



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 to
Develop the Marcellus Shale and Other
Low-Permeability Gas Reservoirs**

Lead Agency:

NYSDEC, 625 Broadway, Albany, NY 12233

Lead Agency Contact:

**Eugene Leff
NYSDEC, 625 Broadway, 14th Floor
Albany, NY 12233
(518) 402-8044**

Action Location: **Statewide**

Comments Due By: **December 12, 2011**

Prepared By:

NYSDEC, with Assistance from Alpha Environmental, Inc., Ecology and Environment Engineering, P.C., ICF International, URS Corp, NTC Consultants and Sammons/Dutton LLC.

Date of Completion of dSGEIS: **September 30, 2009**

Date of Completion of Revised dSGEIS: **September 7, 2011**

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 to
Develop the Marcellus Shale and Other
Low-Permeability Gas Reservoirs

Prepared By:

NYSDEC DIVISION OF WATER

NYSDEC DIVISION OF AIR RESOURCES

NYSDEC DIVISION OF LANDS AND FORESTS

NYSDEC DIVISION OF FISH, WILDLIFE & MARINE RESOURCES

Coordinated and Edited By:

NYSDEC DIVISION OF MINERAL RESOURCES

Assisted By:

Ecology and Environment Engineering, P.C.

NEW YORK STATE ENERGY RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY*

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
Bureau of Water Supply Protection
Bureau of Toxic Substance Assessment
Bureau of Environmental Radiation Protection

NYSDEC OFFICE OF CLIMATE CHANGE
NYSDEC DIVISION OF MATERIALS MANAGEMENT
NYSDEC DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS
NYSDEC DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION

* NYSERDA research assistance for September 2009 draft SGEIS contracted to Alpha Environmental Inc., ICF International, URS Corporation and NTC Consultants. NYSERDA research assistance for 2011 revised draft contracted to Alpha Geological Services, Inc., URS Corporation, NTC Consultants and Sammons/Dutton LLC.

This page intentionally left blank.

New York State



Executive Summary

Revised Draft
Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement

This page intentionally left blank.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

High-volume hydraulic fracturing is a well stimulation technique that has greatly increased the ability to extract natural gas from very tight rock. High-volume hydraulic fracturing, which is often used in conjunction with horizontal drilling and multi-well pad development, is an approach to extracting natural gas in New York that raises new, potentially significant, adverse impacts not studied in 1992 in the Department of Environmental Conservation's (Department or DEC) previous Generic Environmental Impact Statement (1992 GEIS) on the Oil, Gas and Solution Mining Regulatory Program.¹ Increased production of domestic natural gas resources from deep underground shale deposits in other parts of the country has dramatically altered future energy supply projections and has the promise of lowering costs for users and purchasers of this energy commodity.

High-volume hydraulic fracturing is distinct from other types of well completion that have been allowed in the State under the 1992 GEIS and Department permits due to the much larger volumes of water and additives used to conduct hydraulic fracturing operations. The use of high-volume hydraulic fracturing with horizontal well drilling technology provides for a number of wells to be drilled from a single well pad (multi-pad wells). Although horizontal drilling results in fewer well pads than traditional vertical well drilling, the pads are larger and the industrial activity taking place on the pads is more intense. Also, hydraulic fracturing requires chemical additives, some of which may pose hazards when highly concentrated. The extra water associated with such drilling may also result in significant adverse impacts relating to water supplies, wastewater treatment and disposal and truck traffic. Horizontal wells also generate greater volumes of drilling waste (cuttings). The industry projections of the level of drilling, as

¹ The Generic Environmental Impact Statement (1992 GEIS) on the Oil, Gas and Solution Mining Regulatory Program is posted on the Department's website at <http://www.dec.ny.gov/energy/45912.html>. The 1992 GEIS includes an analysis of impacts from vertical gas drilling as well as hydraulic fracturing. Since 1992 the Department has used the 1992 GEIS as the basis of its State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) review for permit applications for gas drilling in New York State.

reflected in the intense development activity in neighboring Pennsylvania, has raised additional concerns relating to community character and socioeconomics.

General Background

In New York, the primary target for shale-gas development is currently the Marcellus Shale, with the deeper Utica Shale also identified as a potential resource. Additional low-permeability reservoirs may be considered by project sponsors for development by high-volume hydraulic fracturing. The Department has received applications for permits to drill horizontal wells to evaluate and develop the Marcellus Shale for natural gas production by high-volume hydraulic fracturing.

The Department has prepared this revised draft Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement (draft SGEIS, dSGEIS, or draft Supplement) to satisfy the requirements of the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) by studying the new technique and identifying potential new significant adverse impacts for these anticipated operations. Additionally, the Department prepared this draft SGEIS to satisfy the requirements of the SEQRA for the future enactment of revisions or additions to the Department's regulations associated with high-volume hydraulic fracturing. In reviewing and processing permit applications for high-volume hydraulic fracturing in these deep, low-permeability formations, the Department would apply the requirements contained within regulations, along with the final SGEIS and the findings drawn from it, including criteria and conditions for future approvals, in conjunction with the 1992 GEIS.

The final SGEIS will apply statewide, except in areas that the Department proposes should be off-limits to surface drilling for natural gas using high-volume hydraulic fracturing technology. As explained below, these areas include the watersheds associated with unfiltered water supplied to the New York City and Syracuse areas pursuant to Filtration Avoidance Determinations issued by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), reforestation areas, wildlife management areas, and "primary" aquifers as defined by State regulations, and additional setback and buffer areas. Forest Preserve land in the Adirondacks and Catskills is already off-limits to natural gas development pursuant to the New York State Constitution.

SEQRA Procedure to Date

The public process to develop the dSGEIS began with public scoping sessions in the autumn of 2008. Since then, engineers, geologists and other scientists and specialists in all of the Department's natural resources and environmental quality programs have collaborated to comprehensively analyze a vast amount of information about the proposed operations and the potential significant adverse impacts of these operations on the environment, identify mitigation measures that would prevent or minimize any significant adverse impacts, and identify criteria and conditions for future permit approvals and other regulatory action.

In September 2009, the Department issued a dSGEIS (2009 dSGEIS) for public review and comment. The extensive public comments revealed a significant concern with potential contamination of groundwater and surface drinking water supplies that could result from this new technology. Concerns raised included comments that the 2009 dSGEIS did not fully study the potential for gas migration from this new stimulation technique, or adequately consider impacts from disposal of solid and liquid wastes. Additionally, commenters stated the 2009 dSGEIS did not contain sufficient consideration of visual, noise, traffic, community character or socioeconomic impacts. Accordingly, in 2010 Governor Paterson ordered the Department to issue a revised dSGEIS on or about June 1, 2011. The Executive Order also provided that no permits authorizing high-volume hydraulic fracturing would be issued until the SGEIS was finalized.

Since the issuance of the 2009 draft SGEIS, the Department has gained a more detailed understanding of the potential impacts associated with horizontal drilling from: (i) the extensive public comments from environmental organizations, municipalities, industry groups and other members of the public; (ii) its review of reports and studies of proposed operations prepared by industry groups; (iii) extensive consultations with scientists in several bureaus within the New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH); (iv) the use of outside consulting firms to prepare analyses relating to socioeconomic impacts, as well as impacts on community character, visual, noise and traffic impacts; and, (v) its review of information and data from the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP) and the Susquehanna River Basin Commission (SRBC) about events, regulations, enforcement and other matters associated with

ongoing Marcellus Shale development in Pennsylvania. In June 2011, moreover, Commissioner Joseph Martens and Department staff visited a well pad in LeRoy, Pennsylvania, where contaminants had discharged from the well pad into an adjacent stream, and had further conversations with industry representatives and public officials about that event and high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations in Pennsylvania generally.

The Draft SGEIS

The draft SGEIS contains revised and additional analyses relating to high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations compared to the 2009 dSGEIS and the preliminary draft released earlier this year. The draft SGEIS, which is summarized below, supersedes those earlier versions and the expectation is that public comment will focus on the revisions made since the 2009 dSGEIS. For ease of comparison by the public, this document underscores revised or additional discussion from the 2009 draft, and indicates where text from the 2009 draft has been omitted.

Chapter 1 – Introduction

This Chapter contains an introduction to the dSGEIS. The Chapter summarizes the changes in high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations seen since the 2009 SGEIS, describes the methodology of this environmental review, and highlights enhanced mitigation and new precautionary measures incorporated into the document.

Chapter 2 – Description of Proposed Action

This Chapter includes a discussion of the purpose, public need and benefit of proposed high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations, as well as the potential locations, projected activity levels and environmental setting for such operations. Information on the environmental setting focuses on topics determined during scoping to require attention in the SGEIS. The Department has determined, based on industry projections, that it may receive applications to drill approximately 1,700 - 2,500 horizontal and vertical wells for development of the Marcellus Shale by high-volume hydraulic fracturing during a “peak development” year. An average year may see 1,600 or more applications. Development of the Marcellus Shale in New York may occur over a 30-year period. Those peak and average levels of development are the assumptions

upon which the analyses contained in this dSGEIS are based. A consultant to the Department has completed a draft estimate of the potential economic and public benefits of proposed high-volume hydraulic fracturing development, including an analysis based on an average development scenario as well as a more conservative low potential development scenario. That analysis calculates for each scenario the total economic value to the proposed operations, potential state and local tax revenue, and projected total job creation.

Chapter 3 – Proposed SEQRA Review Process

This Chapter describes how the Department intends to use the 1992 GEIS and the final SGEIS in reviewing applications to conduct high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations in New York State. It describes the proposed Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) addendum requirements that would be used in connection with high-volume hydraulic fracturing applications, and also identifies those potential activities that would require site-specific SEQRA determinations of significance after the SGEIS is completed. Specifically, Chapter 3 states that site-specific environmental assessments and SEQRA determinations of significance would be required for the following types of high-volume hydraulic fracturing applications, regardless of the target formation, the number of wells drilled on the pad and whether the wells are vertical or horizontal:

- 1) Any proposed high-volume hydraulic fracturing where the top of the target fracture zone is shallower than 2,000 feet along a part of the proposed length of the wellbore;
- 2) Any proposed high-volume hydraulic fracturing where the top of the target fracture zone at any point along the entire proposed length of the wellbore is less than 1,000 feet below the base of a known fresh water supply;
- 3) Any proposed well pad within the boundaries of a principal aquifer, or outside but within 500 feet of the boundaries of a principal aquifer;
- 4) Any proposed well pad within 150 feet of a perennial or intermittent stream, storm drain, lake or pond;
- 5) A proposed surface water withdrawal that is found not to be consistent with the Department's preferred passby flow methodology as described in Chapter 7; and

- 6) Any proposed well location determined by the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP) to be within 1,000 feet of its subsurface water supply infrastructure.

In all of the aforementioned circumstances a site-specific SEQRA assessment is required because such application is either beyond the scope of the analyses contained in this draft SGEIS or the Department has determined that proposed activities in these areas raise environmental issues that necessitate a site-specific review.

Chapter 3 also identifies the Department's oil and gas well regulations, located at 6 NYCRR Part 550, and it discusses the existence of other regulations and mitigation measures described in this draft SGEIS related to high-volume hydraulic fracturing. For a number of these measures, the Department will propose revisions or additions to its regulations. This chapter discusses how proposed revisions and additions to regulations are part of the environmental review of this draft SGEIS and how the State Administrative Procedure Act process for rulemaking will consider additional impacts of these regulatory actions. These two processes will ensure full review of the proposed environmental controls for high-volume hydraulic fracturing.

Chapter 4 - Geology

Chapter 4 supplements the geology discussion in the 1992 GEIS (Chapter 5) with additional details about the Marcellus and Utica Shales, seismicity in New York State, naturally occurring radioactive materials (NORM) in the Marcellus Shale and naturally occurring methane in New York State. Chapter 4 does not contain significant revisions or additions from the 2009 dSGEIS.

Chapter 5 - Natural Gas Development Activities & High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing

This Chapter comprehensively describes the activities associated with high-volume hydraulic fracturing and multi-well pad drilling, including the composition of hydraulic fracturing additives and flowback water characteristics. It is based on the most recent up-to-date description of proposed activities provided by industry and informed by high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations currently ongoing in Pennsylvania and elsewhere. In this Chapter, the average disturbance associated with a multi-well pad, access road and proportionate infrastructure during the drilling and fracturing stage is estimated at 7.4 acres, compared to the

average disturbance associated with a well pad for a single vertical well during the drilling and fracturing stage, which is estimated at 4.8 acres. As a result of required partial reclamation, the average well pad would generally be reduced to averages of about 5.5 acres and 4.5 acres, respectively, during the production phase.

This Chapter describes the process for constructing access roads, and observes that because most shale gas development would consist of several wells on a multi-well pad, more than one well would be serviced by a single access road instead of one well per access road as was typically the case when the 1992 GEIS was prepared. Therefore, in areas developed by horizontal drilling using multi-well pads, it is expected that fewer access roads as a function of the number of wells would be constructed. Industry estimates that 90% of the wells used to develop the Marcellus Shale would be horizontal wells located on multi-well pads. This method provides the most flexibility to avoid environmentally sensitive locations within the acreage to be developed.

With respect to overall land disturbance from a horizontal drilling, there would be a larger surface area used for an individual multi-well pad. This would be more than offset, however, by the fewer total number of well pads required within a given area and the need for only a single access road and gas gathering system to service multiple wells on a single pad. Overall, there clearly is a smaller total area of land disturbance associated with horizontal wells for shale gas development than that for vertical wells. For example, a spacing of 40 acres per well for vertical shale gas wells would result in, on average, 70 – 80 acres of disturbance for the well pads, access roads and utility corridors (4.8 acres per well) to develop an area of 640 acres. A single well pad with 6 to 8 horizontal shale gas wells could access all 640 acres with only 7 to 8 acres of total land disturbance.

Chapter 5 describes the constituents of drilling mud and the containment of drilling cuttings, through either a lined on-site reserve pit or in a closed-loop tank system. This Chapter also calculates the projected volume of cuttings and the potential for such cuttings to contain NORM.

This Chapter also discusses the hydraulic fracturing process, the composition of fracturing fluid, on-site storage and handling and transport of fracturing additives. The high-volume hydraulic fracturing process involves the controlled use of water and chemical additives, pumped under

pressure into the cased and cemented wellbore. To protect fresh water zones and isolate the target hydrocarbon-bearing zone, hydraulic fracturing does not occur until after the well is cased and cemented, and typically after the drilling rig and its associated equipment are removed from the well pad. Chapter 5 explains that the Department would generally require at least three strings of cemented casing in the well during fracturing operations. The outer string (i.e., surface casing) would extend below fresh ground water and would have been cemented to the surface before the well was drilled deeper. The intermediate casing string, also called protective string, is installed between the surface and production strings. The innermost casing string (i.e., production casing) typically extends from the ground surface to the toe of the horizontal well.

The fluid used for high-volume hydraulic fracturing is typically comprised of more than 98% fresh water and sand, with chemical additives comprising 2% or less of the fluid. The Department has collected compositional information on many of the additives proposed for use in fracturing shale formations in New York directly from chemical suppliers and service companies and those additives are identified and discussed in detail in Chapter 5. It is estimated that 2.4 million to 7.8 million gallons of water may be used for a multi-stage hydraulic fracturing procedure in a typical 4,000-foot lateral wellbore. Water may be delivered by truck or pipeline directly from the source to the well pad, or may be delivered by trucks or pipeline from centralized water storage or staging facilities consisting of tanks or engineered impoundments.

After the hydraulic fracturing procedure is completed and pressure is released, the direction of fluid flow reverses. The well is “cleaned up” by allowing water and excess proppant (typically sand) to flow up through the wellbore to the surface. Both the process and the returned water are commonly referred to as “flowback.” Chapter 5 discusses the volume, characteristics, recycling and disposal of flowback water. The dSGEIS estimates flowback water volume to range from 216,000 gallons to 2.7 million gallons per well, based on a pumped fluid estimate of 2.4 million to 7.8 million gallons.

Finally, Chapter 5 provides estimates of potential gas production from high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations and also discusses waste disposal associated with high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations, including disposal of cuttings, flowback and production brine

Chapter 6 – Potential Environmental Impacts

This chapter identifies and evaluates the potential significant adverse impacts associated with high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations and, like other chapters, should be read as a supplement to the 1992 GEIS.

Water Resources Impacts

Potential significant adverse impacts on water resources exist with regard to water withdrawals for hydraulic fracturing; stormwater runoff; surface spills, leaks and pit or surface impoundment failures; groundwater impacts associated with well drilling and construction; waste disposal and New York City's subsurface water supply infrastructure. During the public scoping process, additional concerns were raised relating to the potential degradation of New York City's surface drinking water supply and potential groundwater contamination from the hydraulic fracturing procedure itself.

Water for hydraulic fracturing may be obtained by withdrawing it from surface water bodies away from the well site or through new or existing water-supply wells drilled into aquifers. Chapter 6 concludes that, without proper controls on the rate, timing and location of such water withdrawals, the cumulative impacts of such withdrawals could cause modifications to groundwater levels, surface water levels, and stream flow that could result in significant adverse impacts, including but not limited to impacts to the aquatic ecosystem, downstream river channel and riparian resources, wetlands, and aquifer supplies.

Using an industry estimate of a yearly peak activity in New York of 2,462 wells, the dSGEIS estimates that high-volume hydraulic fracturing would result in a calculated peak *annual* fresh water usage of 9 billion gallons. Total *daily* fresh water withdrawal in New York has been estimated at about 10.3 billion gallons. This equates to an annual total of about 3.8 trillion gallons. Based on this calculation, at peak activity high-volume hydraulic fracturing would result in increased demand for fresh water in New York of 0.24%. Thus, water usage for high-volume hydraulic fracturing represents a very small percentage of water usage throughout the state. Nevertheless, as noted, the cumulative impact of water withdrawals, if such withdrawals

were temporally proximate and from the same water resource, could potentially be significant. The mitigation measures to ensure that such impacts are prevented are described in Chapter 7, summarized below.

Chapter 6 also describes the potential impacts on water resources from stormwater flow associated with the construction and operation of high-volume hydraulic fracturing well pads. All phases of natural gas well development, from initial land clearing for access roads, equipment staging areas and well pads, to drilling and fracturing operations, production and final reclamation, have the potential to cause water resource impacts during rain and snow melt events if stormwater is not properly managed. Proposed mitigation measures to prevent significant adverse impacts from stormwater runoff are described in Chapter 7.

The dSGEIS concludes that spills or releases in connection with high-volume hydraulic fracturing could have significant adverse impacts on water resources. The dSGEIS identifies a significant number of contaminants contained in fracturing additives, or otherwise associated with high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations. Spills or releases can occur as a result of tank ruptures, equipment or surface impoundment failures, overfills, vandalism, accidents (including vehicle collisions), ground fires, or improper operations. Spilled, leaked or released fluids could flow to a surface water body or infiltrate the ground, reaching subsurface soils and aquifers. Proposed mitigation measures to prevent significant adverse impacts from spills and releases are described in Chapter 7.

Chapter 6 also assesses the potential significant adverse impacts on groundwater resources from well drilling and construction associated with high-volume hydraulic fracturing. Those potential impacts include impacts from turbidity, fluids pumped into or flowing from rock formations penetrated by the well, and contamination from natural gas present in the rock formations penetrated by the well. The dSGEIS concludes that these potential impacts are not unique to horizontal wells or high-volume hydraulic fracturing and are described and fully assessed in the 1992 GEIS. Nevertheless, because of the concentrated nature of the activity on multi-well pads and the larger fluid volumes and pressures associated with high-volume hydraulic fracturing, enhanced procedures and mitigation measures are proposed and described in Chapter 7.

A supporting study for this dSGEIS concludes that it is highly unlikely that groundwater contamination would occur by fluids escaping from the wellbore for hydraulic fracturing. The 2009 dSGEIS further observes that regulatory officials from 15 states recently testified that groundwater contamination as a result of the hydraulic fracturing process in the tight formation itself has not occurred.

The dSGEIS explains that the potential migration of natural gas to a water well, which presents a safety hazard because of its combustible and asphyxiant nature, especially if the natural gas builds up in an enclosed space such as a well shed, house or garage, was fully addressed in the 1992 GEIS. Well construction associated with high-volume hydraulic fracturing presents no new significant adverse impacts with regard to potential gas migration. Gas migration is a result of poor well construction (i.e., casing and cement problems). As with all gas drilling, well construction practices mandated in New York are designed to prevent gas migration. Those practices would also minimize the risk of migration of other formation fluids such as oil or brine.

The dSGEIS acknowledges that migration of naturally-occurring methane from wetlands, landfills and shallow bedrock can also contaminate water supplies independently or in the absence of any nearby oil and gas activities. Section 4.7 of this dSGEIS explains how the natural occurrence of shallow methane in New York can affect water wells unrelated to natural gas development.

Chapters 5 and 6 contain analyses that demonstrate that no significant adverse impact to water resources is likely to occur due to underground vertical migration of fracturing fluids through the shale formations. The developable shale formations are vertically separated from potential freshwater aquifers by at least 1,000 feet of sandstones and shales of moderate to low permeability. In fact, most of the bedrock formations above the Marcellus Shale are other shales. That shales must be hydraulically fractured to produce fluids is evidence that these types of rock formations do not readily transmit fluids. The high salinity of native water in the Marcellus and other Devonian shales is evidence that fluid has been trapped in the pore spaces for hundreds of millions of years, implying that there is no mechanism for discharge of fluids to other formations.

Hydraulic fracturing is engineered to target the prospective hydrocarbon-producing zone. The induced fractures create a pathway to the intended wellbore, but do not create a discharge mechanism or pathway beyond the fractured zone where none existed before. The pressure differential that pushes fracturing fluid into the formation is diminished once the rock has fractured, and is reversed toward the wellbore during the flowback and production phases. Accordingly, there is no likelihood of significant adverse impacts from the underground migration of fracturing fluids.

No significant adverse impacts are identified with regard to the disposal of liquid wastes. Drilling and fracturing fluids, mud-drilled cuttings, pit liners, flowback water and produced brine, although classified as non-hazardous industrial waste, must be hauled under a New York State Part 364 waste transporter permit issued by the Department. Furthermore, as discussed in Chapter 7, any environmental risk posed by the improper discharge of liquid wastes would be addressed through the institution of a waste tracking procedure similar to that which is required for medical waste, even though the hazards are not equivalent. Another concern relates to potential spills as a result of trucking accidents. Information about traffic management related to high-volume hydraulic fracturing is discussed in Chapter 7.

The disposal of flowback water could cause a significant adverse impact if the wastewater was not properly treated prior to disposal. Residual fracturing chemicals and naturally-occurring constituents from the rock formation could be present in flowback water and could result in treatment, sludge disposal, and receiving-water impacts. Salts and dissolved solids may not be sufficiently treated by municipal biological treatment and/or other treatment technologies which are not designed to remove pollutants of this nature. Mitigation measures have been identified that would eliminate any potential significant adverse impact from flowback water or treatment of other liquid wastes associated with high-volume hydraulic fracturing.

The Department is not proposing to alter its 1992 GEIS Finding that proposed disposal wells require individual site-specific review under SEQRA. Therefore, the potential for significant adverse environmental impacts from any proposal to inject flowback water from high-volume hydraulic fracturing into a disposal well would be reviewed on a site-specific basis with

consideration to local geology (including faults and seismicity), hydrogeology, nearby wellbores or other potential conduits for fluid migration and other pertinent site-specific factors.

The 1992 GEIS summarized the potential impacts of flood damage relative to mud or reserve pits, brine and oil tanks, other fluid tanks, brush debris, erosion and topsoil, bulk supplies (including additives) and accidents. Those potential impacts are equally applicable to high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations. Severe flooding is described as one of the few ways that bulk supplies such as additives “might accidentally enter the environment in large quantities.” Mitigation measures to ensure that significant adverse impacts from floods do not occur in connection with high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations are identified and recommended in Chapter 7.

