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Abstract

Marcellus Shale exploration and production operations in Pennsylvania generate large quantities of flowback and produced water. With continued Marcellus shale development, as well as Genesee/Burket Shale and Utica Shale exploration, Pennsylvania is poised to be a major player in shale development for decades to come. Although there is a strong increasing trend in recycling, not all flowback and produced waters can be cost-effectively recycled due to water chemistry, a specific company's lack of a nearby new well or pad at which the water can be recycled and other factors. Brine disposal wells have an important role to play in managing such waters in a cost-effective and environmentally protective manner. The need for brine disposal wells in Pennsylvania is expected to increase as the Marcellus and other shale plays mature and potentially tens of thousands of new wells begin generating produced water on a daily basis. Although currently there are only seven permitted brine disposal wells operating in Pennsylvania, with only two of these being commercial wells, there is potential to develop many additional brine disposal wells within or near Marcellus Shale fields and other producing areas.

The authors will provide an overview of the status of currently permitted brine disposal wells in Pennsylvania and nearby states, most of which have substantially more wells than Pennsylvania. Potential target formations for brine disposal in Pennsylvania will be discussed along with procedures for identifying and evaluating specific candidate injection well sites. An overview of EPA brine disposal well permit application procedures will also be presented along with a summary of well construction and operating requirements. A case study on the Bear Lake Properties commercial injection well facility, which injects into depleted Medina/Whirlpool Sandstone intervals, will be included. Ranges in capital and operation and maintenance (O&M) costs and the economics of utilizing brine disposal wells relative to other available options (e.g., water treatment plants) will also be discussed.
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Marcellus Shale exploration and production operations in Pennsylvania generate large quantities of flowback and produced water. With continued Marcellus Shale development, as well as Geneseo/Burket Shale and Utica Shale exploration and production, there is a strong increasing trend in drilling, most of which have no infrastructure to handle the water. This water is typically not effectively recycled due to water chemistry, a lack of nearby new wells, or other factors.

Brine disposal wells have an important role to play in managing such waters in a cost-effective and environmentally-protective manner. The need for brine disposal wells in Pennsylvania is expected to increase as the Marcellus and other shale plays mature as well as other producing areas.

Although currently there are only seven permitted brine disposal wells operating in Pennsylvania, with only two of these being commercial wells, there is potential to develop many additional brine disposal wells in Marcellus Shale fields and other producing areas.

The authors will provide an overview of the status of currently permitted brine disposal wells in Pennsylvania and nearby states, most of which have substantially more wells than Pennsylvania. Potential target formations for brine disposal in Pennsylvania will be discussed along with procedures for identifying and evaluating specific candidate injection well sites. An overview of EPA brine disposal well permit application procedures will also be presented along with a summary of well construction and operating requirements. Case studies of the Bear Lake Properties commercial injection well facility will also be presented with ranges in capital and operation and maintenance (O&M) costs and the economics of utilizing brine disposal wells relative to other available options (e.g., water treatment plants) will also be discussed.

EPA UIC Well Permit Application

- Define Area of Review/Zone of Endangerment
- USDW Description
- Geologic conditions related to Induced Seismicity
- Injection well construction
- Well operation including maximum injection pressure and rates
- Plugging and abandonment
- Financial Responsibility

UIC Permit - Area of Review

Plan View of Area of Review
Comparison of PA, OH and WV UIC Class II D Well Permitting

State | Primary Area of Review (AOR) | Maximum Injection Pressure (SIP) Data | Sensitivity Evaluations | Approved Timeframes
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
PA | EPM | Calculated based on 30-year capillary pressure. Default low.
 | | SIP from PA consider 30% of brine final gradient at 6 months to 20 months.
 | | No SIP review.
OH | States | <2000 MDAH - 3/4 mi, 2000 MDAH - 1/2 mi
 | | Permeability of 0.75 pcf/s
 | | Yes, 5 to 6 months.
WV | States | 1/4 mi or calculated
 | | Permeability of 0.8 pcf/s. 80% of injection pressure may be approved
 | | Yes, 3 to 6 months.

Case Study: Bear Lake Properties Brine Disposal Permits
Warren County, Pennsylvania

Summary of Bear Lake Brine Disposal Properties
- Depleted Medina/Whirlpool gas well field
- Over 11,000 acres
- 2 Commercial UIC Well permits, currently accepting brine for disposal, with a third well being permitted
- 30,000 bbl/mo/well permitted capacity
- Thru May 2014, 120,000 Bbls. brine disposed of at ~700 Bbls. per day (not operating at full capacity)
- Approx. 20 wells could potentially be converted to injection
- Est. 300 million Bbls. capacity within the potential injection field

INJECTIVITY TESTING
- Step-Rate Test -- Establish optimal rate for constant rate test -- SIP data can help regarding Maximum Injection Pressure (MIP)
- Constant Rate Test -- Injection -- establish radial flow -- Pressure Fall-off monitoring -- Data Evaluation - permeability, injection pressures, rates, AOR, boundaries, etc.
- Valuable tool but may have limitations in predicting long term performance

Brine Disposal Wells - $/Bbl Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Cost ($1000s)</th>
<th>O&amp;M ($1000s)</th>
<th>Total Cost 15 years ($1000s)</th>
<th>500 Bbl/d</th>
<th>1000 Bbl/d</th>
<th>2000 Bbl/d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3250</td>
<td>$1.67</td>
<td>$0.83</td>
<td>$0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3750</td>
<td>$1.92</td>
<td>$0.96</td>
<td>$0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4250</td>
<td>$2.18</td>
<td>$1.09</td>
<td>$0.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Assumes 260 operating days per year

INJECTION MAPPING: Medina Sandstone
Net Reservoir Using an 8% Porosity Cut-off

SUMMARY OF BEAR LAKE SWD FIELD
- The two-well field is conveniently located within the Marcellus and Utica Shale fairways.
- Injection interval includes the Medina and Whirlpool Sandstones.
- The Silurian Salina Group (salts and anhydrites) serve as a confining interval for disposal.
- The field is currently in operation, taking brines from oil and gas production operations.

CONCLUSIONS
- Strong understanding of the reservoir system is key to geologic siting of a possible SWD project.
- Geologic insight into the structural geology, as it relates to possible seismicity issues.
- Can be a very cost-effective and safe option for brine disposal management
- Underutilized in PA — only 10 wells permitted with many additional wells needed
- There are various potential injection targets which may vary locally/regionally
- Depleted oil or gas wells/fields can be "low hanging fruit"
- Siting and public education strategies may help in addressing public opposition issues
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