4.

The list of chemical additives most toxic to aquatic organisms (Table S5) differs from the list for mammalian toxicity (Table S4). Fourteen chemicals were identified as having a GHS category ranking of 1 and 23 were identified as having a GHS category ranking of 2 for at least one aquatic species (Table S5). The isothiazolone compounds—used as biocides—appear on this list as does the biocide 2,2-dibromo-3-nitrilopropionamide, however, many of the chemical additives most toxic to aquatic life are ethoxylated alcohol surfactants. There are several hydrocarbon products listed, which also have well-established toxicity profiles.

Important chemical additives that have CASRN, but were still missing toxicity data included 1,2-ethanediaminium, N1,N2-bis[2-[bis(2-hydroxyethyl)methylammonio]ethyl]-N1,N2-bis(2-hydroxyethyl)-N1,N2-dimethyl-,chloride (1:4), 2-Butoxypropan-1-ol, phenol polymer with formaldehyde, and 2-acrylamido-2-methylpropane sulfonate. Given the prevalent use of these chemical additives, toxicity data—including both mammalian and aquatic toxicity—should be obtained.

Environmental implications of chemical use

The use of large numbers of poorly characterized chemicals has raised public concerns about the environmental and human health impacts of oil and gas development using hydraulic fracturing [63, 64, 68]. In this paper we identified chemicals of concern based on the frequency of use, amounts used, and toxicological properties. This analysis indicates that biocides, corrosion inhibitors, and QACs are potential chemicals of concern and deserve further investigation. Biocides are subject to more regulation than other chemicals used in hydraulic fracturing and are typically more completely characterized than other industrial chemicals, but still further deserve scrutiny due to their designed toxicity, especially in the context of water treatment and reuse [69]. Corrosion inhibitors are widely used in oil and gas fields and corrosion inhibitors are known to have poor environmental profiles [33, 44]. QACs as a class should be further investigated based on their wide-spread and frequent use, potential aquatic toxicity, and poor characterization for properties related to environmental transport and persistence. QACs are important components of hydraulic fracturing fluid formulations. Sixteen unique QACs were identified that were used in 349 treatments. Of the 16 reported QACs, only nine were identified by CASRN.

Many other chemical additives used consist of nitrogen-containing compounds (QACs, amines, amides, ammonium salts, etc.). Twenty-four percent of the compounds reported contained nitrogen. The prevalence of nitrogen-containing compounds suggests that elevated nitrogen levels may be present in environmental waters that are impacted by hydraulic fracturing waste streams.

It is not known if chemicals injected during well stimulation will return to the surface with produced water, are bound in the subsurface, or are degraded [70]. Since analytical

techniques for analysis of these chemicals in water samples are still under development [71-74], there is very little direct information of the presence of fracturing chemicals or their degradation products in fluids returning to the surface. Most studies examining organic chemicals in produced water from wells that have been hydraulically fractured have found hydrocarbons naturally present in oil and gas formations [74-78] and some studies have found ethoxylated surfactants or their residuals [73, 77]. Understanding the fate of these material in the subsurface and in produced water will be critical for understanding the environmental impact of chemical use during oil and gas development.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the California Natural Resources Agency and the U.S. Bureau of Land Management, under Work for Others Agreements with the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) at LBNL, under contract number DE-AC02-05CH11231. We appreciate the cooperation and leadership of Jane Long and Laura Feinstein of the California Council on Science and Technology (CCST) in the execution of the SB4 Scientific Study.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Clark, A. Burnham, C. Harto, R. Horner, Hydraulic Fracturing and Shale Gas Production: Technology, Impacts, and Regulations, in: E.S. Division (Ed.), Argonne National Laboratory, 2013.
- [2] G.E. King, Hydraulic fracturing 101: What every representative, environmentalist, regulator, reporter, investor, university researcher, neighbor and engineer should know about estimating frac risk and improving frac performance in unconventional gas and oil wells, in: SPE Hydraulic Fracturing Technology Conference, Society of Petroleum Engineers, The Woodlands, Texas, February 6-8, 2012.
- [3] J.C.S. Long, L.C. Feinstein, J. Birkholzer, P. Jordan, J. Houseworth, P.F. Dobson, M. Heberger, D.L. Gautier, An Independent Scientific Assessment of Well Stimulation in California, Volume I: Well Stimulation Technologies and their Past, Present, and Potential

Future Use in California. ISBN Number: 978-1-930117-97-6, in, California Council on Science and Technology and Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Sacramento, CA, 2015.