Gamma ray logs from deep wells drilled in New York over the past several decades show the Marcellus Shale to be higher in radioactivity than other bedrock formations including other potential reservoirs that could be developed by high-volume hydraulic fracturing. However, based on the analytical results from field-screening and gamma ray spectroscopy performed on samples of Marcellus Shale NORM levels in cuttings are not significant because the levels are similar to those naturally encountered in the surrounding environment. As explained in Chapter 5, the total volume of drill cuttings produced from drilling a horizontal well may be about 40% greater than that for a conventional, vertical well. For multi-well pads, cuttings volume would be multiplied by the number of wells on the pad. The potential water resources impact associated with the greater volume of drill cuttings from multiple horizontal well drilling operations would arise from the retention of cuttings during drilling, necessitating a larger reserve pit that may be present for a longer period of time, unless the cuttings are directed into tanks as part of a closed-loop tank system.

Impacts on Ecosystems and Wildlife

The dSGEIS has been revised to expand the analysis of the potential significant adverse impacts on ecosystems and wildlife from high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations. Four areas of concern related to high-volume hydraulic fracturing are: (1) fragmentation of habitat; (2)

potential transfer of invasive species; (3) impacts to endangered and threatened species; and (4) use of state-owned lands.

The dSGEIS concludes that high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations would have a significant impact on the environment because such operations have the potential to draw substantial development into New York, which would result in unavoidable impacts to habitats (fragmentation, loss of connectivity, degradation, etc.), species distributions and populations, and overall natural resource biodiversity. Habitat loss, conversion, and fragmentation (both short-term and long-term) would result from land grading and clearing, and the construction of well pads, roads, pipelines, and other infrastructure associated with gas drilling. Partial mitigation of such impacts is identified in Chapter 7.

The number of vehicle trips associated with high-volume hydraulic fracturing, particularly at multi-well sites, has been identified as an activity which presents the opportunity to transfer invasive terrestrial species. Surface water withdrawals also have the potential to transfer invasive aquatic species. The introduction of terrestrial and aquatic invasive species would have a significant adverse impact on the environment.

State-owned lands play a unique role in New York's landscape because they are managed under public ownership to allow for sustainable use of natural resources, provide recreational opportunities for all New Yorkers, and provide important wildlife habitat and open space. Given the level of development expected for multi-pad horizontal drilling, the dSGEIS anticipates that there would be additional pressure for surface disturbance on State lands. Surface disturbance associated with gas extraction could have an impact on habitats on State lands, and recreational use of those lands, especially large contiguous forest patches that are valuable because they sustain wide-ranging forest species, and provide more habitat for forest interior species.

The area underlain by the Marcellus Shale includes both terrestrial and aquatic habitat for 18 animal species listed as endangered or threatened in New York State that are protected under the State Endangered Species Law (ECL 11-0535) and associated regulations (6 NYCRR Part 182). Endangered and threatened wildlife may be adversely impacted through project actions such as clearing, grading and road building that occur within the habitats that they occupy. Certain

species are unable to avoid direct impact due to their inherent poor mobility (e.g., Blanding's turtle, club shell mussel). Certain actions, such as clearing of vegetation or alteration of stream beds, can also result in the loss of nesting and spawning areas.

Mitigation for potentially significant adverse impacts from potential transfer of invasive species or from use of State lands, and mitigation for potential impacts to endangered and threatened species is identified in Chapter 7.

Impacts on Air Resources

Chapter 6 of the dSGEIS provides a comprehensive list of federal and New York State regulations that apply to potential air emissions and air quality impacts associated with the drilling, completion (hydraulic fracturing and flowback) and production phases (processing, transmission and storage). The revised Chapter includes a regulatory assessment of the various air pollution sources and the air permitting process, as well as a supplemental analysis of impacts not addressed in the 2009 dSGEIS. The review of potential air impacts and expanded analyses accounts for information acquired subsequent to the initial review.

As part of the Department's effort to address the potential air quality impacts of horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing activities in the Marcellus Shale and other low-permeability gas reservoirs, an air quality modeling analysis was undertaken by DEC's Division of Air Resources (DAR). The analysis identifies the emission sources involved in well drilling, completion and production, and the analysis of source operations for purposes of assessing compliance with applicable air quality standards.

Since September 2009 industry has provided information that: (1) simultaneous drilling and completion operations at a single pad would not occur; (2) the maximum number of wells to be drilled at a pad in a year would be four in a 12-month period; and (3) centralized flowback impoundments, which are large volume, lined ponds that function as fluid collection points for multiple wells, are not contemplated. Based on these operational restrictions, the Department revised the limited modeling of 24 hour PM_{2.5} impacts and conducted supplemental air quality modeling to assess standards compliance and air quality impacts. In addition, the Department conducted supplemental modeling to account for the promulgation of new 1 hour SO₂ and NO₂

National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) after September 2009. The results of this supplemental modeling indicate the need for the imposition of certain control measures to achieve the NO₂ and PM_{2.5} NAAQS. These measures, along with all other restrictions reflecting industry's proposed operational restrictions and recommended mitigation measures based on the modeling results, are detailed in Section 7.5.3 of the dSGEIS as proposed operation conditions to be included in well permits. The Department also developed an air monitoring program to fully address potential for adverse air quality impacts beyond those analyzed in the dSGEIS, which are either not fully known at this time or not verifiable by the assessments to date. The air monitoring plan would help determine and distinguish both the background and drilling related concentrations of pertinent pollutants in the ambient air.

Air quality impact mitigation measures are further discussed in Chapter 7 of the dSGEIS, including a detailed discussion of pollution control techniques, various operational scenarios and equipment that can be used to achieve regulatory compliance, and mitigation measures for well pad operations. In addition, measures to reduce benzene emissions from glycol dehydrators and formaldehyde emissions from off-site compressor stations are provided.

Greenhouse Gas Emission Impacts

All operational phases of proposed well pad activities were considered, and resulting greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions determined in the dSGEIS. Emission estimates of carbon dioxide (CO₂) and methane (CH₄) are included as both short tons and as carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e) expressed in short tons for expected exploration and development of the Marcellus Shale and other low-permeability gas reservoirs using high-volume hydraulic fracturing. The Department not only quantified potential GHG emissions from activities, but also identified and characterized major sources of CO₂ and CH₄ during anticipated operations so that key contributors of GHGs with the most significant Global Warming Potential (GWP) could be addressed and mitigated, with particular emphasis placed on mitigating CH₄, with its greater GWP.

Socioeconomic Impacts

To assess the potential socioeconomic impacts of high-volume hydraulic fracturing, including the potential impacts on population, employment and housing, three representative regions were selected. The three regions were selected to evaluate how high-volume hydraulic fracturing might impact areas with different production potential, different land use patterns, and different levels of experience with natural gas well development. Region A consists of Broome, Chemung and Tioga County. Region B consists of Delaware, Otsego and Sullivan County, and Region C consists of Cattaraugus and Chautauqua County. Using a low and average rate of development based on industry estimates, high-volume hydraulic fracturing will have a significant positive economic effect where the activity takes place. At the maximum rate of well construction, total direct construction employment is predicted to range from 4,408 construction jobs under the low development scenario to 17,634 jobs under the average scenario. An additional 29,174 jobs are predicted to result indirectly from the introduction of high-volume hydraulic fracturing statewide.

There will also be positive impacts on income levels in the state as a result of high-volume hydraulic fracturing. When well construction reaches its maximum levels, total annual construction earnings are projected to range from \$298.4 million under the low development scenario to nearly \$1.2 billion under the average development scenario. Employee earnings from operational employment are expected to range from \$121.2 million under the low development scenario to \$484.8 million under the average development scenario in Year 30. Indirect employee earnings are anticipated to range from \$202.3 million under the low development scenario to \$809.2 million under the average development scenario in Year 30. The total direct and indirect impacts on employee earnings are projected to range from \$621.9 million to \$2.5 billion per year at peak production and construction levels in Year 30. Chapter 6 details how the potential job creation and employee earnings might be distributed across the three representative regions.

Chapter 6 also assesses the potential temporary and permanent population impacts on each of the three selected regions, finding that Region A will experience an estimated 1.4% increase in the

region's total population the first decade after high-volume hydraulic fracturing is introduced. Region C is projected to be more modestly impacted by high-volume hydraulic fracturing.

While providing positive impacts in the areas of employment and income, high-volume hydraulic fracturing could cause adverse impacts on the availability of housing, especially temporary housing such as hotels and motels. In Region A, where the use of high-volume hydraulic fracturing is expected to be initially concentrated, there could be shortages of rental housing. High-volume hydraulic fracturing would also bring both positive and negative impacts on state and local government spending. Increased activity will result in large increases in local tax revenues and increases in the receipt of production royalties but would also result in an increased demand for local services, including emergency response services.

Visual, Noise and Community Character Impacts

The construction of well pads and wells associated with high-volume hydraulic fracturing will result in temporary, but adverse impacts relating to noise. In certain areas the construction activity would also result in temporary visual impacts. Mitigation measures to address such impacts are summarized in Chapter 7.

The cumulative impact of well construction activity and related truck traffic would cause impacts on the character of the rural communities where much of this activity would take place. Methods to control simultaneous development within a specific area are discussed in Chapter 7.

Transportation Impacts

The introduction of high-volume hydraulic fracturing has the potential to generate significant truck traffic during the construction and development phases of the well. These impacts would be temporary, but the cumulative impact of this truck traffic has the potential to result in significant adverse impacts on local roads and, to a lesser extent, state roads where truck traffic from this activity is concentrated. It is not feasible to conduct a detailed traffic assessment given that the precise location of well pads is unknown at this time. However, such traffic has the potential to damage roads. Chapter 7 discusses the potential mitigation measures to address such impacts, including the requirement that the applicant develop a Transportation Plan that sets

forth proposed truck routes, surveys road conditions along those routes and requires local road use agreements to address any impacts on local roads.

Additional NORM Concerns

Based upon currently available information it is anticipated that flowback water would not contain levels of NORM of significance, whereas production brine could contain elevated NORM levels. Although the highest concentrations of NORM are in produced waters, it does not present a risk to workers because the external radiation levels are very low. However, the build-up of NORM in pipes and equipment (pipe scale and sludge) has the potential to cause a significant adverse impact because it could expose workers handling (cleaning or maintenance) the pipe to increased radiation levels. Also, wastes from the treatment of production waters may contain concentrated NORM and, if so, controls would be required to limit radiation exposure to workers handling this material as well as to ensure that this material is disposed of in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements.

Seismicity

There is a reasonable base of knowledge and experience related to seismicity induced by hydraulic fracturing. Information reviewed indicates that there is essentially no increased risk to the public, infrastructure, or natural resources from induced seismicity related to hydraulic fracturing. The microseisms created by hydraulic fracturing are too small to be felt, or to cause damage at the ground surface or to nearby wells. Accordingly, no significant adverse impacts from induced seismicity are expected to result from high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations.

Chapter 7 – Mitigation Measures

This Chapter describes the measures the Department has identified that, if implemented, would eliminate or mitigate potentially significant adverse impacts from high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations. A number of significant, new mitigation measures not contained in the 2009 dSGEIS have been identified as follows.

No High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing Operations in the New York City and Syracuse Watersheds

In April 2010 the Department concluded that due to the unique issues presented by high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations within the drinking watersheds for the City of New York and Syracuse, the SGEIS would not apply to activities in those watersheds. Those areas present unique issues that primarily stem from the fact that they are unfiltered water supplies that depend on strict land use and development controls to ensure that water quality is protected.

The revised analysis of high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations in the revised dSGEIS concludes that the proposed high-volume hydraulic fracturing activity is not consistent with the preservation of these watersheds as an unfiltered drinking water supply. Even with all of the criteria and conditions identified in this dSGEIS, a risk remains that significant high-volume hydraulic fracturing activities in these areas could result in a degradation of drinking water supplies from accidents, surface spills, etc. Moreover, such large scale industrial activity in these areas, even without spills, could imperil EPA's Filtration Avoidance Determinations and result in the affected municipalities incurring substantial costs to filter their drinking water supply. Accordingly, this dSGEIS supports a finding that site disturbance relating to high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations not be permitted in the Syracuse and New York City watersheds or in a protective 4,000 foot buffer area around those watersheds.

No High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing Operations on Primary Aquifers

Although not subject to Filtration Avoidance Determinations, 18 other aquifers in the State of New York have been identified by the New York State Department of Health as highly productive aquifers presently utilized as sources of water supply by major municipal water supply systems and are designated as "primary aquifers." Because these aquifers are the primary source of drinking water for many public drinking water supplies, the Department recommends in this dSGEIS that site disturbance relating to high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations should not be permitted there either or in a protective 500-foot buffer area around them. Horizontal extraction of gas resources underneath primary aquifers from well pads located outside this area would not significantly impact this valuable water resource.

No High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing Operations on Certain State Lands

This dSGEIS supports a finding that site disturbance relating to high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations should not be permitted on certain State lands because it is inconsistent with the purposes for which those lands have been acquired. In addition, precluding site disturbance on certain State lands would partially mitigate the significant adverse impacts from habitat fragmentation on forest lands due to high-volume hydraulic fracturing activity. It would preclude the loss of such habitat in the protected State land areas which represent some of the largest contiguous forest patches where high-volume hydraulic fracturing activity could occur. Horizontal extraction of gas resources underneath State lands from well pads located outside this area would not significantly impact this valuable habitat on forested State lands.

No High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing Operations on Principal Aquifers Without Site-Specific Environmental Review

Principal Aquifers are aquifers known to be highly productive or whose geology suggests abundant potential water supply, but which are not intensively used as sources of water supply by major municipal systems at the present time. In order to mitigate the risk of significant adverse impacts on these important water resources from the risk of surface discharges from high-volume hydraulic fracturing well pads, the dSGEIS proposes that for at least two years from issuance of the final SGEIS, applications for high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations at any surface location within the boundaries of principal aquifers, or outside but within 500 feet of the boundaries of principal aquifers, would require (1) site-specific SEQRA determinations of significance and (2) individual SPDES permits for storm water discharges. The dSGEIS proposes the Department re-evaluate the necessity of this restriction after two years of experience issuing permits in areas outside of the 500-foot boundary.

No High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing Operations within 2,000 feet of Public Drinking Water Supplies

The dSGEIS seeks to mitigate the risk of significant adverse impacts on water resources from the risk of surface discharges from high-volume hydraulic fracturing well pads by proposing that high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations at any surface location within 2,000 feet of public water supply wells, river or stream intakes and reservoirs should not be permitted. The dSGEIS

proposes that the Department re-evaluate the necessity of this approach after three years of experience issuing permits in areas outside of this setback.

No High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing Operations in Floodplains or Within 500 Feet of Private Water Wells

In order to address potential significant adverse impacts due to flooding, the dSGEIS supports a finding that the Department not issue permits for high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations at any well pad that is wholly or partially within a 100-year floodplain. In order to ensure that there are no impacts on drinking water supplies from high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations, the dSGEIS also supports a finding that no permits be issued for any well pad located within 500 feet of a private water well or domestic use spring, unless waived by the landowner.

Mandatory Disclosure of Hydraulic Fracturing Additives and Alternatives Analysis

The dSGEIS identifies by chemical name and Chemical Abstract Services (CAS) number, 322 chemicals proposed for use for high-volume hydraulic fracturing in New York. Chemical usage was reviewed by NYSDOH, which provided health hazard information that is presented in the document. In response to public concerns relating to the use of hydraulic fracturing additives and their potential impact on water resources, this dSGEIS adds a new requirement that operators evaluate the use of alternative hydraulic fracturing additive products that pose less potential risk to water resources. In addition, in the EAF addendum a project sponsor must disclose all additive products it proposes to use, and provide Material Safety Data Sheets for those products, so that the appropriate remedial measures can be imposed if a spill occurs. The Department will publicly disclose the identities of hydraulic fracturing fluid additive products and their Material Safety Data Sheets, provided that information which meets the confidential business information exception to the Department's records access program will not be subject to public disclosure.

Enhanced Well Casing

In order to mitigate the risk of significant adverse impacts to water resources from the migration of gas or pollutants in connection with high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations, the dSGEIS adds a requirement for a third cemented "string" of well casing around the gas production wells

in most situations. This enhanced casing specification is designed to specifically address concerns over migration of gas into aquifers.

Required Secondary Containment and Stormwater Controls

In order to mitigate the risk of a significant adverse impact to water resources from spills of chemical additives, hydraulic fracturing fluid or liquid wastes associated with high-volume hydraulic fracturing, secondary containment, spill prevention and storm water pollution prevention are comprehensively addressed for all stages of well pad development. The dSGEIS supports the Department's proposal for a new stormwater general permit for gas drilling operations that would address potential stormwater impacts associated with high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations.

Conditions Related to Disposal of Wastewater and Solid Waste

As provided in the 2009 dSGEIS, to ensure that wastewater from high-volume hydraulic fracturing operation is properly disposed, the Department proposes to require that before any permit is issued the operator have Department-approved plans in place for disposing of flowback water and production brine. In addition, the Department proposes to require a tracking system, similar to what is in place for medical waste, for all liquid and solid wastes generated in connection with high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations.

The dSGEIS also proposes to expand its proposed requirement for closed-loop drilling in order to ensure that no significant adverse impacts related to the disposal of pyrite-rich Marcellus Shale cuttings on-site.

Air Quality Control Measures and Mitigation for Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The dSGEIS identifies additional mitigation measures designed to ensure that emissions associated with high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations do not result in the exceedance of any NAAQS. In addition, the Department has committed to implement local and regional level air quality monitoring at well pads and surrounding areas.

The dSGEIS also identifies mitigation measures that can be required through permit conditions and possibly new regulations to ensure that high-volume hydraulic fracturing do not result in significant adverse impacts relating to climate change. The dSGEIS proposes to require a greenhouse gas emission impacts mitigation plan (the Plan). The Plan must include: a list of best management practices for GHG emission sources for implementation at the permitted well site; a leak detection and repair program; use of EPA's Natural Gas Star best management practices for any pertinent equipment; use of reduced emission completions that provide for the recovery of methane instead of flaring whenever a gas sales line and interconnecting gathering line are available; and a statement that the operator would provide the Department with a copy of the report filed with EPA to meet the GHG Reporting Rule.

Mitigation for Loss of Habitat and Impacts on Wildlife

In order to further mitigate significant adverse impacts on wildlife habitat caused by fragmentation of forest and grasslands on private land, the Department proposes to require that surface disturbance in contiguous forest patches of 150 acres or more and contiguous grassland patches of 30 acres or more within specified Forest and Grassland Focus areas, respectively, be contingent upon site-specific ecological assessments conducted by the permit applicant and implementation of best management practices identified through such assessments.

Other Control Measures

Other important existing and anticipated regulatory requirements and/or permit conditions that would be imposed to ensure that high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations do not cause significant impacts on the environment in New York include:

- Before a permit is issued, Department staff would review the proposed layout of the well site based on analysis of application materials and a site visit. Risky site plans would either not be approved or would be subject to enhanced site-specific construction requirements.
- The Department's staff reviews the proposed casing and cementing plan for each well prior to permit issuance. Permits are not issued for improperly designed wells, and in

the case of high-volume hydraulic fracturing, the as-built wellbore construction would be verified before the operation is allowed to proceed.

- The current dSGEIS proposes to require in most cases fully cemented intermediate casing, with the setting depths of both surface and intermediate casing determined by site-specific conditions.
- Fracturing equipment components would be pressure tested with fresh water, mud or brine prior to the introduction of chemical additives.
- The current dSGEIS requires pressure testing of blowout prevention equipment, the use of at least two mechanical barriers that can be tested, the use of specialized equipment designed for entering the wellbore when pressure is anticipated, and the on-site presence of a certified well control specialist.
- Flowback water stored on-site must use covered watertight tanks within secondary containment and the fluid contained in the tanks must be removed from the site within certain time periods.
- The Department has a robust permitting and approval process in place to address any proposals to discharge flowback water or production brine to wastewater treatment plants. The Department would require that before any permit is issued the operator have Department-approved plans in place for disposing of flowback water and production brine. Permission to treat such wastewater at a treatment plant in New York State would not be granted without a demonstrable showing that such wastewater can be properly treated at the plant. Additionally, the Department anticipates that operators would favor reusing flowback water for subsequent fracturing operations as they are now doing in Pennsylvania, so that disposal of flowback would be minimized.
- The Department would require that a Transportation Plan be developed and included with any permit application. That plan would include proposed truck routes and an assessment of road conditions along such routes. Any local road use agreement(s)

would have to be disclosed and the applicant would have to demonstrate that the roads to be used are sufficient to accommodate the proposed truck traffic.

- The Department would consult with local governments and, where appropriate, place limits on the number of wells and/or well pads that can be constructed in a specific area at a single time in order to mitigate potential adverse impacts on community character, tourism and other potential socioeconomic impacts that could result from a concentration of well construction activity in a short period of time within a confined area.
- The Department would also impose measures designed to reduce adverse noise or visual impacts from well construction.

Chapter 8 – Permit Process and Regulatory Coordination

This Chapter explains inter- and intra-agency coordination relative to the well permit process, including the role of local governments and a revised approach to local government notification and consideration of potential impacts of high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations on local land use laws and policies. Unlike the 2009 dSGEIS, the current draft Supplement supports a condition that local governments be given notice in writing of all high-volume hydraulic fracturing applications in the locality. A continuously updated database of local government officials and an electronic notification system would be developed for this purpose.

In addition, the EAF Addendum would require the project sponsor to identify whether the proposed location of the well pad, or any other activity under the jurisdiction of the Department, conflicts with local land use laws or regulations, plans or policies. The project sponsor would also be required to identify whether the well pad is located in an area where the affected community has adopted a comprehensive plan or other local land use plan and whether the proposed action is inconsistent with such plan(s). Where the project sponsor indicates that the location of the well pad, or any other activity under the jurisdiction of the Department, is either consistent with local land use laws, regulations, plans or policies, or is not covered by such local land use laws, regulations, plans or policies, no further review of local land use laws and policies would be required.

In cases where a project sponsor indicates that all or part of their proposed application is inconsistent with local land use laws, regulations, plans or policies, or where the potentially impacted local government advises the Department that it believes the application is inconsistent with such laws, regulations, plans or policies, the Department intends to request additional information in the permit application process to determine whether this inconsistency raises significant adverse environmental impacts that have not been addressed in the SGEIS.

Chapter 9 – Alternative Actions

Chapter 9 discusses the alternatives to well permit issuance that were reviewed and considered by the Department. Chapter 21 of the 1992 GEIS and the 1992 Findings Statement discussed a range of alternatives concerning oil and gas resource development in New York State that included both its prohibition and the removal of oil and gas industry regulation. Regulation as described by the GEIS was found to be the best alternative.

The dSGEIS considers a range of alternatives to the proposed approach for regulating and authorizing high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations in New York. As required by SEQRA, the dSGEIS considers the no action alternative. The Department finds that the no action alternative would not result in any of the significant adverse impacts identified herein, but would also not result in the significant economic and other benefits identified with natural gas drilling by this method. The Department believes that this alternative is not preferable because significant adverse impacts from high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations can be fully or partially mitigated.

The alternatives analysis also considers the use of a phased-permitting approach to developing the Marcellus Shale and other low permeability gas reservoirs, including consideration of limiting and/or restricting resource development in designated areas. As discussed above, the Department proposes to partially adopt this alternative by restricting resource development in the New York City and Syracuse watersheds (plus buffer), public water supplies, primary aquifers and certain state lands. In addition, restrictions and setbacks relating to development in other areas near public water supplies, principal aquifers and other resources as outlined above are recommended. The Department does not believe that resource development should be further

limited by imposing an annual limit on permits issued for high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations. The Department believes any such annual limit would be arbitrary. Rather, the Department proposes to limit permit issuance to match the Department resources that are made available to review and approve permit applications, and to adequately inspect well pads and enforce permit conditions and regulations. Although it is not possible to predict the number of permit applications that will be submitted in any given area, and therefore proscribe the level of activity that any one operator may undertake in those areas, the Department has the ability to respond and adjust to conditions in the field. If it is demonstrated, for example, that the measures in place to mitigate noise impacts do not adequately address the impact of high-volume hydraulic fracturing on a host community, the department retains the option through the permitting process to impose additional conditions on operations, such as phasing of drilling operations on adjacent well pads, to prevent or mitigate cumulative or simultaneous operations from impacting nearby residents.