[4] W.T. Stringfellow, J.K. Domen, M.K. Camarillo, W.L. Sandelin, S. Borglin, Physical, chemical, and biological characteristics of compounds used in hydraulic fracturing, *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 275 (2014) 37-54.

[5] M. Elsner, K. Hoelzer, Quantitative survey and structural classification of hydraulic fracturing chemicals reported in unconventional gas production, *Environmental Science & Technology*, 50 (2016) 3290-3314.

[6] J.C.S. Long, L.C. Feinstein, C.E. Bachmann, J.T. Birkholzer, M.K. Camarillo, J.K. Domen, W. Foxall, J.E. Houseworth, L. Jin, P.D. Jordan, N.J. Lindsey, R.L. Maddalena, T.E. McKone, D.E. Millstein, M.T. Reagan, W.L. Sandelin, W.T. Stringfellow, C. Varadharajan, H. Cooley, K. Donnelly, M.G. Heberger, J. Hays, S.B.C. Shonkoff, A. Brandt, J.G. Englander, A. Hamdoun, S.C.T. Nicklisch, R.J. Harrison, Z.S. Wettstein, J. Banbury, B.L. Cypher, S.E. Phillips., *An Independent Scientific Assessment of Well Stimulation in California Volume II: Potential Environmental Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing and Acid Stimulation*. (July 1) The California Council on Science and Technology, Sacramento, CA. ISBN Number: 978-1-930117-75-4., in, California Council on Science and Technology and Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Sacramento, CA, 2015.

[7] S.C. Long, Direct and indirect challenges for water quality from the hydraulic fracturing industry, *Journal American Water Works Association*, 106 (2014) 53-57.

[8] R. Jain, Natural resource development for science, technology, and environmental policy issues: the case of hydraulic fracturing, *Clean Technologies and Environmental Policy*, 17 (2015) 3-8.

[9] K. Gregory, A.M. Mohan, Current perspective on produced water management challenges during hydraulic fracturing for oil and gas recovery, *Environ. Chem.*, 12 (2015) 261-266.

[10] T.G. Burton, H.S. Rifai, Z.L. Hildenbrand, D.D. Carlton, B.E. Fontenot, K.A. Schug, Elucidating hydraulic fracturing impacts on ground water quality using a regional geospatial statistical modeling approach, *Science of the Total Environment*, 545 (2016) 114-126.

[11] A. Vengosh, R.B. Jackson, N. Warner, T.H. Darrah, A. Kondash, A critical review of the risks to water resources from unconventional shale gas development and hydraulic fracturing in the United States, *Environmental Science & Technology*, 48 (2014) 8334-8348.

[12] U.S. EPA, Analysis of Hydraulic Fracturing Fluid Data from the FracFocus Chemical Disclosure Registry 1.0: Data Management and Quality Assessment Report. EPA/601/R-14/006. , in, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C., 2015.

[13] California Council on Science and Technology (CCST), Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL), Pacific Institute, Advanced Well Stimulation Technologies in California: An Independent Review of Scientific and Technical Information, in, California Council on Science and Technology, Sacramento, CA, 2014.

[14] J. Houseworth, W.T. Stringfellow, A Case Study of California Offshore Petroleum Production, Well Stimulation, and Associated Environmental Impacts. In: An Independent Scientific Assessment of Well Stimulation in California, Volume III: Case Studies of Hydraulic Fracturing and Acid Stimulation in Select Regions: Offshore, Monterey Formation, Los Angeles Basin, and San Joaquin Basin. (July 1) The California Council on Science and Technology, Sacramento, CA. ISBN Number: 978-1-930117-70-9., in, 2015.

[15] US EIA, California State Energy Profile, in, Energy Information Administration, Washington, D.C., 2014.

[16] FracFocus, FracFocus Chemical Disclosure Registry, Ground Water Protection Council and Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission, <http://fracfocus.org>, Accessed March 8, 2013, 2013.

[17] SCAQMD, Notification and Reporting Requirements for Oil and Gas Wells and Chemical Suppliers, in: Rule 1148.2, South Coast Air Quality Management District, 2013.