The dSGEIS also contains a review and analysis of the development and use of “green” or non-chemical fracturing alternatives. The Department finds that the use of environmentally-friendly or “green chemicals” would proceed based on the characteristics of the Marcellus Shale play and other shale plays across the United States, as well as the potential environmental impacts of the development. While more research and approval criteria would be necessary to establish benchmarks for “green chemicals,” this dSGEIS adopts this alternative approach where feasible by requiring applicants to review and consider the use of alternative additive products that may pose less risk to the environment, including water resources, and to publicly disclose the chemicals that make up these additives. These requirements may be altered and/or expanded as the use of “green chemicals” begin to provide reasonable alternatives and the appropriate technology, criteria and processes are in place to evaluate and produce “green chemicals.”

Chapter 10 – Review of Selected Non-Routine Incidents in Pennsylvania

Chapter 10 discusses a number of widely publicized incidents involving high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations in Pennsylvania that have caused public concern about the safety and potential adverse impacts associated with high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations. The case

studies describe the events and their likely causes, and explains how protective measures currently in place or identified as proposed mitigation measures in this dSGEIS would further minimize the risk of such events occurring should high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations be permitted in New York.

Chapter 11 – Summary of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Chapter 11 highlights the mitigation measures implemented through the 1992 GEIS and summarizes the impacts and mitigation that are discussed in Chapters 6 and 7.

Next Steps

Following the public comment period for the revised draft SGEIS and the draft regulations, the Department will produce a final SGEIS. The final SGEIS will include summaries of the substantive comments received on both the 2009 draft SGEIS and the revised dSGEIS, along with the Department's responses to such comments. The final SGEIS will also incorporate by reference all volumes of the 1992 GEIS.

Chapter 1 – Introduction

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1 HYDRAULIC FRACTURING AND MULTI-WELL PAD DRILLING	1-1
1.1.1 Significant Changes in Proposed Operations Since 2009	1-2
1.1.1.1 Use of Reserve Pits or Centralized Impoundments for Flowback Water.....	1-2
1.1.1.2 Flowback Water Recycling	1-2
1.2 REGULATORY JURISDICTION	1-3
1.3 STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW ACT	1-3
1.4 PROJECT CHRONOLOGY	1-4
1.4.1 February 2009 Final Scope	1-4
1.4.2 2009 Draft SGEIS.....	1-4
1.4.2.1 April 2010 Announcement Regarding Communities with Filtration Avoidance Determinations ...	1-5
1.4.2.2 Subsequent Exclusion of Communities with Filtration Avoidance Determinations	1-5
1.4.3 Revised Draft SGEIS	1-5
1.4.4 Next Steps.....	1-5
1.5 METHODOLOGY	1-5
1.5.1 Information about the Proposed Operations.....	1-5
1.5.2 Intra-/Inter-agency Coordination	1-6
1.5.3 Comment Review	1-6
1.6 LAYOUT AND ORGANIZATION	1-7
1.6.1 Chapters	1-7
1.6.2 Revisions.....	1-9
1.6.3 Glossary, Bibliographies and Appendices.....	1-9
1.7 ENHANCED IMPACT ANALYSES AND MITIGATION MEASURES	1-9
1.7.1 Hydraulic Fracturing Chemical Disclosure	1-9
1.7.2 Water Well Testing.....	1-10
1.7.3 Water Withdrawal and Consumption.....	1-10
1.7.3.1 2009 Draft SGEIS	1-10
1.7.3.2 Revised Draft SGEIS.....	1-10
1.7.4 Well Control and Emergency Response Planning.....	1-10
1.7.5 Local Planning Documents.....	1-11
1.7.6 Secondary Containment, Spill Prevention and Stormwater Pollution Prevention	1-11
1.7.7 Well Construction	1-11
1.7.7.1 2009 Draft SGEIS	1-11
1.7.7.2 Revised Draft SGEIS.....	1-12
1.7.8 Flowback Water Handling On-Site.....	1-12
1.7.9 Flowback Water Disposal	1-13
1.7.10 Management of Drill Cuttings	1-13
1.7.11 Emissions and Air Quality	1-14
1.7.11.1 2009 Draft SGEIS	1-14
1.7.11.2 Revised Draft SGEIS.....	1-15
1.7.12 Greenhouse Gas Mitigation.....	1-16
1.7.13 Habitat Fragmentation	1-16
1.7.14 State Forests, State Wildlife Management Areas and State Parks	1-17
1.7.15 Community and Socioeconomic Impacts	1-17
1.8 ADDITIONAL PRECAUTIONARY MEASURES	1-17

Chapter 2 – Description of Proposed Action

CHAPTER 2 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION.....	1
2.1 PURPOSE	2
2.2 PUBLIC NEED AND BENEFIT.....	2
2.3 PROJECT LOCATION	7
2.4 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING	8
2.4.1 Water Use Classifications	8
2.4.2 Water Quality Standards	12
2.4.3 Drinking Water.....	13
2.4.3.1 Federal.....	13
2.4.3.2 New York State	18
2.4.4 Public Water Systems	19
2.4.4.1 Primary and Principal Aquifers	20
2.4.4.2 Public Water Supply Wells.....	22
2.4.5 Private Water Wells and Domestic-Supply Springs	22
2.4.6 History of Drilling and Hydraulic Fracturing in Water Supply Areas	23
2.4.7 Regulated Drainage Basins	25
2.4.7.1 Delaware River Basin.....	25
2.4.7.2 Susquehanna River Basin.....	26
2.4.7.3 Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin.....	28
2.4.8 Water Resources Replenishment	28
2.4.9 Floodplains.....	30
2.4.9.1 Analysis of Recent Flood Events	32
2.4.9.2 Flood Zone Mapping.....	32
2.4.9.3 Seasonal Analysis.....	33
2.4.10 Freshwater Wetlands.....	34
2.4.11 Socioeconomic Conditions.....	35
2.4.11.1 Economy, Employment, and Income.....	41
2.4.11.2 Population	75
2.4.11.3 Housing.....	81
2.4.11.4 Government Revenues and Expenditures	91
2.4.11.5 Environmental Justice	103
2.4.12 Visual Resources	116
2.4.12.1 Historic Properties and Cultural Resources	119
2.4.12.2 Parks and Other Recreation Areas	126
2.4.12.3 Natural Areas.....	132
2.4.12.4 Additional Designated Scenic or Other Areas	141
2.4.13 Noise	150
2.4.13.1 Noise Fundamentals.....	150
2.4.13.2 Common Noise Effects	151
2.4.13.3 Noise Regulations and Guidance.....	153
2.4.13.4 Existing Noise Levels.....	155
2.4.14 Transportation - Existing Environment	156
2.4.14.1 Terminology and Definitions	156
2.4.14.2 Regional Road Systems.....	161
2.4.14.3 Condition of New York State Roads.....	167
2.4.14.4 NYSDOT Funding Mechanisms	168
2.4.14.5 Rail and Air Services	171
2.4.15 Community Character.....	172

FIGURES

Figure 2.1 - Primary and Principal Aquifers in New York State..... 21

Figure 2.2 - Susquehanna and Delaware River Basins 27

Figure 2.3 - Representative Regions Within the Marcellus Shale Extent (New August 2011)..... 36

Figure 2.4 - Representative Regions A, B, and C (New August 2011) 38

Figure 2.5 - Region A: Natural Gas Production, 1994 to 2009 (New August 2011) 61

Figure 2.6 - Region C: Natural Gas Production, 1994-2009 (New August 2011) 73

Figure 2.7 - Potential Environmental Justice Areas for Region A (New August 2011)..... 108

Figure 2.8 - Potential Environmental Justice Areas for Region B (New August 2011)..... 111

Figure 2.9 - Potential Environmental Justice Areas for Region C (New August 2011)..... 114

Figure 2.10 - Area of Interest for Visual Resources (New August 2011)..... 117

Figure 2.11 - Visually Sensitive Areas Associated with Historic Properties and Cultural Resources (New August 2011) 125

Figure 2.12 - Parks and Recreational Resources that May be Visually Sensitive (New August 2011) 130

Figure 2.13 - Natural Areas that May be Visually Sensitive (New August 2011) 133

Figure 2.14 - Additional Designated Scenic or other Areas that May be Visually Sensitive 142

Figure 2.15 - Level of Continuous Noise Causing Speech Interference (New August 2011)..... 152

Figure 2.16 - FHWA Vehicle Classifications (New August 2011)..... 159

Figure 2.17 - New York State Department of Transportation Regions (New August 2011) 161

Figure 2.18 - Transportation (New August 2011) 163

Figure 2.19 - Land Cover and Agricultural Districts, Representative Region A (New August 2011) 176

Figure 2.20 - Land Cover and Agricultural Districts, Representative Region B (New August 2011) 184

Figure 2.21 - Land Cover and Agricultural Districts, Representative Region C (New August 2011) 192

TABLES

Table 2.1 - Economic and Fiscal Impacts of Gas Well Drilling Activities in Broome County, NY Over 10 Years 6

Table 2.2 - New York Water Use Classifications 9

Table 2.3 - Primary Drinking Water Standards 15

Table 2.4 - Secondary Drinking Water Standards 18

Table 2.5 - Public Water System Definition 20

Table 2.6 - New York State: Area Employment by Industry, 2009 (New August 2011) 43

Table 2.7 - New York State: Wages by Industry, 2009 (New August 2011) 44

Table 2.8 - New York State: Labor Force Statistics, 2000 and 2010 (New August 2011) 44

Table 2.9 - New York State: Income Statistics, 1999 and 2009 (New August 2011)..... 45

Table 2.10 - New York State: Employment in Travel and Tourism, 2009 (New August 2011)..... 46

Table 2.11 - New York State: Wages in Travel and Tourism, 2009 (New August 2011) 46

Table 2.12 - New York State: Agricultural Data, 2007 (New August 2011)..... 47

Table 2.13 - New York: Impact of a \$1 Million Dollar Increase in the Final Demand in the Output of the Oil and Gas Extraction Industry on the Value of the Output of Other Industries (New August 2011) 48

Table 2.14 - New York State: Employment in the Oil and Gas Extraction Industry, 2000-2010 (New August 2011) .. 49

Table 2.15 - Most Common Occupations in the U.S. Oil and Gas Extraction Industry, 2008 (New August 2011)..... 50

Table 2.16 - New York State: Wages in the Oil and Gas Industry, 2009 (New August 2011) 51

Table 2.17 - New York State: Natural Gas Production, 1985-2009 (New August 2011)..... 52

Table 2.18 - Permits Issued, Wells Completed, and Active Wells, NYS Gas Wells, 1994-2009 (New August 2011) 52

Table 2.19 - Average Wellhead Price for New York State’s Natural Gas, 1994-2009 (New August 2011) 54

Table 2.20 - Market Value of New York State’s Natural Gas Production, 1994-2009 (New August 2011)..... 54

Table 2.21 - Region A: Area Employment by Industry, 2009 (New August 2011) 55

Table 2.22 - Region A: Wages by Industry, 2009 (New August 2011) 56

Table 2.23 - Region A: Labor Force Statistics, 2000 and 2010 (New August 2011) 57

Table 2.24 - Region A: Income Statistics, 1999 and 2009 (New August 2011) 57

Table 2.25 - Region A: Employment in Travel and Tourism, 2009 (New August 2011) 59

Table 2.26 - Region A: Wages in Travel and Tourism, 2009 (New August 2011)..... 59

Table 2.27 - Region A: Agricultural Data, 2007 (New August 2011) 60

Table 2.28 - Region A: Number of Active Natural Gas Wells, 1994-2009 (New August 2011)	61
Table 2.29 – Natural Gas Production and Active Wells by Town within each County in Region A, 2009 (New August 2011).....	62
Table 2.30 - Region B: Area Employment, by Industry, 2009 (New August 2011)	63
Table 2.31 - Region B: Wages, by Industry, 2009 (New August 2011).....	63
Table 2.32 - Region B: Labor Force Statistics, 2000 and 2010 ((New August 2011)).....	64
Table 2.33 - Region B: Income Statistics, 1999 and 2009 (New August 2011)	65
Table 2.34 - Region B: Travel and Tourism, by Industrial Group, 2009 (New August 2011).....	66
Table 2.35 - Region B: Wages in Travel and Tourism, 2009 (New August 2011).....	66
Table 2.36 - Region B: Agricultural Data, 2007 (New August 2011)	67
Table 2.37 - Region C: Area Employment by Industry, 2009 (New August 2011)	68
Table 2.38 - Region C: Wages, by Industry, 2009 (New August 2011).....	68
Table 2.39 - Region C: Labor Force Statistics, 2000 and 2010 (New August 2011)	69
Table 2.40 - Region C: Income Statistics, 1999 and 2009 (New August 2011)	69
Table 2.41 - Region C: Travel and Tourism, by Industrial Group, 2009 (New August 2011).....	71
Table 2.42 - Region C: Wages in Travel and Tourism, 2009 (New August 2011).....	71
Table 2.43 - Region C: Agricultural Data, 2007 (New August 2011)	72
Table 2.44 - Number of Active Natural Gas Wells in Region C, 1994-2009 (New August 2011)	73
Table 2.45 - Natural Gas Production and the Number of Active Gas Wells by Town within each County in Region C, 2009 (New August 2011)	74
Table 2.46 - New York State: Historical and Current Population, 1990, 2000, 2010 (New August 2011)	76
Table 2.47 - New York State: Projected Population, 2015 to 2030 (New August 2011).....	76
Table 2.48 - Region A: Historical and Current Population, 1990, 2000, 2010 (New August 2011).....	77
Table 2.49 - Region A: Population Projections, 2015 to 2030 (New August 2011).....	78
Table 2.50 - Region B: Historical and Current Population - 1990, 2000, 2010 (New August 2011).....	78
Table 2.51 - Region B: Population Projections, 2015 to 2030 (New August 2011).....	79
Table 2.52 - Region C: Historical and Current Population - 1990, 2000, 2010 (New August 2011).....	80
Table 2.53 - Region C: Population Projections, 2015 to 2030 (New August 2011).....	80
Table 2.54 - New York State: Total Housing Units - 1990, 2000, 2010 (New August 2011).....	81
Table 2.55 - New York State: Type of Housing Units, 2009 ¹ (New August 2011)	81
Table 2.56 - New York State: Number of Sales and Annual Median Sale Price of Single-Family Homes Sold, 2008-2010 (New August 2011)	82
Table 2.57 - New York State: Housing Characteristics, 2010 (New August 2011)	82
Table 2.58 - Region A: Total Housing Units - 1990, 2000, 2010 (New August 2011).....	83
Table 2.59 - Region A: Total Housing Units by Type of Structure, 2009 ¹ (New August 2011).....	83
Table 2.60 - Region A: Number of Sales and Annual Median Sale Price of Single-Family Homes Sold, 2008-2010 (New August 2011)	84
Table 2.61 - Region A: Housing Characteristics, 2010 (New August 2011).....	85
Table 2.62 - Region A: Short-Term Accommodations (Hotels/Motels), 2011 (New August 2011)	85
Table 2.63 - Region B: Total Housing Units - 1990, 2000, 2010 (New August 2011)	86
Table 2.64 - Region B: Total Housing Units by Type of Structure 2009 ¹ (New August 2011).....	86
Table 2.65- Region B: Number of Sales and Annual Median Sale Price of Single-Family Homes Sold, 2008-2010 (New August 2011).....	87
Table 2.66 - Region B: Housing Characteristics, 2010 (New August 2011).....	88
Table 2.67 - Region B: Short-Term Accommodations (Hotels/Motels) (New August 2011).....	88
Table 2.68 - Region C: Total Housing Units - 1990, 2000, 2010 (New August 2011)	89
Table 2.69 - Region C: Total Housing Units by Type of Structure, 2009 ¹ (New August 2011)	89
Table 2.70 - Region C: Number of Sales and Annual Median Sale Price of Single-Family Homes Sold, 2008-2010 (New August 2011)	90
Table 2.71 - Region C: Housing Characteristics, 2010 (New August 2011).....	90
Table 2.72 - Region C: Short-Term Accommodations (Hotels/Motels) (New August 2011).....	91
Table 2.73 - New York State Revenues Collected for FY Ending March 31, 2010 (New August 2011).....	92

Table 2.74 - New York State: Number of Leases and Acreage of State Land Leased for Oil and Natural Gas Development, 2010 (New August 2011)	93
Table 2.75 - 2000-2010 Leasing Revenue by Payment Type for New York State (New August 2011).....	93
Table 2.76 - Region A: Total Revenue for FY Ending December 31, 2009 (\$ millions) (New August 2011).....	95
Table 2.77 - Region A: Local Tax Revenue for FY Ending December 31, 2009 (\$ millions) (New August 2011)	96
Table 2.78 - Gas Economic Profile for Medina Region 3 (New August 2011)	96
Table 2.79 - Region A: Expenditures for FY Ending December 31, 2009 (\$ millions) (New August 2011).....	97
Table 2.80 - Region B: Total Revenue for FY Ending December 31, 2009 (\$ millions) (New August 2011)	98
Table 2.81 - Region B: Local Tax Revenue for FY Ending December 31, 2009 (\$ millions) (New August 2011)	99
Table 2.82 - Gas Economic Profile for Medina Region 4 and State Equalization Rates and Millage Rates for Region B (New August 2011)	99
Table 2.83 - Region B: Expenditures for FY Ending December 31, 2009 (\$ millions) (New August 2011).....	100
Table 2.84 - Region C: Revenues for FY Ending December 31, 2009 (\$ millions) (New August 2011).....	101
Table 2.85 - Region C: Local Tax Revenue for FY Ending December 31, 2009 (\$ millions) (New August 2011)	102
Table 2.86 - Gas Economic Profile for Medina Region 2 and State Equalization Rates and Millage Rates for Region C (New August 2011)	102
Table 2.87 - Region C: Expenditures for FY Ending December 31, 2009 (New August 2011).....	103
Table 2.88 - Racial and Ethnicity Characteristics for New York State (New August 2011)	106
Table 2.89 - Region A: Racial and Ethnicity Characteristics (New August 2011)	109
Table 2.90 - Region B: Racial and Ethnicity Characteristics (New August 2011)	112
Table 2.91 - Region C: Racial and Ethnicity Characteristics (New August 2011)	115
Table 2.92 - Number of NRHP-Listed Historic Properties within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011).....	120
Table 2.93 - National Historic Landmarks (NHLs) Located within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011).....	123
Table 2.94 - State Parks Located within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011).....	127
Table 2.95 - Select Trails Located within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011).....	131
Table 2.96 - State Nature and Historic Preserves in Counties Located within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011)	134
Table 2.97 - National and State Wild, Scenic and Recreational Rivers (designated or potential) Located within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011)	137
Table 2.98 - State Game Refuges and State Wildlife Management Areas Located within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011).....	139
Table 2.99 - National Natural Landmarks Located within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011).....	140
Table 2.100 - Designated and Proposed National and State Scenic Byways, Highways, and Roads Located within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011)	143
Table 2.101 - Recommended Open Space Conservation Projects Located in the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011)	146
Table 2.102 - Effects of Noise on People (New August 2011)	153
Table 2.103 - Summary of Noise Levels Identified as Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety (New August 2011)	154
Table 2.104 - Common Noise Levels (New August 2011)	156
Table 2.105 - Guidelines on Extent of Rural Functional Systems (New August 2011).....	158
Table 2.106 - Descriptions of the Thirteen FHWA Vehicle Classification Categories (New August 2011).....	160
Table 2.107 - Region A: Highway Mileage by County, 2009 (New August 2011)	164
Table 2.108 - Heavy Vehicles as a Percentage of Total Vehicles in Rural Areas in NYSDOT Regions 6 and 9, 2004-2009 (New August 2011)	164
Table 2.109 - Region B: Highway Mileage by County, 2009 (New August 2011).....	165
Table 2.110 - Heavy Vehicles as a Percentage of Total Vehicles in Rural Areas in NYSDOT Region 9, 2004-2009 (New August 2011).....	166

Table 2.111 - Region C: Highway Mileage by County, 2009 (New August 2011).....	166
Table 2.112 - Heavy Vehicles as a Percentage of Total Vehicles in Rural Areas in NYSDOT Region 5, 2009 (New August 2011).....	167
Table 2.113 - Ranking System of Pavement Condition in New York State (New August 2011).....	168
Table 2.114 - NYSDOT Total Receipts, 2009-2012 (\$ thousands) (New August 2011)	170

Chapter 3 - Proposed SEQRA Review Process

CHAPTER 3 PROPOSED SEQRA REVIEW PROCESS	3-1
3.1 INTRODUCTION – USE OF A GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT	3-1
3.1.1 1992 GEIS and Findings	3-2
3.1.2 Need for a Supplemental GEIS.....	3-2
3.2 FUTURE SEQRA COMPLIANCE	3-3
3.2.1 Scenarios for Future SEQRA Compliance under the SGEIS	3-4
3.2.2 Review Parameters.....	3-5
3.2.2.1 SGEIS Applicability - Definition of High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing	3-6
3.2.2.2 Project Scope.....	3-6
3.2.2.3 Size of Project	3-7
3.2.2.4 Lead Agency.....	3-8
3.2.3 EAF Addendum and Additional Informational Requirements	3-8
3.2.3.1 Hydraulic Fracturing Information	3-9
3.2.3.2 Water Source Information.....	3-9
3.2.3.3 Distances	3-10
3.2.3.4 Water Well Information	3-11
3.2.3.5 Fluid Disposal Plan.....	3-11
3.2.3.6 Operational Information	3-12
3.2.3.7 Invasive Species Survey and Map.....	3-13
3.2.3.8 Required Affirmations	3-13
3.2.3.9 Local Planning Documents	3-14
3.2.3.10 Habitat Fragmentation	3-14
3.2.4 Prohibited Locations.....	3-14
3.2.5 Projects Requiring Site-Specific SEQRA Determinations of Significance	3-15
3.3 REGULATIONS	3-17

Chapter 4 - Geology

CHAPTER 4 - GEOLOGY	4-1
4.1 INTRODUCTION	4-1
4.2 BLACK SHALES	4-2
4.3 UTICA SHALE	4-5
4.3.1 Total Organic Carbon.....	4-10
4.3.2 Thermal Maturity and Fairways	4-13
4.3.3 Potential for Gas Production	4-13
4.4 MARCELLUS FORMATION	4-14
4.4.1 Total Organic Carbon.....	4-16
4.4.2 Thermal Maturity and Fairways	4-16
4.4.3 Potential for Gas Production	4-17
4.5 SEISMICITY IN NEW YORK STATE	4-23
4.5.1 Background.....	4-23
4.5.2 Seismic Risk Zones.....	4-24
4.5.4 Seismic Events	4-27
4.5.5 Monitoring Systems in New York	4-35
4.6 NATURALLY OCCURRING RADIOACTIVE MATERIALS (NORM) IN MARCELLUS SHALE	4-35
4.7 NATURALLY-OCCURRING METHANE IN NEW YORK STATE	4-36

FIGURES

Figure 4.1 - Gas Shale Distribution in the Appalachian Basin	4-4
Figure 4.2 - Stratigraphic Column of Southwestern New York	4-7
Figure 4.3 - East West Cross-Section of New York State.	4-8
Figure 4.4 - Extent of Utica Shale in New York State	4-9
Figure 4.5 - Depth to Base of Utica Shale in New York State.....	4-11
Figure 4.6 - Thickness of High-Organic Utica Shale in New York State	4-12
Figure 4.7 - Utica Shale Fairway in New York State	4-15
Figure 4.8 - Depth and Extent of Marcellus Shale in New York State	4-18
Figure 4.9 - Marcellus Shale Thickness in New York State.....	4-19
Figure 4.10 - Total Organic Carbon of Marcellus Shale in New York State	4-20
Figure 4.11 - Marcellus Shale Thermal Maturity	4-21
Figure 4.12 - Marcellus Shale Fairway in New York State.....	4-22
Figure 4.13 - Mapped Geologic Faults in New York State	4-25
Figure 4.14 - New York State Seismic Hazard Map.....	4-26
Figure 4.15 - Seismic Events in New York State (1970 to 2009)	4-34

TABLES

Table 4.1 - Modified Mercalli Scale	4-29
Table 4.2 - Summary of Seismic Events in New York State.....	4-30

Chapter 5 - Natural Gas Development Activities & High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing

CHAPTER 5 NATURAL GAS DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES & HIGH-VOLUME HYDRAULIC FRACTURING	5-5
5.1 LAND DISTURBANCE.....	5-6
5.1.1 Access Roads	5-6
5.1.2 Well Pads	5-10
5.1.3 Utility Corridors	5-14
5.1.4 Well Pad Density.....	5-14
5.1.4.1 Historic Well Density.....	5-14
5.1.4.2 Anticipated Well Pad Density	5-16
5.2 HORIZONTAL DRILLING	5-24
5.2.1 Drilling Rigs	5-25
5.2.2 Multi-Well Pad Development	5-30
5.2.3 Drilling Mud	5-32
5.2.4 Cuttings.....	5-33
5.2.4.1 Cuttings Volume.....	5-33
5.2.4.2 NORM in Marcellus Cuttings.....	5-34
5.2.5 Management of Drilling Fluids and Cuttings	5-37
5.2.5.1 Reserve Pits on Multi-Well Pads	5-37
5.2.5.2 Closed-Loop Tank Systems.....	5-37
5.3 HYDRAULIC FRACTURING.....	5-39
5.4 FRACTURING FLUID	5-40
5.4.1 Properties of Fracturing Fluids	5-49
5.4.2 Classes of Additives	5-49
5.4.3 Composition of Fracturing Fluids.....	5-50
5.4.3.1 Chemical Categories and Health Information.....	5-63
5.5 TRANSPORT OF HYDRAULIC FRACTURING ADDITIVES	5-79
5.6 ON-SITE STORAGE AND HANDLING OF HYDRAULIC FRACTURING ADDITIVES	5-80
5.6.1 Summary of Additive Container Types	5-81
5.7 SOURCE WATER FOR HIGH-VOLUME HYDRAULIC FRACTURING	5-83
5.7.1 Delivery of Source Water to the Well Pad.....	5-84
5.7.2 Use of Centralized Impoundments for Fresh Water Storage	5-85
5.8 HYDRAULIC FRACTURING DESIGN	5-88
5.8.1 Fracture Development.....	5-89
5.8.2 Methods for Limiting Fracture Growth	5-90
5.8.3 Hydraulic Fracturing Design – Summary	5-90
5.9 HYDRAULIC FRACTURING PROCEDURE	5-91
5.10 RE-FRACTURING.....	5-98
5.11 FLUID RETURN.....	5-99
5.11.1 Flowback Water Recovery	5-99
5.11.2 Flowback Water Handling at the Wellsite	5-100
5.11.3 Flowback Water Characteristics	5-100
5.11.3.1 Temporal Trends in Flowback Water Composition.....	5-117
5.11.3.2 NORM in Flowback Water	5-117

5.12 FLOWBACK WATER TREATMENT, RECYCLING AND REUSE.....	5-118
5.12.1 Physical and Chemical Separation	5-120
5.12.2 Dilution	5-121
5.12.2.1 Reuse	5-122
5.12.3 Other On-Site Treatment Technologies.....	5-124
5.12.3.1 Membranes / Reverse Osmosis	5-124
5.12.3.2 Thermal Distillation.....	5-125
5.12.3.3 Ion Exchange	5-126
5.12.3.4 Electrodialysis/Electrodialysis Reversal	5-126
5.12.3.5 Ozone/Ultrasonic/Ultraviolet	5-127
5.12.3.6 Crystallization/Zero Liquid Discharge	5-128
5.12.4 Comparison of Potential On-Site Treatment Technologies	5-128
5.13 WASTE DISPOSAL.....	5-129
5.13.1 Cuttings from Mud Drilling	5-129
5.13.2 Reserve Pit Liner from Mud Drilling	5-130
5.13.3 Flowback Water.....	5-130
5.13.3.1 Injection Wells	5-131
5.13.3.2 Municipal Sewage Treatment Facilities	5-132
5.13.3.3 Out-of-State Treatment Plants	5-132
5.13.3.4 Road Spreading.....	5-133
5.13.3.5 Private In-State Industrial Treatment Plants	5-133
5.13.3.6 Enhanced Oil Recovery	5-134
5.13.4 Solid Residuals from Flowback Water Treatment	5-134
5.14 WELL CLEANUP AND TESTING	5-134
5.15 SUMMARY OF OPERATIONS PRIOR TO PRODUCTION.....	5-135
5.16 NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION	5-137
5.16.1 Partial Site Reclamation.....	5-137
5.16.2 Gas Composition.....	5-137
5.16.2.1 Hydrocarbons.....	5-137
5.16.2.2 Hydrogen Sulfide.....	5-138
5.16.3 Production Rate.....	5-138
5.16.4 Well Pad Production Equipment	5-139
5.16.5 Brine Storage	5-141
5.16.6 Brine Disposal	5-141
5.16.7 NORM in Marcellus Production Brine	5-141
5.16.8 Gas Gathering and Compression	5-142
5.17 WELL PLUGGING	5-143

FIGURES

Figure 5.1 - Well Pad Schematic 5-15
Figure 5.2 - Possible well spacing unit configurations and wellbore paths 5-31
Figure 5.3 - Sample Fracturing Fluid Composition (12 Additives), by Weight, from Fayetteville Shale 5-53
Figure 5.4 - Sample Fracturing Fluid Composition (9 Additives), by Weight, from Marcellus Shale (New July 2011). 5-53
Figure 5.5 - Sample Fracturing Fluid Composition (6 Additives), by Weight, from Marcellus Shale (New July 2011). 5-54
Figure 5.6 - Example Fracturing Fluid Composition Including Recycled Flowback Water (New July 2011)..... 5-123
Figure 5.7 - One configuration of potential on-site treatment technologies. 5-124
Figure 5.8 - Simplified Illustration of Gas Production Process..... 5-140

TABLES

Table 5.1 - Ten square mile area (i.e., 6,400 acres), completely drilled with horizontal wells in multi-well units or vertical wells in single-well units (Updated July 2011) 5-23
Table 5.2 - 2009 Marcellus Radiological Data 5-35
Table 5.3 - Gamma Ray Spectroscopy 5-36
Table 5.4 - Fracturing Additive Products – Complete Composition Disclosure Made to the Department (Updated July 2011)..... 5-42
Table 5.5 - Fracturing Additive Products – Partial Composition Disclosure to the Department (Updated July 2011) 5-47
Table 5.6 - Types and Purposes of Additives Proposed for Use in New York State (Updated July 2011)..... 5-50
Table 5.7 - Chemical Constituents in Additives” (Updated July 2011) 5-55
Table 5.8 - Categories based on chemical structure of potential fracturing fluid constituents. (Updated July 2011) 5-64
Table 5.9 - Parameters present in a limited set of flowback analytical results (Updated July 2011) 5-102
Table 5.10 - Typical concentrations of flowback constituents based on limited samples from PA and WV, and regulated in NY’ (Revised July 2011) 5-106
Table 5.11 - Typical concentrations of flowback constituents based on limited samples from PA and WV, not regulated in NY(Revised July 2011) 5-108
Table 5.12 - Conventional Analytes In MSC Study (New July 2011) 5-110
Table 5.13 - Total and Dissolved Metals Analyzed In MSC Study (New July 2011)..... 5-110
Table 5.14 - Volatile Organic Compounds Analyzed in MSC Study (New July 2011) 5-111
Table 5.15 - Semi-Volatile Organics Analyzed in MSC Study (New July 2011)..... 5-112
Table 5.16 - Organochlorine Pesticides Analyzed in MSC Study (New July 2011) 5-112
Table 5.17 - PCBs Analyzed in MSC Study (New July 2011) 5-113
Table 5.18 - Organophosphorus Pesticides Analyzed in MSC Study (New July 2011) 5-113
Table 5.19 - Alcohols Analyzed in MSC Study (New July 2011) 5-113
Table 5.20 - Glycols Analyzed in MSC Study (New July 2011)..... 5-113
Table 5.21 - Acids Analyzed in MSC Study (New July 2011) 5-113
Table 5.22 - Parameter Classes Analyzed for in the MSC Study (New July 2011)..... 5-114
Table 5.23 - Parameter Classes Detected in Flowback Analyticals in MSC Study (New July 2011) 5-114
Table 5.24 - Concentrations of NORM constituents based on limited samples from PA and WV (Revised July 2011)5-118
Table 5.25 - Maximum allowable water quality requirements for fracturing fluids, based on input from one expert panel on Barnett Shale (Revised July 2011)..... 5-119
Table 5.26 - Treatment capabilities of EDR and RO Systems..... 5-127
Table 5.27 - Summary of Characteristics of On-Site Flowback Water Treatment Technologies (Updated July 2011) 5-129
Table 5.28 - Out-of-state treatment plants proposed for disposition of NY flowback water..... 5-133
Table 5.29 - Primary Pre-Production Well Pad Operations (Revised July 2011)..... 5-135
Table 5.30 - Marcellus Gas Composition from Bradford County, PA..... 5-137

PHOTOS

Photo 5.1 - Access Road and Erosion/Sedimentation Controls, Salo 1, Barton, Tioga County NY 5-8

Photo 5.2 - Access Road, Nornew Smyrna Hillbillies 2H, Smyrna, Madison County NY 5-8

Photo 5.3 - In-Service Access Road to Horizontal Marcellus well in Bradford County PA..... 5-9

Photo 5.4 - Access Road and Sedimentation Controls, Moss 1, Corning, Steuben County NY..... 5-9

Photo 5.5 - Chesapeake Energy Marcellus Well Drilling, Bradford County, PA 5-12

Photo 5.6 - Hydraulic fracturing operation, Horizontal Marcellus Well, Upshur County, WV 5-12

Photo 5.7 - Hydraulic Fracturing Operation, Horizontal Marcellus Well, Bradford County, PA 5-13

Photo 5.8 - Locations of Over 44,000 Natural Gas Wells Targeting the Medina Formation, Chautauqua County NY 5-18

Photo 5.9 - Locations of 48 Natural Gas Wells Targeting the Medina Formation, Chautauqua County NY..... 5-19

Photo 5.10 - Locations of 28 Wells in the Town of Poland, Chautauqua County NY..... 5-20

Photo 5.11 - Locations of 77 Wells in the Town of Sheridan, Chautauqua County NY..... 5-21

Photo 5.12 - Double Drilling Rig, Union Drilling Rig 54, Olsen 1B, Town of Fenton, Broome County NY 5-28

Photo 5.13 - Double Drilling Rig, Union Drilling Rig 48, Salo 1, Town of Barton, Tioga County NY 5-28

Photo 5.14 - Triple Drilling Rig, Precision Drilling Rig 26, Ruger 1, Horseheads, Chemung County NY 5-29

Photo 5.15 - Top Drive Single Drilling Rig, Barber and DeLine Rig, Sheckells 1, Town of Cherry Valley, Otsego County NY 5-29

Photo 5.16 - Drilling rig mud system (blue tanks) 5-33

Photo 5.17 - Sand used as proppant in hydraulic fracturing operation in Bradford County, PA..... 5-51

Photo 5.18 - Transport trucks with totes..... 5-82

Photo 5.19 - Fortuna SRBC-Approved Chemung River Water Withdrawal Facility, Towanda PA 5-86

Photo 5.20 - Fresh Water Supply Pond..... 5-86

Photo 5.21 - Water Pipeline from Fortuna Centralized Freshwater Impoundments, Troy PA 5-86

Photo 5.22 - Construction of Freshwater Impoundment, Upshur County WV..... 5-87

Photo 5.23 - Personnel monitoring a hydraulic fracturing procedure. Source: Fortuna Energy. 5-91

Photo 5.24 - Three Fortuna Energy wells being prepared for hydraulic fracturing, with 10,000 psi well head and goat head attached to lines. Troy PA. Source: New York State Department of Environmental Conservation 20095-93

Photo 5.25 - Hydraulic Fracturing Operation Equipment at a Fortuna Energy Multi-Well Site, Troy PA 5-96

Photo 5.26 - Fortuna Energy Multi-Well Site in Troy PA After Removal of Most Hydraulic Fracturing Equipment 5-97

Photo 5.27 - Wellhead and Fracturing Equipment 5-97

Photo 5.28 - Pipeline Compressor in New York. Source: Fortuna Energy 5-143

Chapter 6 – Potential Environmental Impacts

CHAPTER 6 POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS.....	6-1
6.1 WATER RESOURCES	6-1
6.1.1 Water Withdrawals	6-2
6.1.1.1 Reduced Stream Flow	6-2
6.1.1.2 Degradation of a Stream’s Best Use	6-2
6.1.1.3 Impacts to Aquatic Habitat	6-3
6.1.1.4 Impacts to Aquatic Ecosystems	6-3
6.1.1.5 Impacts to Wetlands	6-5
6.1.1.6 Aquifer Depletion.....	6-5
6.1.1.7 Cumulative Water Withdrawal Impacts	6-6
6.1.2 Stormwater Runoff	6-14
6.1.3 Surface Spills and Releases at the Well Pad	6-15
6.1.3.1 Drilling.....	6-16
6.1.3.2 Hydraulic Fracturing Additives.....	6-16
6.1.3.3 Flowback Water and Production Brine	6-17
6.1.3.4 Potential Impacts to Primary and Principal Aquifers	6-36
6.1.4 Groundwater Impacts Associated With Well Drilling and Construction	6-40
6.1.4.1 Turbidity.....	6-40
6.1.4.2 Fluids Pumped Into the Well.....	6-41
6.1.4.3 Natural Gas Migration	6-41
6.1.5 Unfiltered Surface Drinking Water Supplies: NYC and Syracuse	6-42
6.1.5.1 Pollutants of Critical Concern in Unfiltered Drinking Water Supplies	6-45
6.1.5.2 Regulatory and Programmatic Framework for Filtration Avoidance	6-48
6.1.5.3 Adverse Impacts to Unfiltered Drinking Waters from High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing.....	6-50
6.1.5.4 Conclusion.....	6-52
6.1.6 Hydraulic Fracturing Procedure.....	6-52
6.1.6.1 Wellbore Failure	6-53
6.1.6.2 Subsurface Pathways	6-53
6.1.7 Waste Transport.....	6-56
6.1.8 Fluid Discharges.....	6-57
6.1.8.1 POTWs	6-57
6.1.8.2 Private Off-site Wastewater Treatment and/or Reuse Facilities	6-63
6.1.8.3 Private On-site Wastewater Treatment and/or Reuse Facilities	6-64
6.1.8.4 Disposal Wells.....	6-64
6.1.8.5 Other Means of Wastewater Disposal.....	6-64
6.1.9 Solids Disposal	6-65
6.1.9.1 NORM Considerations - Cuttings	6-65
6.1.9.2 Cuttings Volume.....	6-65
6.1.9.3 Cuttings and Liner Associated With Mud-Drilling	6-66
6.2 FLOODPLAINS	6-66
6.3 FRESHWATER WETLANDS	6-66
6.4 ECOSYSTEMS AND WILDLIFE.....	6-66
6.4.1 Impacts of Fragmentation to Terrestrial Habitats and Wildlife.....	6-67
6.4.1.1 Impacts of Grassland Fragmentation.....	6-72
6.4.1.2 Impacts of Forest Fragmentation	6-74
6.4.2 Invasive Species	6-84

6.4.2.1	Terrestrial.....	6-84
6.4.2.2	Aquatic.....	6-86
6.4.3	Impacts to Endangered and Threatened Species	6-88
6.4.4	Impacts to State-Owned Lands.....	6-90
6.5	AIR QUALITY.....	6-93
6.5.1	Regulatory Overview	6-93
6.5.1.1	Emission Analysis NO _x - Internal Combustion Engine Emissions	6-99
6.5.1.2	Natural Gas Production Facilities NESHAP 40 CFR Part 63, Subpart HH (Glycol Dehydrators) ...	6-102
6.5.1.3	Flaring Versus Venting of Wellsite Air Emissions.....	6-103
6.5.1.4	Number of Wells Per Pad Site.....	6-104
6.5.1.5	Natural Gas Condensate Tanks	6-104
6.5.1.6	Emissions Tables	6-105
6.5.1.7	Offsite Gas Gathering Station Engine	6-107
6.5.1.8	Department Determinations on the Air Permitting Process Relative to Marcellus Shale High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing Development Activities.....	6-108
6.5.2	Air Quality Impact Assessment.....	6-110
6.5.2.1	Introduction	6-110
6.5.2.2	Sources of Air Emissions and Operational Scenarios	6-113
6.5.2.3	Modeling Procedures	6-117
6.5.2.4	Results of the Modeling Analysis	6-132
6.5.2.5	Supplemental Modeling Assessment for Short Term PM _{2.5} , SO ₂ and NO ₂ Impacts and Mitigation Measures Necessary to Meet NAAQS.....	6-140
6.5.2.6	The Practicality of Mitigation Measures on the Completion Equipment and Drilling Engines.....	6-153
6.5.2.7	Conclusions from the Modeling Analysis.....	6-157
6.5.3	Regional Emissions of O ₃ Precursors and Their Effects on Attainment Status in the SIP	6-168
6.5.4	Air Quality Monitoring Requirements for Marcellus Shale Activities.....	6-180
6.5.5	Permitting Approach to the Well Pad and Compressor Station Operations	6-185
6.6	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS	6-186
6.6.1	Greenhouse Gases.....	6-187
6.6.2	Emissions from Oil and Gas Operations	6-187
6.6.2.1	Vented Emissions.....	6-188
6.6.2.2	Combustion Emissions.....	6-188
6.6.2.3	Fugitive Emissions.....	6-189
6.6.3	Emissions Source Characterization.....	6-189
6.6.4	Emission Rates	6-193
6.6.5	Drilling Rig Mobilization, Site Preparation and Demobilization	6-194
6.6.6	Completion Rig Mobilization and Demobilization	6-195
6.6.7	Well Drilling	6-195
6.6.8	Well Completion.....	6-196
6.6.9	Well Production.....	6-198
6.6.10	Summary of GHG Emissions	6-200
6.7	NATURALLY OCCURRING RADIOACTIVE MATERIALS IN THE MARCELLUS SHALE.....	6-205
6.8	SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACTS	6-207
6.8.1	Economy, Employment, and Income.....	6-211
6.8.1.1	New York State	6-211
6.8.1.2	Representative Regions	6-217
6.8.2	Population	6-231
6.8.2.1	New York State	6-233
6.8.2.2	Representative Regions	6-238
6.8.3	Housing.....	6-242

6.8.3.1	New York State	6-242
6.8.3.2	Representative Regions	6-245
6.8.3.3	Cyclical Nature of the Natural Gas Industry.....	6-250
6.8.3.4	Property Values	6-250
6.8.4	Government Revenue and Expenditures.....	6-254
6.8.4.1	New York State	6-254
6.8.4.2	Representative Regions	6-257
6.8.5	Environmental Justice.....	6-263
6.9	VISUAL IMPACTS	6-263
6.9.1	Changes since Publication of the 1992 GEIS that Affect the Assessment of Visual Impacts	6-264
6.9.1.1	Equipment and Drilling Techniques	6-264
6.9.1.2	Changes in Well Pad Size and the Number of Water Storage Sites	6-265
6.9.1.3	Duration and Nature of Drilling and Hydraulic-Fracturing Activities	6-265
6.9.2	New Landscape Features Associated with the Different Phases of Horizontal Drilling and Hydraulic Fracturing	6-266
6.9.2.1	New Landscape Features Associated with the Construction of Well Pads.....	6-266
6.9.2.2	New Landscape Features Associated with Drilling Activities at Well Pads	6-270
6.9.2.3	New Landscape Features Associated with Hydraulic Fracturing Activities at Well Pads.....	6-270
6.9.2.4	New Landscape Features Associated with Production at Viable Well Sites	6-272
6.9.2.5	New Landscape Features Associated with the Reclamation of Well Sites.....	6-272
6.9.3	Visual Impacts Associated with the Different Phases of Horizontal Drilling and Hydraulic Fracturing	6-272
6.9.3.1	Visual Impacts Associated with Construction of Well Pads	6-273
6.9.3.2	Visual Impacts Associated with Drilling Activities on Well Pads.....	6-274
6.9.3.3	Visual Impacts Associated with Hydraulic Fracturing Activities at Well Sites.....	6-275
6.9.3.4	Visual Impacts Associated with Production at Well Sites	6-275
6.9.3.5	Visual Impacts Associated with the Reclamation of Well Sites	6-276
6.9.4	Visual Impacts of Off-site Activities Associated with Horizontal Drilling and Hydraulic Fracturing	6-277
6.9.5	Previous Evaluations of Visual Impacts from Horizontal Drilling and Hydraulic Fracturing	6-279
6.9.6	Assessment of Visual Impacts using NYSDEC Policy and Guidance	6-283
6.9.7	Summary of Visual Impacts	6-284
6.10	NOISE	6-289
6.10.1	Access Road Construction	6-291
6.10.2	Well Site Preparation.....	6-292
6.10.3	High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing – Drilling	6-293
6.10.4	High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing – Fracturing	6-296
6.10.5	Transportation.....	6-299
6.10.6	Gas Well Production	6-300
6.11	TRANSPORTATION IMPACTS	6-300
6.11.1	Estimated Truck Traffic.....	6-301
6.11.1.1	Total Number of Trucks per Well.....	6-301
6.11.1.2	Temporal Distribution of Truck Traffic per Well	6-304
6.11.1.3	Temporal Distribution of Truck Traffic for Multi-Well Pads	6-304
6.11.2	Increased Traffic on Roadways.....	6-307
6.11.3	Damage to Local Roads, Bridges, and other Infrastructure.....	6-310
6.11.4	Damage to State Roads, Bridges, and other Infrastructure.....	6-312
6.11.5	Operational and Safety Impacts on Road Systems	6-314
6.11.6	Transportation of Hazardous Materials.....	6-315
6.11.7	Impacts on Rail and Air Travel	6-316
6.12	COMMUNITY CHARACTER IMPACTS.....	6-316

6.13 SEISMICITY	6-319
6.13.1 Hydraulic Fracturing-Induced Seismicity	6-319
6.13.1.1 Background	6-320
6.13.1.2 Recent Investigations and Studies	6-323
6.13.1.3 Correlations between New York and Texas	6-325
6.13.1.4 Affects of Seismicity on Wellbore Integrity	6-326
6.13.2 Summary of Potential Seismicity Impacts	6-327

FIGURES

Figure 6.1 - Water Withdrawals in the United States	6-11
Figure 6.2 - Fresh Water Use in NY (millions of gallons per day) with Projected Peak Water Use for High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing (New July 2011)	6-12
Figure 6.3 - Daily Water Withdrawals, Exports, and Consumptive Uses in the Delaware River Basin	6-13
Figure 6.4- NYSDOH Regulated Groundwater Supplies within Mapped Primary and Principal Aquifers in NY, Where the Marcellus Shale is Greater than 2,000 Feet below Ground Surface	6-38
Figure 6.5 - Average Spatial Disturbance for Marcellus Shale Well Pads in Forested Context (New July 2011)	6-77
Figure 6.6 – Interior Forest Habitat Before & After Development of a Marcellus Gas Well Pad, Elk County PA (New July 2011)	6-80
Figure 6.7 - Total Forest Areas Converted (New July 2011)	6-81
Figure 6.8 - New York’s Forest Matrix Blocks and State Connectivity (New July 2011)	6-83
Figure 6.9-Areas of Concern for Endangered and Threatened Animal Species within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus Shale in New York, March 31, 2011 (New July 2011)	6-90
Figure 6.10 - Location of Well Pad Sources of Air Pollution Used in Modeling	6-167
Figure 6.11 - Barnett Shale Natural Gas Production Trend, 1998-2007	6-173
Figure 6.12 – Projected Direct Employment in New York State Resulting from Each Development Scenario (New August 2011)	6-214
Figure 6.13 - Projected Total Employment in New York State Resulting from Each Development Scenario (New August 2011)	6-215
Figure 6.14 - Projected Direct Employment in Region A Resulting from Each Development Scenario (New August 2011)	6-221
Figure 6.15 - Projected Direct Employment in Region B Resulting from Each Development Scenario (New August 2011)	6-222
Figure 6.16 - Projected Direct Employment in Region C Resulting from Each Development Scenario (New August 2011)	6-223
Figure 6.17 – Projected Total Employment in Region A Under Each Development Scenario (New August 2011)	6-225
Figure 6.18 - Projected Total Employment in Region B Under Each Development Scenario (New August 2011)	6-226
Figure 6.19 - Projected Total Employment in Region C Under Each Development Scenario (New August 2011)	6-227
Figure 6.20 - A-Weighted Noise Emissions: Cruise Throttle, Average Pavement (New August 2011)	6-299
Figure 6.21 - Estimated Round-Trip Daily Heavy and Light Truck Traffic, by Well Type - Single Well (New August 2011)	6-304
Figure 6.22 - Estimated Daily Round-Trips of Heavy and Light Truck Traffic - Multi Horizontal Wells (New August 2011)	6-306
Figure 6.23 - Estimated Round-Trip Daily Heavy and Light Truck Traffic - Multi Vertical Wells (New August 2011) ..	6-306