[18] J.C.S. Long, L.C. Feinstein, J.T. Birkholzer, W. Foxall, J.E. Houseworth, P.D. Jordan, N.J. Lindsey, R.L. Maddalena, T.E. McKone, W.T. Stringfellow, C. Ulrich, M.G. Heberger, S.B.C. Shonkoff, A. Brandt, K. Ferrar, D.L. Gautier, S.E. Phillips, B.K. Greenfield, M.L.B. Jerrett, An Independent Scientific Assessment of Well Stimulation in California Volume III. Case Studies of Hydraulic Fracturing and Acid Stimulation in Select Regions: Offshore, Monterey Formation, Los Angeles Basin, and San Joaquin Basin. ISBN Number: 978-1-930117-70-9, in, California Council on Science and Technology and Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, CCST, Sacramento, CA, 2015.

[19] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA), ECOTOXicology Database (ECOTOX), Release 4.0, in, 2013.

[20] C.A. Service, SciFinder, in, American Chemical Society, Columbus, OH, 2014.

[21] National Library of Medicine, Hazardous Substances Data Bank: A TOXNET Database, in, National Institute of Health, 2013.

- [22] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA), Toxic Substance Control Act Test Submissions (TSCATS) 2.0, in, 2014.
- [23] European Chemicals Agency (ECHA), International Uniform Chemical Information Database (IUCLID), CD-ROM Year 2000 Edition, 2000.
- [24] R.J. Lewis, N.I. Sax, Sax's Dangerous Properties of Industrial Materials, 9th ed., Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York, NY, 1996.
- [25] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA), ACToR (Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource) Database, in, 2013.
- [26] National Library of Medicine, ChemIDplus Advanced: A TOXNET Database. <http://chem.sis.nlm.nih.gov/chemidplus/>, in, National Institute of Health, Bethesda, MD, 2013.
- [27] Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Screening Information Data Set (SIDS) for High Volume Chemicals, in, 2007.
- [28] United Nations, Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS), 4th Revised Edition, in, New York and Geneva, 2013.
- [29] K. Abdullah, T. Malloy, M.K. Stenstrom, I.H. Suffet, Toxicity of acidization fluids used in California oil exploration, Toxicological and Environmental Chemistry, DOI: 10.1080/02772248.2016.1160285, (2016).
- [30] J.F. Gadberry, M.D. Hoey, R. Franklin, G. del Carmen Vale, F. Mozayeni, Surfactants for Hydraulic Fracturing Compositions, in, Akzo Nobel Nv, U.S.A., 1999.
- [31] U.S. EPA, Chapter 4: Hydraulic Fracturing Fluids, in: Evaluation of Impacts to Underground Sources of Drinking Water by Hydraulic Fracturing of Coalbed Methane Reservoirs. EPA 816-R-04-003, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C., 2004.
- [32] Baker Hughes Oilfield Operations Inc., Updated Master Fracturing Chemical List. Disclosure to Arkansas Oil and Gas Commission., in: K.L. Chandler (Ed.), Arkansas Oil and Gas Commission, El Dorado, Arkansas (http://aogc2.state.ar.us/B-19/1075_ChemConst.pdf), 2014.
- [33] M. Finsgar, J. Jackson, Application of corrosion inhibitors for steels in acidic media for the oil and gas industry: A review, Corrosion Science, 86 (2014) 17-41.