TABLES

Table 6.1 - Comparison of additives used or proposed for use in NY, parameters detected in analytical results of flowback from the Marcellus operations in PA and WV and parameters regulated via primary and secondary drinking water standards, SPDES or TOGS111 (Revised August 2011)	6-19
Table 6.2 - Grassland Bird Population Trends at Three Scales from 1966 to 2005. (New July 2011)	6-73

Table 6.3 - Terrestrial Invasive Plant Species In New York State (Interim List)'	6-85
Table 6.4 - Aquatic, Wetland & Littoral Invasive Plant Species in New York State (Interim List)'	6-87
Table 6.5 - Endangered & Threatened Animal Species within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus Shale (New July 2011)	6-89
Table 6.6 - EPA AP-42 Emissions Factors Tables	6-100
Table 6.7 - Estimated Wellsite Emissions (Dry Gas) - Flowback Gas Flaring (Tpy)(Updated July 2011)	6-106
Table 6.8 - Estimated Wellsite Emissions (Dry Gas) - Flowback Gas Venting (Tpy)(Updated July 2011)	6-106
Table 6.9 - Estimated Wellsite Emissions (Wet Gas) - Flowback Gas Flaring (Tpy) (Updated July 2011)	6-106
Table 6.10 - Estimated Wellsite Emissions (Wet Gas) - Flowback Gas Venting (Tpy) (Updated July 2011)	6-106
Table 6.11 - Estimated Off-Site Compressor Station Emissions (Tpy)	6-107
Table 6.12 - Sources and Pollutants Modeled for Short-Term Simultaneous Operations	6-159
Table 6.13 - National Weather Service Data Sites Used in the Modeling	6-159
Table 6.14 - National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), PSD Increments & Significant Impact Levels (SILs) for Criteria Pollutants ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	6-160
Table 6.15 - Maximum Background Concentration from Department Monitor Sites	6-161
Table 6.16 - Maximum Impacts of Criteria Pollutants for Each Meteorological Data Set	6-162
Table 6.17 - Maximum Project Impacts of Criteria Pollutants and Comparison to SILs, PSD Increments and Ambient Standards	6-163
Table 6.18 - Maximum Impacts of Non-Criteria Pollutants and Comparisons to SGC/AGC and New York State AAQS	6-164
Table 6.19 - Modeling Results for Short Term PM ₁₀ , PM _{2.5} and NO ₂ (New July 2011)	6-165
Table 6.20 - Engine Tiers and Use in New York with Recommended Mitigation Controls Based on the Modeling Analysis (New July 2011)	6-166
Table 6.21 - Predicted Ozone Precursor Emissions (Tpy)	6-174
Table 6.22 - Barnett Shale Annual Average Emissions from All Sources	6-178
Table 6.23 - Near-Field Pollutants of Concern for Inclusion in the Near-Field Monitoring Program (New July 2011)	6-182
Table 6.24 - Department Air Quality Monitoring Requirements for Marcellus Shale Activities (New July 2011)	6-184
Table 6.25 - Assumed Drilling & Completion Time Frames for Single Vertical Well (New July 2011)	6-192
Table 6.26 - Assumed Drilling & Completion Time Frames for Single Horizontal Well (Updated July 2011)	6-192
Table 6.27 - Global Warming Potential for Given Time Horizon	6-201
Table 6.28 - Summary of Estimated Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Revised July 2011)	6-201
Table 6.29 - Emission Estimation Approaches – General Considerations	6-204
Table 6.30 - Radionuclide Half-Lives	6-206
Table 6.31 - Major Development Scenario Assumptions (New August 2011)	6-209
Table 6.32 - Maximum Direct and Indirect Employment Impacts on New York State under Each Development Scenario (New August 2011)	6-213
Table 6.33 - Maximum Direct and Indirect Annual Employee Earnings Impacts on New York State under Each Development Scenario (New August 2011)	6-216
Table 6.34 - Major Development Scenario Assumptions for Each Representative Region (New August 2011)	6-218
Table 6.35 - Maximum Direct and Indirect Employment Impacts on Each Representative Region under Each Development Scenario (New August 2011)	6-220
Table 6.36 - Maximum Direct and Indirect Earnings Impacts on Each Representative Region under Each Development Scenario (New August 2011)	6-228
Table 6.37 - Transient, Permanent and Total Construction Employment Under Each Development Scenario for Select Years: New York State (New August 2011)	6-234
Table 6.38 - Estimated Population Associated with Construction and Production Employment for Select Years: New York State (New August 2011)	6-235
Table 6.39 - Maximum Temporary and Permanent Impacts Associated with Well Construction and Production: New York State (New August 2011)	6-237
Table 6.40 - Transient, Permanent, and Total Construction Employment Under Each Development Scenario for Select Years for Representative Region A (New August 2011)	6-238

Table 6.41 - Transient, Permanent, and Total Construction Employment Under Each Development Scenario for Select Years for Representative Region B (New August 2011)	6-238
Table 6.42 - Transient, Permanent, and Total Construction Employment Under Each Development Scenario for Select Years for Representative Region C (New August 2011)	6-239
Table 6.43 - Maximum Temporary and Permanent Impacts Associated with Well Construction and Production	6-240
Table 6.44 - Maximum ¹ Estimated Employment by Development Scenario for New York State (New August 2011)	6-243
Table 6.45 - New York State Rental Housing Stock (2010) (New August 2011).....	6-244
Table 6.46 - Availability of Owner-Occupied Housing Units (2010) (New August 2011).....	6-245
Table 6.47 - Maximum Transient and Permanent Employment by Development Scenario and Region (New August 2011).....	6-245
Table 6.48 - Availability of Rental Housing Units (New August 2011)	6-247
Table 6.49 - Availability of Housing Units (New August 2011)	6-249
Table 6.50 - Example of the Real Property Tax Payments From a Typical Horizontal Well (New August 2011) ...	6-259
Table 6.51 - Example of the Real Property Tax Payments from a Typical Vertical Well (New August 2011)	6-261
Table 6.52 - Projected Change in Total Assessed Value and Property Tax Receipts ¹ at Peak Production (Year 30), by Region (New August 2011)	6-261
Table 6.53 - Summary of Generic Visual Impacts Resulting from Horizontal Drilling and Hydraulic Fracturing in the Marcellus and Utica Shale Area of New York (New August 2011).....	6-285
Table 6.54 - Estimated Construction Noise Levels at Various Distances for Access Road Construction (New August 2011).....	6-292
Table 6.55 - Estimated Construction Noise Levels at Various Distances for Well Pad Preparation (New August 2011)	6-293
Table 6.56 - Estimated Construction Noise Levels at Various Distances for Rotary Air Well Drilling (New August 2011).....	6-295
Table 6.57 - Estimated Construction Noise Levels at Various Distances for Horizontal Drilling (New August 2011) ..	6-295
Table 6.58 - Estimated Construction Noise Levels at Various Distances for High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing (New August 2011).....	6-297
Table 6.59 - Assumed Construction and Development Times (New August 2011)	6-298
Table 6.60 - Estimated Number of One-Way (Loaded) Trips Per Well: Horizontal Well ¹ (New August 2011)	6-302
Table 6.61 - Estimated Number of One-Way (Loaded) Trips Per Well: Vertical Well (New August 2011).....	6-303
Table 6.62 - Estimated Truck Volumes for Horizontal Wells Compared to Vertical Wells (New August 2011).....	6-303
Table 6.63 - Estimated Annual Heavy Truck Trips (in thousands) (New August 2011).....	6-309
Table 6.64 - Illustrative AADT Range for State Roads (New August 2011)	6-310

PHOTOS

Photo 6.1 - A representative view of completion activities at a recently constructed well pad (New August 2011) .	6-267
Photo 6.2 - A representative view of completion activities at a recently constructed well pad, showing a newly created access road in foreground (New August 2011)	6-268
Photo 6.3 - A representative view of a newly constructed water impoundment area (New August 2011)	6-269
Photo 6.4 - A representative view of a water procurement site (New August 2011)	6-269
Photo 6.5 - A representative view of active high-volume hydraulic fracturing (New August 2011)	6-271
Photo 6.6 - Electric Generators, Active Drilling Site (New August 2011).....	6-296
Photo 6.7 - Truck-mounted Hydraulic Fracturing Pump (New August 2011)	6-297
Photo 6.8 - Hydraulic Fracturing of a Marcellus Shale Well Site (New August 2011).....	6-298
Photo 6.9 - Map Depicting Trenton-Black River Wells and Historical Wells Targeting Other Formations in Chemung County	6-329
Photo 6.10 - Map Depicting the Location of Trenton-Black River Wells in the Eastern-end of Quackenbush Hill Field	6-330
Photo 6.11 - Trenton-Black River Well Site (Rhodes)	6-330

Photo 6.12 - Trenton-Black River Well Site (Gregory)	6-331
Photo 6.13 - Trenton-Black River Well Site (Schwingel)	6-331
Photo 6.14 - Trenton-Black River Well Site (Soderblom).....	6-332
Photo 6.15 - Map Depicting the Locations of Two Trenton Black River Wells in North-Central Chemung County	6-333
Photo 6.16 - Trenton-Black River Well Site (Little)	6-334
Photo 6.17 - Trenton-Black River Well Site (Hulett)	6-334
Photo 6.18 - Map Depicting the Location of Trenton-Black River Wells in Western Chemung County and Eastern Steuben County	6-335
Photo 6.19 - Trenton-Black River Well Site (Lovell)	6-336
Photo 6.20 - Trenton Black River Well Site (Henkel)	6-336

Chapter 7 – Mitigation Measures

CHAPTER 7 EXISTING AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	7-1
7.1 PROTECTING WATER RESOURCES	7-1
7.1.1 Water Withdrawal Regulatory and Oversight Programs	7-2
7.1.1.1 Department Jurisdictions.....	7-2
7.1.1.2 Other Jurisdictions - Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin Water Resources Compact	7-5
7.1.1.3 Other Jurisdictions - River Basin Commissions	7-6
7.1.1.4 Impact Mitigation Measures for Surface Water Withdrawals.....	7-14
7.1.1.5 Impact Mitigation Measures for Groundwater Withdrawals	7-24
7.1.1.6 Cumulative Water Withdrawal Impacts	7-25
7.1.2 Stormwater.....	7-26
7.1.2.1 Construction Activities.....	7-30
7.1.2.2 Industrial Activities	7-30
7.1.2.3 Production Activities.....	7-31
7.1.3 Surface Spills and Releases at the Well Pad	7-32
7.1.3.1 Fueling Tank and Tank Refilling Activities	7-33
7.1.3.2 Drilling Fluids	7-35
7.1.3.3 Hydraulic Fracturing Additives.....	7-38
7.1.3.4 Flowback Water	7-39
7.1.3.5 Primary and Principal Aquifers	7-40
7.1.4 Potential Ground Water Impacts Associated With Well Drilling and Construction	7-42
7.1.4.1 Private Water Well Testing.....	7-44
7.1.4.2 Sufficiency of As-Built Wellbore Construction.....	7-49
7.1.4.3 Annular Pressure Buildup	7-55
7.1.5 Setback from FAD Watersheds.....	7-55
7.1.6 Hydraulic Fracturing Procedure.....	7-56
7.1.7 Waste Transport.....	7-59
7.1.7.1 Drilling and Production Waste Tracking Form	7-59
7.1.7.2 Road Spreading.....	7-60
7.1.7.3 Flowback Water Piping	7-61
7.1.7.4 Use of Tanks Instead of Impoundments for Centralized Flowback Water Storage	7-61
7.1.7.5 Closure Requirements	7-62
7.1.8 SPDES Discharge Permits.....	7-62
7.1.8.1 Treatment Facilities	7-63
7.1.8.2 Disposal Wells.....	7-65
7.1.9 Solids Disposal	7-66
7.1.10 Protecting NYC’s Subsurface Water Supply Infrastructure	7-68
7.1.11 Setbacks.....	7-69
7.1.11.1 Setbacks from Groundwater Resources	7-71
7.1.11.2 Setbacks from Other Surface Water Resources.....	7-74
7.2 PROTECTING FLOODPLAINS	7-76
7.3 PROTECTING FRESHWATER WETLANDS	7-76
7.4 MITIGATING POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON ECOSYSTEMS AND WILDLIFE.....	7-77
7.4.1 Protecting Terrestrial Habitats and Wildlife	7-77
7.4.1.1 BMPs for Reducing Direct Impacts at Individual Well Sites.....	7-77
7.4.1.2 Reducing Indirect and Cumulative Impacts of Habitat Fragmentation	7-79
7.4.1.3 Monitoring Changes in Habitat.....	7-87
7.4.2 Invasive Species.....	7-88
7.4.2.1 Terrestrial.....	7-89

7.4.2.2	Aquatic.....	7-92
7.4.3	Protecting Endangered and Threatened Species	7-98
7.4.4	Protecting State-Owned Land	7-100
7.5	MITIGATING AIR QUALITY IMPACTS	7-101
7.5.1	Mitigation Measures Resulting from Regulatory Analysis (Internal Combustion Engines and Glycol Dehydrators).....	7-102
7.5.1.1	Control Measures for Nitrogen Oxides-NO _x	7-102
7.5.1.2	Control Measures for Sulfur Oxides - SO _x	7-105
7.5.1.3	Natural Gas Production Facilities Subject to NESHAP 40 CFR Part 63, Subpart HH (Glycol Dehydrators).....	7-106
7.5.2	Mitigation Measures Resulting from Air Quality Impact Assessment and Regional Ozone Precursor Emissions	7-107
7.5.3	Summary of Mitigation Measures to Protect Air Quality	7-108
7.5.3.1	Well Pad Activity Mitigation Measures.....	7-108
7.5.3.2	Mitigation Measures for Off-Site Gas Compressors	7-110
7.6	MITIGATING GHG EMISSIONS	7-110
7.6.1	General	7-110
7.6.2	Site Selection	7-111
7.6.3	Transportation.....	7-111
7.6.4	Well Design and Drilling.....	7-112
7.6.5	Well Completion.....	7-112
7.6.6	Well Production.....	7-113
7.6.7	Leak and Detection Repair Program.....	7-114
7.6.8	Mitigating GHG Emissions Impacts - Conclusion	7-116
7.7	MITIGATING NORM IMPACTS	7-117
7.7.1	State and Federal Responses to Oil and Gas NORM.....	7-117
7.7.2	Regulation of NORM in New York State	7-118
7.8	SOCIOECONOMIC MITIGATION MEASURES.....	7-120
7.9	VISUAL MITIGATION MEASURES	7-121
7.9.1	Design and Siting Measures.....	7-122
7.9.2	Maintenance Activities	7-126
7.9.3	Decommissioning	7-127
7.9.4	Offsetting Mitigation	7-128
7.10	NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES.....	7-128
7.10.1	Pad Siting Equipment, Layout and Operation	7-128
7.10.2	Access Road and Traffic Noise	7-129
7.10.3	Well Drilling and Hydraulic Fracturing.....	7-130
7.10.4	Conclusion	7-134
7.11	TRANSPORTATION MITIGATION MEASURES	7-135
7.11.1	Mitigating Damage to Local Road Systems.....	7-135
7.11.1.1	Development of Transportation Plans, Baseline Surveys, and Traffic Studies	7-136
7.11.1.2	Municipal Control over Local Road Systems.....	7-137
7.11.1.3	Road Use Agreements	7-138
7.11.1.4	Reimbursement for Costs Associated with Local Road Work	7-139
7.11.2	Mitigating Incremental Damage to the State System of Roads.....	7-140
7.11.3	Mitigating Operational and Safety Impacts on Road Systems	7-141
7.11.4	Other Transportation Mitigation Measures	7-142
7.11.5	Mitigating Impacts from the Transportation of Hazardous Materials	7-142

7.11.6 Mitigating Impacts on Rail and Air Travel.....	7-143
7.12 COMMUNITY CHARACTER MITIGATION MEASURES	7-144
7.13 EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN	7-146

FIGURES

Figure 7.1 - Hydrologic Regions of New York (New July 2011) (Taken from Lumia et al, 2006).....	7-21
Figure 7.2 - Key Habitat Areas for Protecting Grassland and Interior Forest Habitats (Updated August 2011).....	7-80
Figure 7.3 - Scaling Factors for Matrix Forest Systems in the High Allegheny Ecoregion (New July 2011)	7-84

TABLES

Table 7.1 - Regulations Pertaining to Watershed Withdrawal (Revised July 2011).....	7-7
Table 7.2 - Regional Passby Flow Coefficients (cfs/sq. mi.) (Updated August 2011).....	7-22
Table 7.3 - NYSDOH Water Well Testing Recommendations	7-46
Table 7.4 - Principal Species Found in the Four Grassland Focus Areas within the area underlain by the Marcellus Shale in New York (New July 2011)	7-81
Table 7.5 - Summary of Regulations Pertaining to Transfer of Invasive Species.....	7-94
Table 7.6 - Required Well Pad Stack Heights to Prevent Exceedances.....	7-109

PHOTOS

Photo 7.1 - View of a well site during the fracturing phase of development, with maximum presence of on-site equipment. (New August 2011).....	7-125
Photo 7.2 - Sound Barrier. Source: Ground Water Protection Council, Oklahoma City, OK and ALL Consulting, Tulsa OK, 2009 (New August 2011).....	7-132
Photo 7.3 - Sound Barrier Installation (New August 2011).....	7-133
Photo 7.4 - Sound Barrier Installation (New August 2011).....	7-133

Chapter 8 – Permit Process and Regulatory Coordination

CHAPTER 8 PERMIT PROCESS AND REGULATORY COORDINATION	8-1
8.1 INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.....	8-1
8.1.1 Local Governments.....	8-1
8.1.1.1 SEQRA Participation	8-1
8.1.1.2 NYCDEP.....	8-4
8.1.1.3 Local Government Notification	8-4
8.1.1.4 Road-Use Agreements.....	8-4
8.1.1.5 Local Planning Documents	8-4
8.1.1.6 County Health Departments.....	8-5
8.1.2 State	8-5
8.1.2.1 Public Service Commission	8-6
8.1.2.2 NYS Department of Transportation.....	8-18
8.1.3 Federal.....	8-19
8.1.3.1 U.S. Department of Transportation.....	8-19
8.1.3.2 Occupational Safety and Health Administration – Material Safety Data Sheets.....	8-21
8.1.3.3 EPA’s Mandatory Reporting of Greenhouse Gases	8-24
8.1.4 River Basin Commissions.....	8-28
8.2 INTRA-DEPARTMENT	8-29
8.2.1 Well Permit Review Process.....	8-29
8.2.1.1 Required Hydraulic Fracturing Additive Information	8-29
8.2.2 Other Department Permits and Approvals	8-32
8.2.2.1 Bulk Storage.....	8-32
8.2.2.2 Impoundment Regulation	8-33
8.2.3 Enforcement.....	8-42
8.2.3.1 Enforcement of Article 23	8-42
8.2.3.2 Enforcement of Article 17	8-44
8.3 WELL PERMIT ISSUANCE	8-48
8.3.1 Use and Summary of Supplementary Permit Conditions for High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing.....	8-48
8.3.2 High-Volume Re-Fracturing.....	8-48
8.4 OTHER STATES’ REGULATIONS.....	8-49
8.4.1 Ground Water Protection Council.....	8-51
8.4.1.1 GWPC - Hydraulic Fracturing.....	8-51
8.4.1.2 GWPC - Other Activities.....	8-52
8.4.2 Alpha’s Regulatory Survey.....	8-53
8.4.2.1 Alpha - Hydraulic Fracturing.....	8-53
8.4.2.2 Alpha - Other Activities.....	8-54
8.4.3 Colorado’s Final Amended Rules.....	8-61
8.4.3.1 Colorado - New MSDS Maintenance and Chemical Inventory Rule	8-61
8.4.3.2 Colorado - Setbacks from Public Water Supplies	8-62
8.4.4 Summary of Pennsylvania Environmental Quality Board. Title 25-Environmental Protection, Chapter 78, Oil and Gas Wells.....	8-63
8.4.5 Other States’ Regulations - Conclusion	8-63

FIGURES

Figure 8.1- Protection of Waters - Dam Safety Permitting Criteria	8-35
---	------

TABLES

Table 8.1 - Regulatory Jurisdictions Associated with High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing (Revised July 2011).....	8-3
Table 8.2 - Intrastate Pipeline Regulation	8-10
Table 8.3 - Water Resources and Private Dwelling Setbacks from Alpha, 2009.....	8-60

Chapter 9 – Alternative Actions

CHAPTER 9 ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS	9-1
9.1 NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE.....	9-1
9.2 PHASED PERMITTING APPROACH	9-3
9.2.1 Inherent Difficulties in Predicting Gas Well Development Rates and Patterns.....	9-4
9.2.2 Known Tendency for Development to Occur in Phases without Government Intervention	9-4
9.2.3 Prohibitions and Limits that Function as a Partial Phased Permitting Approach	9-5
9.2.3.1 Permanent Prohibitions	9-6
9.2.3.2 Prohibitions in Place for at Least 3 Years	9-6
9.2.3.3 Prohibitions in Place for At Least 2 Years	9-6
9.2.4 Permit Issuance Matched to Department Resources.....	9-7
9.3 “GREEN” OR NON-CHEMICAL FRACTURING TECHNOLOGIES AND ADDITIVES	9-7
9.3.1 Environmentally-Friendly Chemical Alternatives	9-9
9.3.2 Summary	9-10
TABLES	
Table 9.1 - Marcellus Permits Issued in Pennsylvania, 2007 - 2010	9-5

Chapter 10 – Review of Selected Non-Routine Incidents in Pennsylvania

CHAPTER 10 REVIEW OF SELECTED NON-ROUTINE INCIDENTS IN PENNSYLVANIA	10-1
10.1 GAS MIGRATION – SUSQUEHANNA AND BRADFORD COUNTIES	10-1
10.1.1 Description of Incidents	10-1
10.1.2 New York Mitigation Measures Designed to Prevent Gas Migration Similar to the Pennsylvania Incidents.....	10-1
10.2 FRACTURING FLUID RELEASES – SUSQUEHANNA AND BRADFORD COUNTIES	10-2
10.2.1 Description of Incidents	10-2
10.2.2 New York Mitigation Measures Designed to Prevent Fracturing Fluid Releases.....	10-3
10.3 UNCONTROLLED WELLBORE RELEASE OF FLOWBACK WATER AND BRINE – CLEARFIELD COUNTY	10-4
10.3.1 Description of Incident.....	10-4
10.3.2 New York Mitigation Measures Designed to Prevent Uncontrolled Wellbore Release of Flowback Water and Brine	10-4
10.4 HIGH TOTAL DISSOLVED SOLIDS (TDS) DISCHARGES – MONONGAHELA RIVER.....	10-4
10.4.1 Description of Incidents	10-4
10.4.2 New York Mitigation Measures Designed to Prevent High In-Stream TDS.....	10-4

Chapter 11 – Summary of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures

CHAPTER 11 SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES11-1

TABLES

Table 11.1 - Summary of Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures (New July 2011) 11-2



Chapter 1

Introduction

This page intentionally left blank.

Chapter 1 – Introduction

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1 HYDRAULIC FRACTURING AND MULTI-WELL PAD DRILLING	1-1
1.1.1 Significant Changes in Proposed Operations Since 2009	1-2
1.1.1.1 Use of Reserve Pits or Centralized Impoundments for Flowback Water.....	1-2
1.1.1.2 Flowback Water Recycling.....	1-2
1.2 REGULATORY JURISDICTION	1-3
1.3 STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW ACT	1-3
1.4 PROJECT CHRONOLOGY	1-4
1.4.1 February 2009 Final Scope	1-4
1.4.2 2009 Draft SGEIS.....	1-4
1.4.2.1 April 2010 Announcement Regarding Communities with Filtration Avoidance Determinations ...	1-5
1.4.2.2 Subsequent Exclusion of Communities with Filtration Avoidance Determinations	1-5
1.4.3 Revised Draft SGEIS	1-5
1.4.4 Next Steps.....	1-5
1.5 METHODOLOGY	1-5
1.5.1 Information about the Proposed Operations.....	1-5
1.5.2 Intra-/Inter-agency Coordination	1-6
1.5.3 Comment Review	1-6
1.6 LAYOUT AND ORGANIZATION	1-7
1.6.1 Chapters	1-7
1.6.2 Revisions.....	1-9
1.6.3 Glossary, Bibliographies and Appendices.....	1-9
1.7 ENHANCED IMPACT ANALYSES AND MITIGATION MEASURES	1-9
1.7.1 Hydraulic Fracturing Chemical Disclosure	1-9
1.7.2 Water Well Testing.....	1-10
1.7.3 Water Withdrawal and Consumption.....	1-10
1.7.3.1 2009 Draft SGEIS	1-10
1.7.3.2 Revised Draft SGEIS.....	1-10
1.7.4 Well Control and Emergency Response Planning.....	1-10
1.7.5 Local Planning Documents.....	1-11
1.7.6 Secondary Containment, Spill Prevention and Stormwater Pollution Prevention	1-11
1.7.7 Well Construction	1-11
1.7.7.1 2009 Draft SGEIS	1-11
1.7.7.2 Revised Draft SGEIS.....	1-12
1.7.8 Flowback Water Handling On-Site.....	1-12
1.7.9 Flowback Water Disposal	1-13
1.7.10 Management of Drill Cuttings	1-13
1.7.11 Emissions and Air Quality	1-14
1.7.11.1 2009 Draft SGEIS	1-14
1.7.11.2 Revised Draft SGEIS.....	1-15
1.7.12 Greenhouse Gas Mitigation.....	1-16
1.7.13 Habitat Fragmentation	1-16
1.7.14 State Forests, State Wildlife Management Areas and State Parks	1-17
1.7.15 Community and Socioeconomic Impacts	1-17
1.8 ADDITIONAL PRECAUTIONARY MEASURES	1-17

This page intentionally left blank.

Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION

The Department of Environmental Conservation (Department) has received applications for permits to drill horizontal wells to evaluate and develop the Marcellus and Utica Shales for natural gas production. To release the gas embedded in the shale formations, wells would undergo a stimulation process known as high-volume hydraulic fracturing. While the horizontal well applications received to date are for proposed locations in Broome, Cattaraugus, Chemung, Chenango, Delaware, and Tioga Counties, the Department expects to receive applications to drill in other areas, including counties where natural gas production has not previously occurred. There is also potential for development of the Utica Shale using horizontal drilling and high-volume hydraulic fracturing in Otsego and Schoharie Counties and elsewhere as shown in Chapter 4. Other shale and low-permeability formations in New York may also be targeted for future application of horizontal drilling and high-volume hydraulic fracturing. The Department has prepared this revised draft Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement (SGEIS) to satisfy the requirements of the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) for some of these anticipated operations. In reviewing and processing permit applications for horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing in these deep, low-permeability formations, the Department would apply the findings and requirements of the SGEIS, including criteria and conditions for future approvals, in conjunction with the existing Generic Environmental Impact Statement on the Oil, Gas and Solution Mining Regulatory Program, issued by the Department in 1992 (1992 GEIS).¹

1.1 Hydraulic Fracturing and Multi-Well Pad Drilling

Hydraulic fracturing is a well stimulation technique which consists of pumping an engineered fluid system and a propping agent (proppant) such as sand down the wellbore under high pressure to create fractures in the hydrocarbon-bearing rock. The fractures serve as pathways for hydrocarbons to move to the wellbore for production. Further information on high-volume hydraulic fracturing, including the composition of the fluid system, is provided in Chapter 5.

¹ The 1992 GEIS is posted on the Department's website at <http://www.dec.ny.gov/energy/45912.html>.

For environmental review purposes pursuant to SEQRA, stimulation including hydraulic fracturing is considered part of the action of drilling a well. Wells where high-volume hydraulic fracturing is used may be drilled vertically, directionally or horizontally. Multiple wells may be drilled from a common location (multi-well pad or multi-well site).

1.1.1 Significant Changes in Proposed Operations Since 2009

The gas drilling industry has informed the Department of the following changes in its planned operations in New York, based, in part, on experience gained in actively developing the Marcellus Shale in Pennsylvania. These changes are reflected in the assumptions used in this revised draft SGEIS to identify and consider potential significant adverse impacts.

1.1.1.1 Use of Reserve Pits or Centralized Impoundments for Flowback Water

The Department was informed in September 2010 that operators would not routinely propose to store flowback water either in reserve pits on the wellpad or in centralized impoundments.² Therefore, these practices are not addressed in this revised draft SGEIS and such impoundments would not be approved without site-specific environmental review.

1.1.1.2 Flowback Water Recycling

The Department was also informed in September 2010 that operators plan to maximize reuse of flowback water for subsequent high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations, with some companies targeting goals of recycling 100% of flowback water.³ The technologies for accomplishing this have evolved through ongoing Marcellus Shale development in Pennsylvania. The Susquehanna River Basin Commission (SRBC) has confirmed that operators are re-using flowback water.⁴ This development has the potential to greatly reduce the volume of flowback water that requires treatment, hauling and disposal, and the related environmental concerns. Fresh water consumption and hauling are also somewhat reduced, but in current practice fresh water still comprises 80-90% of the water used at each well for high-volume hydraulic fracturing.

² ALL Consulting, 2010, pp. 18-19.

³ ALL Consulting, 2010, pp. 73-76.

⁴ Richenderfer, 2010, p. 30.

1.2 Regulatory Jurisdiction

The State of New York's official policy, enacted into law, is "to conserve, improve and protect its natural resources and environment . . . ,"⁵ and it is the Department's responsibility to carry out this policy. As set forth in Environmental Conservation Law (ECL) §3-0301(1), the Department's broad authority includes, among many other things, the power to:

- manage natural resources to assure their protection and balanced utilization;
- prevent and abate water, land and air pollution; and
- regulate storage, handling and transport of solids, liquids and gases to prevent pollution.

The Department regulates the drilling, operation and plugging of oil and natural gas wells to ensure that activities related to these wells are conducted in accordance with statutory mandates found in the ECL. In addition to protecting the environment and public health and safety, the Department is also required by Article 23 of the ECL (ECL 23) to prevent waste of the State's oil and gas resources, to provide for greater ultimate recovery of the resources, and to protect correlative rights.⁶

1.3 State Environmental Quality Review Act

As explained in greater detail in Chapter 3, the Department's SEQRA regulations authorize the use of generic environmental impact statements to assess the environmental impacts of separate actions having generic or common impacts. Drilling and production of separate oil and gas wells, and other wells regulated under the Oil, Gas and Solution Mining Law (ECL 23) have common impacts. After a comprehensive review of all the potential environmental impacts of oil and gas drilling and production in New York, the Department finalized a Generic Environmental Impact Statement and issued SEQRA Findings on the regulatory program in 1992 (1992 GEIS). In 2008, the Department determined that some aspects of the current and anticipated application of high-volume hydraulic fracturing, which is often used in conjunction with horizontal drilling and multi-well pad development, warranted further review in the context

⁵ Environmental Conservation Law (ECL) §1-0101(1).

⁶ Correlative rights are the rights of mineral owners to receive or recover oil and gas, or the equivalent thereof, from their owned tracts without drilling unnecessary wells or incurring unnecessary expense.

of a SGEIS. This revised draft SGEIS discusses high-volume hydraulic fracturing in great detail and describes the potential significant impacts from this activity as well as measures that would fully or partially mitigate the identified impacts. Specific mitigation measures would be adopted as part of the Department's Findings Statement in the event high-volume hydraulic fracturing is authorized pursuant to the studies presented herein.

1.4 Project Chronology

1.4.1 February 2009 Final Scope

The Department released a draft Scope for public review in October 2008, and held public scoping sessions at six venues in the Southern Tier and Catskills in November and December, 2008. A total of 188 verbal comments were received at these sessions. In addition, over 3,770 written comments were received (via e-mail, mail, or written comment card). All of these comments were read and reviewed by Department staff and the Final Scope was completed in February 2009, outlining the detailed analysis required for a thorough understanding of the potentially significant environmental impacts of horizontal drilling and high-volume hydraulic fracturing in low-permeability shale.

1.4.2 2009 Draft SGEIS

The Department released the 2009 draft SGEIS for public review on September 30, 2009 and held public hearings at four venues in New York City (NYC), the Catskills and the Southern Tier in October and November, 2009. Comments were accepted at the hearings verbally and in writing, by postal mail, by e-mail and through a web-based application developed specifically for that purpose. More than 2,500 people attended the Department hearings, and more than 200 verbal comments were delivered by individuals, local government officials, representatives of environmental groups and other organizations and members of the oil and gas industry. The Department also received over 13,000 comments via e-mail, postal mail and the web-based comment system. In addition, transcripts from hearings held by the New York State Assembly, the City of Oneonta, and the Tompkins County Council of Governments on the 2009 draft SGEIS also provided the Department with numerous comments.

1.4.2.1 April 2010 Announcement Regarding Communities with Filtration Avoidance

Determinations

On April 23, 2010, then-Commissioner Pete Grannis announced that due to the unique issues related to the protection of NYC and Syracuse drinking water supplies, these watersheds would be excluded from the generic environmental review process.

1.4.2.2 Subsequent Exclusion of Communities with Filtration Avoidance Determinations

The analysis of high-volume hydraulic fracturing conducted since the 2009 draft SGEIS supports a finding that high-volume hydraulic fracturing is not consistent with the preservation of these watersheds as an unfiltered drinking water supply.

1.4.3 Revised Draft SGEIS

On January 1, 2011, Governor Cuomo continued Executive Order No. 41 (EO 41), which had been issued by then-Governor Paterson on December 13, 2010. EO 41 directed the Department to publish a revised draft SGEIS on or about June 1, 2011 and to accept public comment on the revisions for a period of not less than 30 days.

1.4.4 Next Steps

Once the revised draft SGEIS is deemed complete, the public comment period will begin. The Department will address the comments and include summaries of the substantive comments received on both the 2009 draft SGEIS and the revised draft SGEIS, along with the Department's responses in the final SGEIS. The final SGEIS will incorporate all volumes of the 1992 GEIS.

At least 10 days after issuance of the final SGEIS, the Department will issue a written Findings Statement. Chapter 3 presents detailed information about a proposed future SEQRA compliance process.

1.5 Methodology

1.5.1 Information about the Proposed Operations

For the 2009 draft SGEIS, the Department primarily relied on two sources of information regarding the operations proposed for New York: (1) a number of permit applications filed with the Department; and (2) the Independent Oil & Gas Association of New York (IOGA-NY),

which provided the Department with information from operators actively developing the Marcellus Shale in Pennsylvania.

Preliminary review of comments on the 2009 draft SGEIS led Department staff to identify additional technical and operational details needed from industry in order to evaluate and address the comments. In April 2010, Department staff sent a “Notice of Information Needs” to IOGA-NY and to specific exploration/production and service companies that commented on the 2009 draft SGEIS. Again, IOGA-NY coordinated industry’s response, which was received in September 2010 (ALL Consulting, 2010).

Department staff also communicated with and reviewed information and data made available from the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP) and the SRBC about events, regulations, enforcement and other matters associated with ongoing Marcellus Shale development in Pennsylvania.

1.5.2 Intra-/Inter-agency Coordination

Within the Department, preparation of both the 2009 draft SGEIS and the revised draft SGEIS involved all of the programs listed on the “Acknowledgements” page of each document.⁷ Other State agencies also provided assistance. Department staff consulted extensively with New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) staff, and staff in the Department of Public Service (Public Service Commission, or PSC) assisted with the text describing that Department’s jurisdiction and regulation over gas gathering facilities.

1.5.3 Comment Review

Of the nearly 13,300 comments received on the 2009 draft SGEIS, at least 9,830 were identified as various campaigns likely generated by on-line form letters, eleven were unique petitions signed by 31,464 individuals and organizations collectively, and seven were the transcripts of the hearings described in Subsection 1.4.2. Each of the transcripts includes comments from a large number of speakers, some of whom also submitted written comments. These transcripts were treated as official public comments, and all comments received are being given equal

⁷ As a result of organizational changes within the Department, the Division of Solid & Hazardous Materials is now the Division of Materials Management.

consideration regardless of the method by which they are received. Department staff read and categorized every transcript and every piece of correspondence received to ensure that all substantive comments would be evaluated.

Although the comment period officially closed on December 31, 2009, the Department accepted all comments submitted through January 8, 2010 to further ensure that all substantive comments would be considered.

Following the comment period for the revised draft SGEIS, Department staff will again review and categorize every comment. Comments on both draft documents will be consolidated, and all programs involved in preparing the revised draft SGEIS will also be involved with developing responses to the summarized comments.

1.6 Layout and Organization

The revised draft SGEIS supplements the existing 1992 GEIS, and does not exhaustively repeat narrative from the 1992 GEIS that remains applicable to well permit issuance for horizontal drilling and high-volume hydraulic fracturing.

1.6.1 Chapters

Chapter 1 is an introduction that explains the context, history and contents of the document, and highlights the enhanced procedures, regulations and mitigation measures incorporated into the document.

Chapter 2 is a description of the proposed action, and includes sections on purpose, public need and benefit, project location and environmental setting that are required by SEQRA. The environmental setting section focuses on topics that arose during the public scoping sessions. For a comprehensive understanding of the environmental setting where high-volume hydraulic fracturing might occur, it is necessary to also consult the 1992 GEIS.

Chapter 3 describes the use of a generic environmental impact statement and the resultant SEQRA review process, identifies those potential projects which would require site-specific SEQRA determinations of significance after the SGEIS is completed, and identifies restricted locations where high-volume hydraulic fracturing would be prohibited.

Chapter 4 supplements the geology discussion in Chapter 5 of the 1992 GEIS with additional details about the Marcellus and Utica Shales, seismicity in New York State, naturally-occurring radioactive materials (NORM) in the Marcellus Shale and naturally-occurring methane in New York State.

Chapter 5 comprehensively describes the activities associated with high-volume hydraulic fracturing and multi-well pad drilling, including the composition of hydraulic fracturing additives and flowback water characteristics.

Chapter 6 describes potential impacts associated with the proposed activity and, like other chapters, should be read as a supplement to the 1992 GEIS.

Chapter 7 describes the enhanced procedures, regulations and proposed mitigation measures that have been identified to fully and/or partially mitigate potential significant adverse impacts from high-volume hydraulic fracturing activities to be covered by the SGEIS and 1992 GEIS for SEQRA purposes.

Chapter 8 explains intra- and interagency coordination involved in the well permitting process, including the role of local governments and an expanded approach to local government notification. Descriptions of other regulatory programs that govern some aspects of the potential activities that were previously distributed among several chapters in the document are also now included in Chapter 8.

Chapter 9 discusses the alternatives to well permit issuance that were reviewed and considered.

Chapter 10 is new in the revised draft SGEIS and provides information on certain non-routine incidents in Pennsylvania where development of the Marcellus Shale by high-volume hydraulic fracturing is currently ongoing.

Chapter 11 is new in the revised draft SGEIS and summarizes the impacts and mitigation discussed in Chapters 6 and 7.

1.6.2 Revisions

Except for the Executive Summary which is entirely new, revisions to the 2009 draft SGEIS text are generally marked by vertical lines in the page margins, and new text is underlined. Revised or new Tables, Figures and Appendices are identified as such in their captions or on their cover pages.

1.6.3 Glossary, Bibliographies and Appendices

The Chapters described above are augmented by 27 Appendices and a lengthy glossary that includes acronyms and technical or scientific terms that appear in the document. References cited throughout the document are listed in a bibliography, and separate bibliographies are included that list the various consultants' sources.

1.7 Enhanced Impact Analyses and Mitigation Measures

The Department has identified numerous enhanced procedures and proposed mitigation measures that are available to address the potential significant environmental impacts associated with well permit issuance for horizontal drilling and high-volume hydraulic fracturing. Only the most significant are listed below. Chapter 7 of this document and the 1992 GEIS in its entirety would need to be consulted for the full range of available and required mitigation practices.

The list presented below does not include analyses and mitigation measures proposed in September 2009 that are superseded by the revised draft SGEIS, or that are no longer relevant because of changes in proposed operations.

1.7.1 Hydraulic Fracturing Chemical Disclosure

The Department's hydraulic fracturing chemical disclosure requirements and public disclosure approach set forth in Chapter 8, combined with the chemical disclosures required from industry for the SGEIS analysis, make the Department's disclosure regime among the most stringent in the country. The Department's regime exceeds the requirements of 22 of the 27 oil and gas producing states reviewed and is on par with the five states currently leading the country on chemical disclosure. Additionally, the enhanced disclosure requirements are equivalent to the proposed requirements of the federal Fracturing Awareness and Responsibility (FRAC) Act of 2011.

1.7.2 Water Well Testing

Prior to drilling, operators would be required to test private wells within 1,000 feet of the drill site to provide baseline information and allow for ongoing monitoring. If there are no wells within 1,000 feet, the survey area would extend to 2,000 feet. Chapter 7 reflects updated recommendations from the NYSDOH regarding what analyses should be conducted.

1.7.3 Water Withdrawal and Consumption

1.7.3.1 2009 Draft SGEIS

Applicants would not only have to follow SRBC and Delaware River Basin Commission (DRBC) protocols for water withdrawal where applicable, but would also be required to adhere to a more stringent and protective passby flow requirement in regards to water withdrawal plans - whether inside or outside of the Susquehanna or Delaware river basins. The intended results of these requirements would be to protect aquatic organisms and their habitats in surface waters.

1.7.3.2 Revised Draft SGEIS

The discussion of passby flow and the required streamflow analysis have been updated based on research and studies conducted after the release of the 2009 draft SGEIS. Additionally, details have been added regarding the Department's methodology for evaluating and determining approvable groundwater withdrawal rates.

1.7.4 Well Control and Emergency Response Planning

Although current practices and requirements have proven effective at countless wells throughout New York State, the Department has responded to the public's heightened concerns regarding well control and emergency response issues by including three significant revisions in the revised draft SGEIS:

- Submission, for review in the permit application, of the operator's proposed blowout preventer use and test plan for drilling and completion;
- Description of the required elements of an emergency response plan (ERP); and
- Submission and on-site availability of an ERP consistent with the SGEIS, including a list of emergency contact numbers for the community surrounding the well pad.

1.7.5 Local Planning Documents

The Department proposes that applicants be required to compare the proposed well pad location to local land use laws, regulations, plans and policies to determine whether the proposed activity is consistent with such local land use laws, regulations, plans and policies. If the applicant or the potentially impacted local government informs the Department that it believes a conflict exists, the Department would request additional information with regard to this issue so it can consider whether significant adverse impacts relating to land use and zoning would result from permit issuance.

1.7.6 Secondary Containment, Spill Prevention and Stormwater Pollution Prevention

The Department proposes to require, via permit condition and/or new regulation, that operators provide secondary containment around all additive staging areas and fueling tanks, manned fluid/fuel transfers and visible piping and appropriate use of troughs, drip pads or drip pans. In addition, drilling and hydraulic fracturing operations would be subject to an activity-specific general stormwater permit that would address industrial activities as well as the construction activities that are traditionally the focus of stormwater permitting for oil and gas well sites. The comprehensive Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would incorporate by reference a Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasures Plan.

1.7.7 Well Construction

Existing requirements are designed to ensure that surface casing be set deeply enough to not only isolate fresh water zones but also to serve as an adequate foundation for well control while drilling deeper. It is also necessary under existing requirements, to the extent possible, to avoid extending the surface casing into shallow gas-bearing zones. Existing casing and cementing requirements that are incorporated into permit conditions establish the required surface casing setting depth based on the best available site-specific information. Each subsequent installation of casing and cement serves to further protect the surface casing and hence, the surrounding fresh water zones.

1.7.7.1 2009 Draft SGEIS

Proposed well construction enhancements for high-volume hydraulic fracturing included:

- Requirement for fully cemented production casing or intermediate casing (if used), with the cement bond evaluated by use of a cement bond logging tool; and
- Required certification prior to hydraulic fracturing of the sufficiency of as-built wellbore construction.

1.7.7.2 Revised Draft SGEIS

Additional well construction enhancements for high-volume hydraulic fracturing that the Department proposes to require pursuant to permit condition and/or regulation are listed below:

- Specific American Petroleum Institute (API) standards, specifications and practices would be incorporated into permit conditions related to well construction. Among these would be requirements to adhere to specifications for centralizer type and for casing and cement quality;
- Fully cemented intermediate casing would be required unless supporting site-specific documentation to waive the requirement is presented. This directly addresses gas migration concerns by providing additional barriers (i.e., steel casing, cement) between aquifers and shallow gas-bearing zones;
- Additional measures to ensure cement strength and sufficiency would be incorporated into permit conditions, also directly addressing gas migration concerns. Compliance would continue to be tracked through site inspections and required well completion reports, and any other documentation the Department deems necessary for the operator to submit or make available for review; and
- Minimum compressive strength requirements.
 - Minimum waiting times during which no activity is allowed which might disturb the cement while it sets;
 - Enhanced requirements for use of centralizers which serve to ensure the uniformity and strength of the cement around the well casing; and
 - Required use of more advanced cement evaluation tools.

1.7.8 Flowback Water Handling On-Site

The Department proposes to require that operators storing flowback water on-site would be required to use watertight tanks located within secondary containment, and remove the fluid from the wellpad within specified time frames.

1.7.9 Flowback Water Disposal

Under existing regulations, before a permit is issued, the operator must disclose plans for disposal of flowback water and production brine. Further, in the SGEIS the Department proposes to use a new "Drilling and Production Waste Tracking" process, similar to the process applicable to medical waste, to monitor disposal. Under existing regulations, full analysis and approvals under state water laws and regulations are required before a water treatment facility can accept flowback from high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations. Appendix 22 includes a description and flow chart of the required approval process for discharge of flowback water or production brine from high-volume hydraulic fracturing to a Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTW). An applicant proposing discharge to a POTW would be required to submit a treatment capacity analysis for the receiving POTW, and, in the event that the POTW is the primary fluid disposal plan, a contingency plan. Additionally, limits would be established for NORM in POTW influent.

1.7.10 Management of Drill Cuttings

The Department has determined that drill cuttings are solid wastes, specifically construction and demolition debris, under the State's regulatory system. Therefore, the Department would allow disposal of cuttings from drilling processes which utilize only air and/or water on-site, at construction and demolition (C&D) debris landfills, or at municipal solid waste (MSW) landfills, while cuttings from processes which utilize any oil-based or polymer-based products could only be disposed of at MSW landfills. The revised draft SGEIS proposes to require, pursuant to permit conditions and/or regulation, that a closed-loop tank system be used instead of a reserve pit to manage drilling fluids and cuttings for:

- Horizontal drilling in the Marcellus Shale without an acceptable acid rock drainage (ARD) mitigation plan for on-site cuttings burial; and
- Cuttings that, because of the drilling fluid composition used must be disposed off-site, including at a landfill.

Only ARD mitigation plans that do not require long-term monitoring would be acceptable.

Examples are provided in Chapter 7.