- [34] G. Schmitt, Application of inhibitors for acid media - Report prepared for the European Federation of Corrosion Working Party on Inhibitors, British Corrosion Journal, 19 (1984) 165-176.
- [35] G.A. Miller, E.D. Weiler, Stabilization of solutions of 3-isothiazolones, in, Rohm and Haas Company, U.S.A., 1978.
- [36] Scientific Committee on Consumer Safety, Opinion on the mixture of 5-chloro-2-methylisothiazolin-3(2H)-one and 2-methylisothiazolin-3(2H)-one (COLIPA n° P56), in: D.-G.f.H.C. European Commission (Ed.), European Commission, Directorate-General for Health & Consumers, Brussels, 2009.
- [37] C.D. Armstrong, H. Le, B. Rajappa, Q. Qu, Sulfates and phosphates as allosteric effectors in mannanohydrolase enzyme breakers, in: U.S.P. Office (Ed.), Baker Hughes Incorporated, USA, 2014.
- [38] M.K. Pakulski, D.V.S. Gupta, High temperature gel stabilizer for fracturing fluids, in: U.S.P. Office (Ed.), The Western Company Of North America, USA, 1994.
- [39] Halliburton Energy Services, GEL-STA L Stabilizer Material Safety Data Sheet, in, Halliburton Energy Services, Duncan, Oklahoma, 2010.
- [40] D.V.S. Gupta, J.W. Kirk, Method for inhibiting or controlling formation of inorganic scales, in: U. S. Patent Office, BJ Services Company, Houston, TX Uniter States, 2009.
- [41] M. Greene, J. Lu, Enhanced retention capabilities through methods comprising surface treatment of functional particulate carrier materials, and functional particulate carrier materials made therefrom in: U.S.P. Office (Ed.), World Minerals, Inc., USA, 2010.
- [42] Bri-Chem Supply Ltd., X-Cide 207 Material Safety Data Sheet, in, Bri-Chem Supply Ltd., Calgary, Alberta, 2013.
- [43] U.S. EPA, Assessment of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing for Oil and Gas on Drinking Water Resources (External Review Draft). EPA/600/R-15/047, in, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C., 2015.
- [44] G.A. Kahrilas, J. Blotevogel, P.S. Stewart, T. Borch, Biocides in hydraulic fracturing fluids: A critical review of their usage, mobility, degradation, and toxicity, Environmental Science & Technology, 49 (2015) 16-32.

- [45] D.J. Poelker, J.M. Arnold, J.A. Schield, High molecular weight polyamine salts as clay stabilizing agents, in: W. US Patent Office, D.C. (Ed.), Baker Hughes Incorporated, Houston, TX, United States, 2010.
- [46] Baker Hughes, Claymaster 5-C Material Safety Data Sheet, in, Baker Huges, Welshpool , WA, Austraila, 2011.
- [47] J.K. Fink, Petroleum Engineer's Guide to Oil Field Chemicals and Fluids, Gulf Professional Publishing, Elsevier, Tokyo, 2012.
- [48] FracFocus, What Chemicals are Used?, Ground Water Protection Council and Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission, <http://fracfocus.org/chemical-use/what-chemicals-are-used>, Accessed March 8, 2013, 2013.
- [49] D.V.S. Gupta, P. Carman, Non-damaging fracturing fluids and methods for their use, in, U.S. Patent Office, 2011.
- [50] Baker Hughes, GW-3LDF Material Safety Data Sheet, in, Tomball, Texas, 2008.
- [51] Santrol Proppants, Resin Coated Sand Material Safety Data Sheet, in, Santrol Proppants, Fresno, TX, 2011.
- [52] Halliburton Energy Services, ACFRAC SB EXCEL Proppant Material Safety Data Sheet, in, Halliburton Energy Services, Duncan, Oklahoma, 2011.
- [53] M. Zoveidavianpoor, A. Gharibi, Application of polymers for coating of proppant in hydraulic fracturing of subterraneous formations: A comprehensive review, Journal of Natural Gas Science and Engineering, 24 (2015) 197-209.
- [54] NYS DEC, Revised Draft Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement on the Oil, Gas and Solution Mining Regulatory Program, Well Permit Issuance for Horizontal Drilling And High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing in the Marcellus Shale and Other Low-Permeability Gas Reservoirs, in, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Albany, NY, 2011.
- [55] NYS DPH, A Public Health Review of High Volume Hydraulic Fracturing for Shale Gas Development, in, New York State Deptatment of Public Health, Albany, NY, 2014.
- [56] G. Konnecker, J. Regelman, S. Belanger, K. Gamon, R. Sedlak, Environmental properties and aquatic hazard assessment of anionic surfactants: Physico-chemical, environmental fate and ecotoxicity properties, Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety, 74 (2011) 1445-1460.