1.7.11 Emissions and Air Quality

The need to re-evaluate air quality impacts and the applicability of various regulations was raised during the scoping process, with emphasis on the duration of activities at a multi-well pad and the number of internal combustion engines used for high-volume hydraulic fracturing.

1.7.11.1 2009 Draft SGEIS

The following conclusions and requirements were set forth:

- Per United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) NESHAPS subpart ZZZZ, the compressor station would have an oxidation catalyst for formaldehyde. This also reduces carbon monoxide (CO) by 90% and Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) by 70%;
- Per EPA subpart HH, the glycol dehydrator would have a condenser to achieve a benzene emission of <1 ton per year (Tpy) (if “wet” gas is detected);
- Use of Ultra Low Sulfur Fuel (ULSF) of 15 parts per million (ppm) in all engines would be required;
- Small stack height increases on compressor, vent and dehydrator would be required (if “sour” and “wet” gas encountered for the latter two, respectively);
- All annual and short-term ambient standards (National Ambient Air Quality Standards, or NAAQS) and the Department’s toxics thresholds (Annual and Short-Term Guideline Concentrations, or AGCs and SGCs) would be met, except 24-hour PM10/PM2.5 NAAQS due to drilling and hydraulic fracturing engines; and
- Impacts from a nearby pad modeled and indicated no overlap in the calculated “cumulative” impacts on local scale.

The facility definition for permitting was based on Clean Air Act (CAA) 112(n)(4) per EPA guidance at the time, which limits it to “surface area” (i.e., per pad). Annual emissions from all sources were calculated assuming ten wells per pad and resulted in a classification of the emissions as “minor” sources. No final determination was made as to whether non-road engines would be part of “stationary” facility since it was unclear before September 2009 if these would be at the pad more than 12 months.

1.7.11.2 Revised Draft SGEIS

The Department performed substantive additional emissions and air quality analyses, which identified the following mitigation measures that the Department proposes to require through enhanced procedures, permit conditions and/or regulations:

- The diesel fuel used in drilling and completion equipment engines would be limited to ULSF with a maximum sulfur content of 15 ppm;
- There would not be any simultaneous operations of the drilling and completion equipment engines at the single well pad;
- The maximum number of wells to be drilled and completed annually or during any consecutive 12-month period at a single pad would be limited to four;
- The emissions of benzene at any glycol dehydrator to be used at the well pad would be limited to 1 Tpy as determined by calculations with the Gas Research Institute's (GRI) GlyCalc program. If wet gas is encountered, then the dehydrator would have a minimum stack height of 30 feet (9.1 meters) and would be equipped with a control device to limit the benzene emissions to 1 Tpy;
- Condensate tanks used at the well pad would be equipped with vapor recovery systems to minimize fugitive VOC emissions;
- During the flowback phase, the venting of gas from each well pad would be limited to a maximum of 5 million standard cubic feet (MMscf) during any consecutive 12 month period. If "sour" gas is encountered with detected hydrogen sulfide (H₂S) emissions, the height at which the gas would be vented would be a minimum of 30 feet (9.1 meters);
- During the flowback phase, flaring of gas at each well pad would be limited to a maximum of 120 MMscf during any consecutive 12-month period;
- Wellhead compressors would be equipped with Non-Selective Catalytic Reduction (NSCR) controls;
- No uncertified (i.e., EPA Tier 0) drilling or completion equipment engines would be used for any activity at the well sites;
- The drilling engines and drilling air compressors would be limited to EPA Tier 2 or newer equipment. If Tier 1 drilling equipment is to be used, these would be equipped with both particulate traps (Continuously Regenerating Diesel Particulate Filters, or CRDPF) and Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR) controls. During operations, this equipment would be positioned as close to the center of the well pad as practicable. If industry deviates from the control requirements or proposes alternate mitigation

and/or control measures to demonstrate ambient standard compliance, site-specific information would be provided to the Department for review and concurrence; and

- The completion equipment engines would be limited to EPA Tier 2 or newer equipment. CRDPFs would be required for all Tier 2 engines. SCR control would be required on all completion equipment engines regardless of the emission Tier. During operations, this equipment would be positioned as close to the center of the well pad as practicable. If industry deviates from this requirement or proposes mitigation and/or alternate control measures to demonstrate ambient standard compliance, site specific information would be provided to the Department for review and concurrence.

In addition, the revised draft SGEIS discusses the effect of region-wide emissions on State Implementation Plan (SIP) for Ozone NAAQS and implementation of local and regional level air quality monitoring at well pads and surrounding areas.

1.7.12 Greenhouse Gas Mitigation

All operational phases of well pad activities, and all greenhouse gas (GHG) emission sources are evaluated in both the 2009 draft SGEIS and the current draft. Based on this analysis, the Department proposes in the current draft to require the following controls and mitigation measures, pursuant to permit conditions and/or regulation:

- Implementation by the operator of a Leak Detection and Repair Program;
- Upon request, the operator would be required to provide a copy of data required under federal (EPA) GHG reporting rule;
- Reduced Emissions Completion (REC) would be required whenever a gathering line is already constructed. In addition, two years after issuance of the first permit for high-volume hydraulic fracturing, the Department would evaluate whether the number of wells that can be drilled on a pad without REC should be limited; and
- Implementation of other control technologies when applicable, as described in Chapter 7.

1.7.13 Habitat Fragmentation

The current draft includes a substantially augmented analysis of potential impacts from high-volume hydraulic fracturing on wildlife and habitat. Based on that analysis, two measures that were not included in the 2009 draft SGEIS are proposed as mitigation in the revised draft SGEIS:

- Grassland Focus Areas on private land – Surface disturbance in grassland patches comprised of 30 acres or more of contiguous grassland within Grassland Focus Areas would be contingent on the findings of a site-specific ecological assessment conducted by the permit applicant and implementation of mitigation measures identified as part of such ecological assessment; and
- Forest Focus Areas on private land – Surface disturbance in forest patches comprised of 150 acres or more of undisturbed, contiguous forest within Forest Focus Areas would be contingent on a site-specific ecological assessment conducted by the permit applicant and implementation of mitigation measures identified as part of such ecological assessment.

1.7.14 State Forests, State Wildlife Management Areas and State Parks

Surface disturbance associated with high-volume hydraulic fracturing would not be allowed on State-owned lands administered by the Department, including but not limited to State Forests and State Wildlife Management Areas, because it is inconsistent with the suite of purposes for which those lands have been acquired. Current Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) policy would impose a similar restriction on State Parks.

1.7.15 Community and Socioeconomic Impacts

Chapter 6 of this revised draft SGEIS includes a significantly expanded discussion of community and socioeconomic impacts, traffic impacts, and noise and visual impacts, with measures that will be implemented by the Department to mitigate these impacts described in Chapter 7.

1.8 Additional Precautionary Measures

In order to safeguard the environment from risks associated with spills or other events that could release contaminants into environmentally sensitive areas, the revised draft SGEIS includes the following prohibitions and mitigation measures for high-volume hydraulic fracturing:

- Well pads for high-volume hydraulic fracturing would be prohibited in the NYC and Syracuse watersheds, and within a 4,000-foot buffer around those watersheds;
- Well pads for high-volume hydraulic fracturing would be prohibited within 500 feet of primary aquifers (subject to reconsideration 2 years after issuance of the first permit for high-volume hydraulic fracturing);
- Well pads for high-volume hydraulic fracturing would be prohibited within 2,000 feet of public water supply wells, river or stream intakes and reservoirs (subject to reconsideration 3 years after issuance of the first permit for high-volume hydraulic fracturing);

- For at least two years from issuance of the first permit for high-volume hydraulic fracturing, proposals for high-volume hydraulic fracturing at any well pad within within 500 feet of principal aquifers, would require (1) site-specific SEORA determinations of significance and (2) individual State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) permits for stormwater discharges. The Department would re-evaluate the necessity of this approach after two years of experience issuing permits in areas outside of the 500-foot boundary;
- The Department would not issue permits for proposed high-volume hydraulic fracturing at any well pad in 100-year floodplains; and
- The Department would not issue permits for proposed high-volume hydraulic fracturing at any proposed well pad within 500 feet of a private water well or domestic use spring, unless waived by the owner.



Chapter 2

Description of Proposed Action

This page intentionally left blank.

Chapter 2 – Description of Proposed Action

CHAPTER 2 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION.....	1
2.1 PURPOSE	2
2.2 PUBLIC NEED AND BENEFIT.....	2
2.3 PROJECT LOCATION	7
2.4 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING	8
2.4.1 Water Use Classifications	8
2.4.2 Water Quality Standards	12
2.4.3 Drinking Water.....	13
2.4.3.1 Federal.....	13
2.4.3.2 New York State	18
2.4.4 Public Water Systems	19
2.4.4.1 Primary and Principal Aquifers	20
2.4.4.2 Public Water Supply Wells.....	22
2.4.5 Private Water Wells and Domestic-Supply Springs	22
2.4.6 History of Drilling and Hydraulic Fracturing in Water Supply Areas	23
2.4.7 Regulated Drainage Basins	25
2.4.7.1 Delaware River Basin.....	25
2.4.7.2 Susquehanna River Basin.....	26
2.4.7.3 Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin.....	28
2.4.8 Water Resources Replenishment	28
2.4.9 Floodplains.....	30
2.4.9.1 Analysis of Recent Flood Events	32
2.4.9.2 Flood Zone Mapping.....	32
2.4.9.3 Seasonal Analysis.....	33
2.4.10 Freshwater Wetlands.....	34
2.4.11 Socioeconomic Conditions.....	35
2.4.11.1 Economy, Employment, and Income.....	41
2.4.11.2 Population	75
2.4.11.3 Housing.....	81
2.4.11.4 Government Revenues and Expenditures	91
2.4.11.5 Environmental Justice	103
2.4.12 Visual Resources	116
2.4.12.1 Historic Properties and Cultural Resources	119
2.4.12.2 Parks and Other Recreation Areas	126
2.4.12.3 Natural Areas.....	132
2.4.12.4 Additional Designated Scenic or Other Areas	141
2.4.13 Noise	150
2.4.13.1 Noise Fundamentals.....	150
2.4.13.2 Common Noise Effects	151
2.4.13.3 Noise Regulations and Guidance.....	153
2.4.13.4 Existing Noise Levels.....	155
2.4.14 Transportation - Existing Environment	156
2.4.14.1 Terminology and Definitions	156
2.4.14.2 Regional Road Systems.....	161
2.4.14.3 Condition of New York State Roads.....	167
2.4.14.4 NYSDOT Funding Mechanisms	168
2.4.14.5 Rail and Air Services	171
2.4.15 Community Character.....	172

FIGURES

Figure 2.1 - Primary and Principal Aquifers in New York State.....21
Figure 2.2 - Susquehanna and Delaware River Basins27
Figure 2.3 - Representative Regions Within the Marcellus Shale Extent (New August 2011).....36
Figure 2.4 - Representative Regions A, B, and C (New August 2011)38
Figure 2.5 - Region A: Natural Gas Production, 1994 to 2009 (New August 2011)61
Figure 2.6 - Region C: Natural Gas Production, 1994-2009 (New August 2011)73
Figure 2.7 - Potential Environmental Justice Areas for Region A (New August 2011).....108
Figure 2.8 - Potential Environmental Justice Areas for Region B (New August 2011).....111
Figure 2.9 - Potential Environmental Justice Areas for Region C (New August 2011).....114
Figure 2.10 - Area of Interest for Visual Resources (New August 2011).....117
Figure 2.11 - Visually Sensitive Areas Associated with Historic Properties and Cultural Resources (New August 2011)
.....125
Figure 2.12 - Parks and Recreational Resources that May be Visually Sensitive (New August 2011)130
Figure 2.13 - Natural Areas that May be Visually Sensitive (New August 2011)133
Figure 2.14 - Additional Designated Scenic or other Areas that May be Visually Sensitive142
Figure 2.15 - Level of Continuous Noise Causing Speech Interference (New August 2011).....152
Figure 2.16 - FHWA Vehicle Classifications (New August 2011).....159
Figure 2.17 - New York State Department of Transportation Regions (New August 2011)161
Figure 2.18 - Transportation (New August 2011)163
Figure 2.19 - Land Cover and Agricultural Districts, Representative Region A (New August 2011)176
Figure 2.20 - Land Cover and Agricultural Districts, Representative Region B (New August 2011)184
Figure 2.21 - Land Cover and Agricultural Districts, Representative Region C (New August 2011)192

TABLES

Table 2.1 - Economic and Fiscal Impacts of Gas Well Drilling Activities in Broome County, NY Over 10 Years6
Table 2.2 - New York Water Use Classifications9
Table 2.3 - Primary Drinking Water Standards15
Table 2.4 - Secondary Drinking Water Standards18
Table 2.5 - Public Water System Definition20
Table 2.6 - New York State: Area Employment by Industry, 2009 (New August 2011)43
Table 2.7 - New York State: Wages by Industry, 2009 (New August 2011)44
Table 2.8 - New York State: Labor Force Statistics, 2000 and 2010 (New August 2011)44
Table 2.9 - New York State: Income Statistics, 1999 and 2009 (New August 2011).....45
Table 2.10 - New York State: Employment in Travel and Tourism, 2009 (New August 2011).....46
Table 2.11 - New York State: Wages in Travel and Tourism, 2009 (New August 2011)46
Table 2.12 - New York State: Agricultural Data, 2007 (New August 2011).....47
Table 2.13 - New York: Impact of a \$1 Million Dollar Increase in the Final Demand in the Output of the Oil and Gas
Extraction Industry on the Value of the Output of Other Industries (New August 2011)48
Table 2.14 - New York State: Employment in the Oil and Gas Extraction Industry, 2000-2010 (New August 2011) ..49
Table 2.15 - Most Common Occupations in the U.S. Oil and Gas Extraction Industry, 2008 (New August 2011).....50
Table 2.16 - New York State: Wages in the Oil and Gas Industry, 2009 (New August 2011)51
Table 2.17 - New York State: Natural Gas Production, 1985-2009 (New August 2011).....52
Table 2.18 - Permits Issued, Wells Completed, and Active Wells, NYS Gas Wells, 1994-2009 (New August 2011)52
Table 2.19 - Average Wellhead Price for New York State’s Natural Gas, 1994-2009 (New August 2011)54
Table 2.20 - Market Value of New York State’s Natural Gas Production, 1994-2009 (New August 2011).....54
Table 2.21 - Region A: Area Employment by Industry, 2009 (New August 2011)55
Table 2.22 - Region A: Wages by Industry, 2009 (New August 2011)56
Table 2.23 - Region A: Labor Force Statistics, 2000 and 2010 (New August 2011)57
Table 2.24 - Region A: Income Statistics, 1999 and 2009 (New August 2011)57
Table 2.25 - Region A: Employment in Travel and Tourism, 2009 (New August 2011)59
Table 2.26 - Region A: Wages in Travel and Tourism, 2009 (New August 2011).....59
Table 2.27 - Region A: Agricultural Data, 2007 (New August 2011)60

Table 2.28 - Region A: Number of Active Natural Gas Wells, 1994-2009 (New August 2011)	61
Table 2.29 – Natural Gas Production and Active Wells by Town within each County in Region A, 2009 (New August 2011).....	62
Table 2.30 - Region B: Area Employment, by Industry, 2009 (New August 2011)	63
Table 2.31 - Region B: Wages, by Industry, 2009 (New August 2011).....	63
Table 2.32 - Region B: Labor Force Statistics, 2000 and 2010 ((New August 2011)).....	64
Table 2.33 - Region B: Income Statistics, 1999 and 2009 (New August 2011)	65
Table 2.34 - Region B: Travel and Tourism, by Industrial Group, 2009 (New August 2011).....	66
Table 2.35 - Region B: Wages in Travel and Tourism, 2009 (New August 2011).....	66
Table 2.36 - Region B: Agricultural Data, 2007 (New August 2011)	67
Table 2.37 - Region C: Area Employment by Industry, 2009 (New August 2011)	68
Table 2.38 - Region C: Wages, by Industry, 2009 (New August 2011).....	68
Table 2.39 - Region C: Labor Force Statistics, 2000 and 2010 (New August 2011)	69
Table 2.40 - Region C: Income Statistics, 1999 and 2009 (New August 2011)	69
Table 2.41 - Region C: Travel and Tourism, by Industrial Group, 2009 (New August 2011).....	71
Table 2.42 - Region C: Wages in Travel and Tourism, 2009 (New August 2011).....	71
Table 2.43 - Region C: Agricultural Data, 2007 (New August 2011)	72
Table 2.44 - Number of Active Natural Gas Wells in Region C, 1994-2009 (New August 2011)	73
Table 2.45 - Natural Gas Production and the Number of Active Gas Wells by Town within each County in Region C, 2009 (New August 2011)	74
Table 2.46 - New York State: Historical and Current Population, 1990, 2000, 2010 (New August 2011)	76
Table 2.47 - New York State: Projected Population, 2015 to 2030 (New August 2011).....	76
Table 2.48 - Region A: Historical and Current Population, 1990, 2000, 2010 (New August 2011).....	77
Table 2.49 - Region A: Population Projections, 2015 to 2030 (New August 2011).....	78
Table 2.50 - Region B: Historical and Current Population - 1990, 2000, 2010 (New August 2011).....	78
Table 2.51 - Region B: Population Projections, 2015 to 2030 (New August 2011).....	79
Table 2.52 - Region C: Historical and Current Population - 1990, 2000, 2010 (New August 2011).....	80
Table 2.53 - Region C: Population Projections, 2015 to 2030 (New August 2011).....	80
Table 2.54 - New York State: Total Housing Units - 1990, 2000, 2010 (New August 2011).....	81
Table 2.55 - New York State: Type of Housing Units, 2009 ¹ (New August 2011)	81
Table 2.56 - New York State: Number of Sales and Annual Median Sale Price of Single-Family Homes Sold, 2008-2010 (New August 2011)	82
Table 2.57 - New York State: Housing Characteristics, 2010 (New August 2011)	82
Table 2.58 - Region A: Total Housing Units - 1990, 2000, 2010 (New August 2011).....	83
Table 2.59 - Region A: Total Housing Units by Type of Structure, 2009 ¹ (New August 2011).....	83
Table 2.60 - Region A: Number of Sales and Annual Median Sale Price of Single-Family Homes Sold, 2008-2010 (New August 2011)	84
Table 2.61 - Region A: Housing Characteristics, 2010 (New August 2011).....	85
Table 2.62 - Region A: Short-Term Accommodations (Hotels/Motels), 2011 (New August 2011)	85
Table 2.63 - Region B: Total Housing Units - 1990, 2000, 2010 (New August 2011)	86
Table 2.64 - Region B: Total Housing Units by Type of Structure 2009 ¹ (New August 2011).....	86
Table 2.65- Region B: Number of Sales and Annual Median Sale Price of Single-Family Homes Sold, 2008-2010 (New August 2011).....	87
Table 2.66 - Region B: Housing Characteristics, 2010 (New August 2011).....	88
Table 2.67 - Region B: Short-Term Accommodations (Hotels/Motels) (New August 2011).....	88
Table 2.68 - Region C: Total Housing Units - 1990, 2000, 2010 (New August 2011)	89
Table 2.69 - Region C: Total Housing Units by Type of Structure, 2009 ¹ (New August 2011)	89
Table 2.70 - Region C: Number of Sales and Annual Median Sale Price of Single-Family Homes Sold, 2008-2010 (New August 2011)	90
Table 2.71 - Region C: Housing Characteristics, 2010 (New August 2011).....	90
Table 2.72 - Region C: Short-Term Accommodations (Hotels/Motels) (New August 2011).....	91
Table 2.73 - New York State Revenues Collected for FY Ending March 31, 2010 (New August 2011).....	92

Table 2.74 - New York State: Number of Leases and Acreage of State Land Leased for Oil and Natural Gas Development, 2010 (New August 2011)	93
Table 2.75 - 2000-2010 Leasing Revenue by Payment Type for New York State (New August 2011).....	93
Table 2.76 - Region A: Total Revenue for FY Ending December 31, 2009 (\$ millions) (New August 2011).....	95
Table 2.77 - Region A: Local Tax Revenue for FY Ending December 31, 2009 (\$ millions) (New August 2011)	96
Table 2.78 - Gas Economic Profile for Medina Region 3 (New August 2011)	96
Table 2.79 - Region A: Expenditures for FY Ending December 31, 2009 (\$ millions) (New August 2011).....	97
Table 2.80 - Region B: Total Revenue for FY Ending December 31, 2009 (\$ millions) (New August 2011)	98
Table 2.81 - Region B: Local Tax Revenue for FY Ending December 31, 2009 (\$ millions) (New August 2011)	99
Table 2.82 - Gas Economic Profile for Medina Region 4 and State Equalization Rates and Millage Rates for Region B (New August 2011)	99
Table 2.83 - Region B: Expenditures for FY Ending December 31, 2009 (\$ millions) (New August 2011).....	100
Table 2.84 - Region C: Revenues for FY Ending December 31, 2009 (\$ millions) (New August 2011).....	101
Table 2.85 - Region C: Local Tax Revenue for FY Ending December 31, 2009 (\$ millions) (New August 2011)	102
Table 2.86 - Gas Economic Profile for Medina Region 2 and State Equalization Rates and Millage Rates for Region C (New August 2011)	102
Table 2.87 - Region C: Expenditures for FY Ending December 31, 2009 (New August 2011).....	103
Table 2.88 - Racial and Ethnicity Characteristics for New York State (New August 2011)	106
Table 2.89 - Region A: Racial and Ethnicity Characteristics (New August 2011)	109
Table 2.90 - Region B: Racial and Ethnicity Characteristics (New August 2011)	112
Table 2.91 - Region C: Racial and Ethnicity Characteristics (New August 2011)	115
Table 2.92 - Number of NRHP-Listed Historic Properties within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011).....	120
Table 2.93 - National Historic Landmarks (NHLs) Located within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011).....	123
Table 2.94 - State Parks Located within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011).....	127
Table 2.95 - Select Trails Located within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011).....	131
Table 2.96 - State Nature and Historic Preserves in Counties Located within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011)	134
Table 2.97 - National and State Wild, Scenic and Recreational Rivers (designated or potential) Located within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011)	137
Table 2.98 - State Game Refuges and State Wildlife Management Areas Located within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011).....	139
Table 2.99 - National Natural Landmarks Located within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011).....	140
Table 2.100 - Designated and Proposed National and State Scenic Byways, Highways, and Roads Located within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011)	143
Table 2.101 - Recommended Open Space Conservation Projects Located in the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011)	146
Table 2.102 - Effects of Noise on People (New August 2011)	153
Table 2.103 - Summary of Noise Levels Identified as Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety (New August 2011)	154
Table 2.104 - Common Noise Levels (New August 2011)	156
Table 2.105 - Guidelines on Extent of Rural Functional Systems (New August 2011).....	158
Table 2.106 - Descriptions of the Thirteen FHWA Vehicle Classification Categories (New August 2011).....	160
Table 2.107 - Region A: Highway Mileage by County, 2009 (New August 2011)	164
Table 2.108 - Heavy Vehicles as a Percentage of Total Vehicles in Rural Areas in NYSDOT Regions 6 and 9, 2004-2009 (New August 2011)	164
Table 2.109 - Region B: Highway Mileage by County, 2009 (New August 2011).....	165
Table 2.110 - Heavy Vehicles as a Percentage of Total Vehicles in Rural Areas in NYSDOT Region 9, 2004-2009 (New August 2011).....	166

Table 2.111 - Region C: Highway Mileage by County, 2009 (New August 2011).....	166
Table 2.112 - Heavy Vehicles as a Percentage of Total Vehicles in Rural Areas in NYSDOT Region 5, 2009 (New August 2011).....	167
Table 2.113 - Ranking System of Pavement Condition in New York State (New August 2011).....	168
Table 2.114 - NYSDOT Total Receipts, 2009-2012 (\$ thousands) (New August 2011)	170

This page intentionally left blank.

Chapter 2 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION

The proposed action is the Department's issuance of permits to drill, deepen, plug back or convert wells for horizontal drilling and high-volume hydraulic fracturing in the Marcellus Shale and other low-permeability natural gas reservoirs. Wells where high-volume hydraulic fracturing is used may be drilled vertically, directionally or horizontally. The proposed action, however, does not include horizontal drilling where high-volume hydraulic fracturing is not employed. Such drilling is covered under the GEIS.