- [57] M.A. Lewis, The Effects of Mixtures and Other Environmental Modifying Factors on the toxicities of surfactants to fresh-water and marine life, *Water Research*, 26 (1992) 1013-1023.
- [58] G.G. Ying, Fate, behavior and effects of surfactants and their degradation products in the environment, *Environment International*, 32 (2006) 417-431.
- [59] T.H. Hutchinson, N. Shillabeer, M.J. Winter, D.B. Pickford, Acute and chronic effects of carrier solvents in aquatic organisms: A critical review, *Aquatic Toxicology*, 76 (2006) 69-92.
- [60] N. Kreuzinger, M. Fuerhacker, S. Scharf, M. Uhl, O. Gans, B. Grillitsch, Methodological approach towards the environmental significance of uncharacterized substances - quaternary ammonium compounds as an example, *Desalination*, 215 (2007) 209-222.
- [61] M.T. García, I. Ribosa, T. Guindulain, J. Sánchez-Leal, J. Vives-Rego, Fate and effect of monoalkyl quaternary ammonium surfactants in the aquatic environment, *Environmental Pollution*, 111 (2001) 169-175.
- [62] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Alternatives Assessment Criteria for Hazard Evaluation, Version 2.0, in: O.o.P.P.T. Design for the Environment Program (Ed.), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C., 2011.
- [63] E.V. Wattenberg, J.M. Bielicki, A.E. Suchomel, J.T. Sweet, E.M. Vold, G. Ramachandran, Assessment of the acute and chronic health hazards of hydraulic fracturing fluids, *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Hygiene*, 12 (2015) 611-624.
- [64] J.D. Rogers, T.L. Burke, S.G. Osborn, J.N. Ryan, A framework for identifying organic compounds of concern in hydraulic fracturing fluids based on their mobility and persistence in groundwater, *Environmental Science & Technology Letters*, 2 (2015) 158-164.
- [65] S.B.C. Shonkoff, R.L. Maddalena, J. Hays, W. Stringfellow, Z.S. Wettstein, R. Harrison, W. Sandelin, T.E. McKone, Chapter 6: Potential Impacts of Well Stimulation on Human Health in California In: An Independent Scientific Assessment of Well Stimulation in California, Volume II: Generic and Potential Environmental Impacts of Well Stimulation Treatments, in, The California Council on Science and Technology, Sacramento, CA, 2015.
- [66] C.G. Struchtemeyer, M.D. Morrison, M.S. Elshahed, A critical assessment of the efficacy of biocides used during the hydraulic fracturing process in shale natural gas wells, *International Biodeterioration & Biodegradation*, 71 (2012) 15-21.
- [67] C. Perry, S.C. Crema, P. Davis, Adducts of propargyl alcohol and their use as corrosion inhibitors in acidizing systems. EP0239770 A1, in, Google Patents, 1987.

- [68] T. Hurley, G. Chhipi-Shrestha, A. Gheisi, K. Hewage, R. Sadiq, Characterizing hydraulic fracturing fluid greenness: application of a hazard-based index approach, *Clean Technologies and Environmental Policy*, 18 (2016) 647-668.
- [69] M.K. Camarillo, J.K. Domen, W.T. Stringfellow, Physical-chemical evaluation of hydraulic fracturing chemicals in the context of produced water treatment, *Journal of Environmental Management* (in press), (2016).
- [70] W.T. Stringfellow, H. Cooley, C. Varadharajan, M. Heberger, M. Reagan, J.K. Domen, W. Sandelin, M.K. Camarillo, P. Jordan, K. Donnelly, S. Nicklisch, A. Hamdoun, J. Houseworth, Chapter 2: Impacts of Well Stimulation on Water Resources, in: *An Independent Scientific Assessment of Well Stimulation in California, Volume II: Generic and Potential Environmental Impacts of Well Stimulation Treatments*, California Council on Science and Technology, Sacramento, CA, 2015.
- [71] B.K. Esser, H.R. Beller, S.A. Carroll, J.A. Cherry, J.M. Gillespie, R.B. Jackson, P.D. Jordan, V. Madrid, B.L. Parker, W.T. Stringfellow, C. Varadharajan, A. Vengosh, Recommendations on Model Criteria for Groundwater Sampling, Testing, and Monitoring of Oil and Gas Development in California, LLNL-TR-669645, in, *Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory*, Livermore, CA, 2015.
- [72] I. Ferrer, E.M. Thurman, Analysis of hydraulic fracturing additives by LC/Q-TOF-MS, *Analytical and Bioanalytical Chemistry*, 407 (2015) 6417-6428.
- [73] E.M. Thurman, I. Ferrer, J. Blotvogel, T. Borch, Analysis of hydraulic fracturing flowback and produced waters using accurate mass: Identification of ethoxylated surfactants, *Analytical Chemistry*, 86 (2014) 9653-9661.
- [74] I. Ferrer, E.M. Thurman, Chemical constituents and analytical approaches for hydraulic fracturing waters, *Trends in Environmental Analytical Chemistry*, 5 (2015) 18-25.
- [75] S.J. Maguire-Boyle, A.R. Barron, Organic compounds in produced waters from shale gas wells, *Environmental Science-Processes & Impacts*, 16 (2014) 2237-2248.
- [76] W. Orem, C. Tatu, M. Varonka, H. Lerch, A. Bates, M. Engle, L. Crosby, J. McIntosh, Organic substances in produced and formation water from unconventional natural gas extraction in coal and shale, *International Journal of Coal Geology*, 126 (2014) 20-31.
- [77] Y. Lester, I. Ferrer, E.M. Thurman, K.A. Sitterley, J.A. Korak, G. Aiken, K.G. Linden, Characterization of hydraulic fracturing flowback water in Colorado: Implications for water treatment, *Science of the Total Environment*, 512 (2015) 637-644.

[78] L.C. Strong, T. Gould, L. Kasinkas, M.J. Sadowsky, A. Aksan, L.P. Wackett, Biodegradation in waters from hydraulic fracturing: chemistry, microbiology, and engineering, *Journal of Environmental Engineering*, 140 (2014).

Figure 1. Frequency distribution of the number of unique components used per hydraulic fracturing operation in California. Based on complete records (N=39,669), consisting of 1,406 treatments.

Figure 2. Frequency distribution of the quantity of water used per hydraulic fracturing operation in California. Based on complete records (N=39,669), consisting of 1,406 treatments.

Figure 3. Number of hydraulic fracturing treatments reported in California that used a specified number of uniquely identified components, as classified by chemical category. Based on complete records (N=39,669), consisting of 1,406 treatments.

Table 1. Hydraulic fracturing chemical use in California by function, where function was positively identified.^a

Function	Chemicals in each function	Chemical categories represented^b	Treatments using chemicals with this function
Breaker	11	4	1,599
Proppant	20	1	1,598
Gelling Agent	2	1	1,593
Biocide	10	6	1,516
Carrier	23	5	1,515
Crosslinker	13	5	1,503
Clay Control	7	4	1,184
Scale Inhibitor	19	6	971
Iron Control	8	4	262
Corrosion Inhibitor	10	5	102
Friction Reducer	3	3	43
Diverting Agent	3	3	10
Antifoam	1	1	6

^aBased on all records (N=45,058), consisting of 1,623 treatments.

^bChemical categories are listed in Table 2.

Table 2. Hydraulic fracturing chemical use in California by class.^a

Category	Chemicals in each category^{b,c}	Treatments reporting using chemicals in this category
Mineral solids	29	1,611
Solvents	50	1,604
Carbohydrates	7	1,599
Water	6	1,579
Surfactants	84	1,546
Ammonium compounds	24	1,489
Boron compounds	10	1,488
Oxidizing agents	6	1,481
Amines and amides	33	1,446
Strong bases	2	1,428
Mineral salts	10	1,409
Enzymes	5	1,368
Isothiazolones	2	1,187
Phosphorus compounds	12	990
Polymers	21	308
Carbonate compounds	4	282
Chelating agents	8	264
Carboxylic compounds	5	251
Resins	9	229
Unknown	15	192
Aldehydes	4	136
Nutrient mixtures	3	115
Organic compounds, misc.	3	103
Reducing agents	9	60
Strong acids	4	44
Organosilicons	9	18

^aBased on all records (N=45,058), consisting of 1,623 treatments.^bOf 380 unique components, 304 were placed in one category and 34 were placed in two categories.

Table 3. Types of solvents used for hydraulic fracturing in California.^a

Category	Chemicals in each category^b	Treatments using chemicals in this category
Hydrocarbons	11	1,404
Glycols	4	1,292
Glycol ethers	9	1,284
Alcohols	8	518
Aromatic hydrocarbons	12	127
Esters	3	90
Cyclic hydrocarbons	2	7
Ethers	1	1

^aBased on all records (N=45,058), consisting of 1,623 treatments.

Table 4. Types of surfactants used for hydraulic fracturing in California.^a

Category	Chemicals in each category^b	Treatments using chemicals in this category	Chemicals identified as biodegradable (%)	Chemicals missing toxicity data (%)
Nonionic	38	1,495	22	76
Cationic	16	354	6	94
Anionic	20	210	33	67
Unspecified	6	168	0	100
Amphoteric	4	53	33	67

^aBased on all records (N=45,058), consisting of 1,623 treatments.