Hydraulic fracturing is a well stimulation technique which consists of pumping an engineered fluid system and a proppant such as sand down the wellbore under high pressure to create fractures in the hydrocarbon-bearing rock. The fractures serve as pathways for hydrocarbons to move to the wellbore for production. High-volume hydraulic fracturing, using 300,000 gallons of water or more per well, is also referred to as "slick water fracturing." An individual well treatment may consist of multiple stages (multi-stage frac). Further information on high-volume hydraulic fracturing, including the composition of the fluid system, is provided in Chapter 5.

Multiple wells may be drilled from a common location (multi-well pad, or multi-well site). The Department may receive applications to drill approximately 1,700 – 2,500 horizontal and vertical wells for development of the Marcellus Shale by high-volume hydraulic fracturing during a "peak development" year. An average year may see 1,600 or more applications. Development of the Marcellus Shale in New York may occur over a 30-year period.¹ More information about these activity estimates and the factors which could affect them is presented in Chapter 5.

This SGEIS is focused on topics not addressed by the 1992 GEIS, with emphasis on potential impacts associated with the large volumes of water required to hydraulically fracture horizontal shale wells using the slick water fracturing technique and the disturbance associated with multi-well sites. An additional aspect of this SGEIS is to consider measures that will be incorporated into revisions or additions to the Department's regulations concerning high-volume hydraulic fracturing.

¹ ALL Consulting, 2010, pp. 7 - 9.

2.1 Purpose

As stated in the 1992 GEIS, a generic environmental impact statement is used to evaluate the environmental effects of a program having wide application and is required for direct programmatic actions undertaken by a state agency. The SGEIS will address new activities or new potential impacts not addressed by the 1992 GEIS and will set forth practices and mitigation designed to reduce environmental impacts to the maximum extent practicable. The SGEIS and its findings will be used to satisfy SEQR for the issuance of permits to drill, deepen, plug back or convert wells for horizontal drilling and high-volume hydraulic fracturing. The SGEIS will also be used to satisfy SEQR for the enactment of revisions or additions to the Department's regulations relating to high-volume hydraulic fracturing.

2.2 Public Need and Benefit

The exploration and development of natural gas resources serves the public's need for energy while providing substantial economic and environmental benefits. Natural gas consumption comprises about 23 percent of the total energy consumption in the United States. Natural gas is used for many purposes: home space and water heating; cooking; commercial and industrial space heating; commercial and industrial processes; as a raw material for the manufacture of fertilizer, plastics, and petrochemicals; as vehicle fuel; and for electric generation. Over 50 percent of the homes in the United States use natural gas as the primary heating fuel. In 2008 U.S. natural gas consumption totaled about 23.2 trillion cubic feet (Tcf), nearly matching the peak consumption of 23.3 Tcf reached in 2000.²

New York is the fourth largest natural gas consuming state in the nation using about 1,200 billion cubic feet (Bcf) of natural gas per year and accounting for about five percent of U.S. demand.³

In 2008 New York's 4.3 million residential customers used about 393 Bcf of natural gas or 33 percent of total statewide gas use. The State's 394,000 commercial customers used about 292 Bcf or 25 percent of total natural gas use. Natural gas consumption in the residential and commercial sectors in New York represents a larger proportion of the total consumption than

² New York State Energy Planning Board, December 2009, p. 7.

³ New York State Energy Planning Board, December 2009, p. 8.

U.S. consumption for those sectors which is 21 and 13 percent, respectively. The primary use of natural gas in New York for residential and small commercial customers is for space heating and is highly weather sensitive. The State's natural gas market is winter- peaking with over 70 percent of residential and 60 percent of commercial natural gas consumption occurring in the five winter months (November through March).⁴

Since natural gas is a national market, developments nationwide regarding gas supply are critical to the State. U.S. natural gas dry production totaled 20.5 Tcf in 2008, which was 6 percent higher than in 2007. About 98 percent of the natural gas produced in the United States comes from production areas in the lower 48 states. The overall U.S. dry natural gas production has been relatively flat over much of the last ten years. However, in the past few years, there has been a significant shift in gas supplies from conventional or traditional supply areas and sources to unconventional or new supply areas and sources. U.S. natural gas production from traditional, more mature and accessible natural gas supply basins has steadily declined. However, this has been offset by increased drilling and production from new unconventional gas supply areas. In 2008 natural gas production from new supply resources totaled about 10.4 Tcf (28.5 Bcf per day) or about 51 percent of the total U.S. dry natural gas production.⁵

The increased production from unconventional resources is primarily from tight sands, coal-bed methane, and shale formations. The Rocky Mountain Region is the fastest-growing region for tight sands natural gas production and the predominant region for coal-bed methane natural gas production in the United States. There are at least 21 shale gas basins located in over 20 states in the United States. Currently, the most prolific-shale producing areas in the country are in the southern US and include the Barnett Shale area in Texas, the Haynesville Shale in Texas and Louisiana, the Woodford Shale in Oklahoma, and the Fayetteville Shale in Arkansas. In the Appalachian region, which extends into New York, the Marcellus Shale is expected to develop into a major natural gas production area. Proven natural gas reserves for the United States totaled over 237 Tcf at the end of 2007, an increase of about 12 percent over 2006 levels. The

⁴ New York State Energy Planning Board, December 2009, p. 8.

⁵ New York State Energy Planning Board, December 2009, p. 10.

increase in reserves was the ninth year in a row that U.S. natural gas proven reserves have increased.⁶

Over 95 percent of the natural gas supply required to meet the demands of New York natural gas customers is from other states, principally the Gulf Coast region, and Canada. The gas supply is brought to the New York market by interstate pipelines that move the gas from producing and storage areas for customers, such as local distribution companies (LDCs) and electric generators, who purchase the gas supplies from gas producers and marketers.

New York natural gas production supplies about 5 percent of the State's natural gas requirements. Currently, there are about 6,700 active natural gas wells in the State. For the 2010 calendar year, total reported State natural gas production was 35.7 Bcf, down 35 percent from the 2006 record total of 55.2 Bcf. These figures represent an increase of over 100 percent since 1998 (16.7 Bcf).⁷

The Marcellus Shale formation has attracted great attention as a significant new source of natural gas production. The Marcellus Shale extends from Ohio through West Virginia and into Pennsylvania and New York. In New York, the Marcellus Shale is located in much of the Southern Tier stretching from Chautauqua and Erie Counties in the west to the counties of Sullivan, Ulster, Greene and Albany in the east. According to researchers at Penn State University, the Marcellus Shale is the largest known shale deposit of gas in the world.⁸ Engelder and Lash (2008) first estimated gas-in-place to be between 168 and 500 Tcf with a recoverable estimate of 50 Tcf.⁹ While it is early in the productive life of Marcellus Shale wells, the most recent estimates by Engelder using well production decline rates indicate a 50 percent probability that recoverable reserves could be as high as 489 Tcf.¹⁰

In Pennsylvania, where Marcellus Shale development is underway, researchers at Penn State University estimated that the natural gas industry generated \$2.3 billion in total value, added

⁶ New York State Energy Planning Board, December 2009, p. 12.

⁷ New York State Energy Planning Board, August 2009, p.14.

⁸ Considine et al., 2009, p.2.

⁹ Engelder and Lash, 2008, p.87.

¹⁰ Engelder, 2009, p.5.

more than 29,000 jobs, and \$240 million in state and local taxes in 2008. With a substantially higher pace of development projected by these researchers subsequently, they anticipated substantially higher economic output, state and local tax revenues, and job creation.¹¹

The Draft 2009 New York State Energy Plan recognizes the potential benefit to New York by development of the Marcellus Shale natural gas resource:

Production and use of in-state energy resources – renewable resources and natural gas – can increase the reliability and security of our energy systems, reduce energy costs, and contribute to meeting climate change, public health and environmental objectives. Additionally, by focusing energy investments on in-state opportunities, New York can reduce the amount of dollars “exported” out of the State to pay for energy resources.¹²

The New York State Energy Plan further includes a recommendation to encourage development of the Marcellus Shale natural gas formation with environmental safeguards that are protective of water supplies and natural resources.¹³

The New York State Commission on State Asset Maximization recommends that “Taking into account the significant environmental considerations, the State should study the potential for new private investment in extracting natural gas in the Marcellus Shale on State-owned lands, in addition to development on private lands.” Depending on the geology, a typical horizontal well in the Marcellus Shale (covering approximately 80 acres) may produce 1.0 to 1.5 Bcf of gas cumulatively over the first five years in service. At a natural gas price of \$6 per thousand cubic feet (Mcf), a 12.5 percent royalty could result in royalty income to a landowner of \$750,000 to over \$1 million over a five-year period.¹⁴

The Final report concludes that an increase in natural gas supplies would place downward pressure on natural gas prices, improve system reliability and result in lower energy costs for New Yorkers. In addition, natural gas extraction would create jobs and increase wealth to

¹¹- Considine et al., 2009, p. 30.

¹² New York State Energy Planning Board, December 2009, p. xiv.

¹³ New York State Energy Planning Board, December 2009, p.xv.

¹⁴ New York State Commission on State Asset Maximization, June 2009, p. 62.

upstate landowners, and increase State revenue from taxes and landowner leases and royalties. The report also concludes that development of State-owned lands not protected by Article XIV of the State Constitution could provide revenue relief to the State and spur economic development and job creation in economically depressed regions of the State.¹⁵

Broome County, New York commissioned a study entitled *Potential Economic and Fiscal Impacts from Natural Gas Production in Broome County, New York*, which was released in July 2009. The report details significant potential economic impacts on the Greater Binghamton Region:

Table 2.1 - Economic and Fiscal Impacts of Gas Well Drilling Activities in Broome County, NY Over 10 Years¹⁶

Description	Impact 2,000 Wells	Impact 4,000 Wells
Total Spending	\$ 7,000,000,000	\$ 14,000,000,000
Total Economic Activity	\$ 7,648,652,000	\$ 15,297,304,000
Total Wages, Salaries, Benefits (labor income)	\$ 396,436,000	\$ 792,872,000
Total Employment (person years)	8,136	16,272
Total Property Income*	\$ 605,676,000	\$ 1,211,352,000
State Taxes [†]	\$ 22,240,000	\$ 44,480,000
Local Taxes [†]	\$ 20,528,000	\$ 41,056,000

*Includes royalties, rents, dividends, and corporate profits. † Includes sales, excise, property taxes, fees, and licenses.

The local economic impacts are already being realized in some cases as exploration companies continue to lease prospective acreage in the Southern Tier and as oil and gas service companies seek to locate in the heart of the activity to better serve their customers. News reports on June 20, 2009, detailed the terms of a lease agreement between Hess Corporation and a coalition of landowners in the Towns of Binghamton and Conklin. The coalition represents some 800 residents who control more than 19,000 acres. The lease provides bonus payments of \$3,500 per acre and a royalty of 20 percent. On August 26, 2009, it was reported that in Horseheads, New York, Schlumberger Technology Corporation planned to build a \$30 million facility to house

¹⁵ New York State Commission on State Asset Maximization, June 2009, p. 62.

¹⁶ Broome County, 2009, p. 10.

\$120 million worth of equipment and technology to service oil and gas exploration companies in the Southern Tier and Northern Pennsylvania. As of June 2011, construction of the Schlumberger CT (coiled tubing) facility was ongoing but the facility was offering some services. Once completed, the facility will comprehensively service horizontal multistage completion needs in the Marcellus Shale. The facility is ideally located to respond to immediate callout and minimize mobilization time and costs. This operations base will be designed to combine CT, cementing, stimulation, and other completion expertise.¹⁷

According to researchers at Penn State University, natural gas will play a pivotal role in the transformation of our economy to achieve lower levels of GHG emissions. Natural gas has lower carbon emissions than both coal and oil, so that any displacement of these fuels by natural gas to supply power plants and other end-users will produce a reduction in GHG.¹⁸

In Chapter 6 the potential negative environmental impacts of the proposed action will be systematically identified and discussed. What is clear is that there are significant positive economic consequences along with significant potential impacts on the environment that need to be carefully considered.

2.3 Project Location

The 1992 GEIS is applicable to onshore oil and gas well drilling statewide. Sedimentary rock formations which may someday be developed by horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing exist from the Vermont/Massachusetts border up to the St. Lawrence/Lake Champlain region, west along Lake Ontario to Lake Erie and across the Southern Tier and Finger Lakes regions. Drilling will not occur on State-owned lands in the Adirondack and Catskill Forest Preserves because of the State Constitution's requirement that Forest Preserve lands be kept forever wild and not be leased or sold. Drilling will not occur on State reforestation areas and wildlife management areas that are located in the Forest Preserve because the State Constitution prohibits those areas from being leased or sold. Surface disturbance associated with high-volume hydraulic fracturing would not be allowed on State-owned lands administered by DEC outside of the Forest Preserve, including but not limited to State Forests and State Wildlife Management

¹⁷ http://www.slb.com/~media/Files/coiled_tubing/brochures/usland_ct_br.ashx.

¹⁸ Considine et al., 2009, p. 2.

Areas, because high-volume hydraulic fracturing would be inconsistent with the purposes for which those lands were acquired. Current OPRHP policy would impose a similar restriction on State Parks. In addition, the subsurface geology of the Adirondacks, NYC and Long Island and other factors render drilling for hydrocarbons in those areas unlikely.

The prospective region for the extraction of natural gas from Marcellus and Utica Shales has been roughly described as an area extending from Chautauqua County eastward to Greene, Ulster and Sullivan Counties, and from the Pennsylvania border north to the approximate location of the east-west portion of the New York State Thruway between Schenectady and Auburn. The maps in Chapter 4 depict the prospective area.

2.4 Environmental Setting

Environmental resources discussed in the 1992 GEIS with respect to potential impacts from oil and gas development include: waterways/water bodies; drinking water supplies; public lands; coastal areas; wetlands; floodplains; soils; agricultural lands; intensive timber production areas; significant habitats; areas of historical, architectural, archeological and cultural significance; clean air and visual resources.¹⁹ Further information is provided below regarding specific aspects of the environmental setting for Marcellus and Utica Shale development and high-volume hydraulic fracturing that were determined during Scoping to require attention in the SGEIS.

2.4.1 Water Use Classifications²⁰

Water use classifications are assigned to surface waters and groundwaters throughout New York. Surface water and groundwater sources are classified by the best use that is or could be made of the source. The preservation of these uses is a regulatory requirement in New York.

Classifications of surface waters and groundwaters in New York are identified and assigned in 6 NYCRR Part 701.

¹⁹ NYSDEC, 1992, GEIS Chapter 6 provides a broad background of these environmental resources, including the then-existing legislative protections, other than SEQRA, guarding these resources from potential impacts. Chapters 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 of the GEIS contain more detailed analyses of the specific environmental impacts of development on these resources, as well as the mitigation measures required to prevent these impacts.

²⁰ URS, 2009, p. 4-2.

In general, the discharge of sewage, industrial waste, or other wastes must not cause impairment of the best usages of the receiving water as specified by the water classifications at the location of discharge and at other locations that may be affected by such discharge. In addition, for higher quality waters, the Department may impose discharge restrictions (described below) in order to protect public health, or the quality of distinguished value or sensitive waters.

A table of water use classifications, usages and restrictions follows.

Table 2.2 - New York Water Use Classifications

Water Use Class	Water Type	Best Usages and Suitability	Notes
N	Fresh Surface	1, 2	
AA-Special	Fresh Surface	3, 4, 5, 6	Note a
A-Special	Fresh Surface	3, 4, 5, 6	Note b
AA	Fresh Surface	3, 4, 5, 6	Note c
A	Fresh Surface	3, 4, 5, 6	Note d
B	Fresh Surface	4, 5, 6	
C	Fresh Surface	5, 6, 7	
D	Fresh Surface	5, 7, 8	
SA	Saline Surface	4, 5, 6, 9	
SB	Saline Surface	4, 5, 6,	
SC	Saline Surface	5, 6, 7	
I	Saline Surface	5, 6, 10	
SD	Saline Surface	5, 8	
GA	Fresh Groundwater	11	
GSA	Saline Groundwater	12	Note e
GSB	Saline Groundwater	13	Note f
Other – T/TS	Fresh Surface	Trout/Trout Spawning	
Other – Discharge Restriction Category	All Types	N/A	See descriptions below

Best Usage/Suitability Categories [Column 3 of Table 2.2 above]

1. Best usage for enjoyment of water in its natural condition and, where compatible, as a source of water for drinking or culinary purposes, bathing, fishing, fish propagation, and recreation;

2. Suitable for shellfish and wildlife propagation and survival, and fish survival;
3. Best usage as source of water supply for drinking, culinary or food processing purposes;
4. Best usage for primary and secondary contact recreation;
5. Best usage for fishing;
6. Suitable for fish, shellfish, and wildlife propagation and survival;
7. Suitable for primary and secondary contact recreation, although other factors may limit the use for these purposes;
8. Suitable for fish, shellfish, and wildlife survival (not propagation);
9. Best usage for shellfishing for market purposes;
10. Best usage for secondary, but not primary, contact recreation;
11. Best usage for potable water supply;
12. Best usage for source of potable mineral waters, or conversion to fresh potable waters, or as raw material for the manufacture of sodium chloride or its derivatives or similar products; and
13. Best usage is as receiving water for disposal of wastes (may not be assigned to any groundwaters of the State, unless the Commissioner finds that adjacent and tributary groundwaters and the best usages thereof will not be impaired by such classification).

Notes [Column 4 of Table 2.2 above]

- a. These waters shall contain no floating solids, settleable solids, oil, sludge deposits, toxic wastes, deleterious substances, colored or other wastes or heated liquids attributable to sewage, industrial wastes or other wastes; there shall be no discharge or disposal of sewage, industrial wastes or other wastes into these waters; these waters shall contain no phosphorus and nitrogen in amounts that will result in growths of algae, weeds and slimes that will impair the waters for their best usages; there shall be no alteration to flow that will impair the waters for their best usages; there shall be no increase in turbidity that will cause a substantial visible contrast to natural conditions;

- b. This classification may be given to those international boundary waters that, if subjected to approved treatment, equal to coagulation, sedimentation, filtration and disinfection with additional treatment, if necessary, to reduce naturally present impurities, meet or will meet NYSDOH drinking water standards and are or will be considered safe and satisfactory for drinking water purposes;
- c. This classification may be given to those waters that if subjected to pre-approved disinfection treatment, with additional treatment if necessary to remove naturally present impurities, meet or will meet NYSDOH drinking water standards and are or will be considered safe and satisfactory for drinking water purposes;
- d. This classification may be given to those waters that, if subjected to approved treatment equal to coagulation, sedimentation, filtration and disinfection, with additional treatment if necessary to reduce naturally present impurities, meet or will meet NYSDOH drinking water standards and are or will be considered safe and satisfactory for drinking water purposes;
- e. Class GSA waters are saline groundwaters. The best usages of these waters are as a source of potable mineral waters, or conversion to fresh potable waters, or as raw material for the manufacture of sodium chloride or its derivatives or similar products; and
- f. Class GSB waters are saline groundwaters that have a chloride concentration in excess of 1,000 milligrams per liter (mg/L) or a total dissolved solids (TDS) concentration in excess of 2,000 mg/L; this classification shall not be assigned to any groundwaters of the State, unless the Department finds that adjacent and tributary groundwaters and the best usages thereof will not be impaired by such classification.

Discharge Restriction Categories [Last Row of Table 2.2 above]

Based on a number of relevant factors and local conditions, per 6 NYCRR §701.20, discharge restriction categories may be assigned to: (1) waters of particular public health concern; (2) significant recreational or ecological waters where the quality of the water is critical to maintaining the value for which the waters are distinguished; and (3) other sensitive waters

where the Department has determined that existing standards are not adequate to maintain water quality.

1. Per 6 NYCRR §701.22, new discharges may be permitted for waters where discharge restriction categories are assigned when such discharges result from environmental remediation projects, from projects correcting environmental or public health emergencies, or when such discharges result in a reduction of pollutants for the designated waters. In all cases, best usages and standards will be maintained;
2. Per 6 NYCRR §701.23, except for storm water discharges, no new discharges shall be permitted and no increase in any existing discharges shall be permitted; and
3. Per 6 NYCRR §701.24, specified substances shall not be permitted in new discharges, and no increase in the release of specified substances shall be permitted for any existing discharges. Storm water discharges are an exception to these restrictions. The substance will be specified at the time the waters are designated.

2.4.2 *Water Quality Standards*

Generally speaking, groundwater and surface water classifications and quality standards in New York are established by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the Department. The NYC Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP) defers to the New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) for water classifications and quality standards.

The most recent NYC Drinking Water Quality Report can be found at

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/dep/pdf/wsstate10.pdf>. The Susquehanna River Basin Commission (SRBC) has not established independent classifications and quality standards. However, one of SRBC's roles is to recommend modifications to state water quality standards to improve consistency among the states. The Delaware River Basin Commission (DRBC) has established independent classifications and water quality standards throughout the Delaware River Basin, including those portions within New York. The relevant and applicable water quality standards and classifications include the following:

- 6 NYCRR Part 703, Surface Water and Groundwater Quality Standards and Groundwater Effluent Limitations;²¹
- USEPA Drinking Water Contaminants;²²
- 18_CFR Part 410, DRBC Administrative Manual Part III Water Quality Regulations;²³
- 10 NYCRR Part 5, Subpart 5-1 Public Water Systems;²⁴ and
- NYCDEP Drinking Water Supply and Quality Report.²⁵

2.4.3 *Drinking Water*²⁶

The protection of drinking water sources and supplies is extremely important for the maintenance of public health, and the protection of this water use type is paramount. Chemical or biological substances that are inadvertently released into surface water or groundwater sources that are designated for drinking water use can adversely impact or disqualify such usage if there are constituents that conflict with applicable standards for drinking water. These standards are discussed below.

2.4.3.1 *Federal*

The Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA), passed in 1974 and amended in 1986 and 1996, gives USEPA the authority to set drinking water standards. There are two categories of drinking water standards: primary and secondary. Primary standards are legally enforceable and apply to public water supply systems. The secondary standards are non-enforceable guidelines that are recommended as standards for drinking water. Public water supply systems are not required to comply with secondary standards unless a state chooses to adopt them as enforceable standards. New York has elected to enforce both as Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) and does not make the distinction.

²¹ <http://www.dec.ny.gov/regs/4590.html>.

²² <http://www.epa.gov/safewater/contaminants/index.html>.

²³ http://www.state.nj.us/drbc/regs/WQRegs_071608.pdf.

²⁴ <http://www.health.state.ny.us/environmental/water/drinking/part5/subpart5.htm>

²⁵ http://www.nyc.gov/html/dep/html/drinking_water/wsstate.shtml.

²⁶ URS, 2009, pp. 4-5:4-16.

The primary standards are designed to protect drinking water quality by limiting the levels of specific contaminants that can adversely affect public health and are known or anticipated to occur in drinking water. The determinations of which contaminants to regulate are based on peer-reviewed science research and an evaluation of the following factors:

- Occurrence in the environment and in public water supply systems at levels of concern;
- Human exposure and risks of adverse health effects in the general population and sensitive subpopulations;
- Analytical methods of detection;
- Technical feasibility; and
- Impacts of regulation on water systems, the economy and public health.

After reviewing health effects studies and considering the risk to sensitive subpopulations, EPA sets a non-enforceable Maximum Contaminant Level Goal (MCLG) for each contaminant as a public health goal. This is the maximum level of a contaminant in drinking water at which no known or anticipated adverse effect on the health of persons would occur, and which allows an adequate margin of safety. MCLGs only consider public health and may not be achievable given the limits of detection and best available treatment technologies. The SDWA prescribes limits in terms of MCLs or Treatment Techniques (TTs), which are achievable at a reasonable cost, to serve as the primary drinking water standards. A contaminant generally is classified as microbial in nature or as a carcinogenic/non-carcinogenic chemical.

Secondary contaminants may cause cosmetic effects (such as skin or tooth discoloration) or aesthetic effects (such as taste, odor, or color) in drinking water. The numerical secondary standards are designed to control these effects to a level desirable to consumers.

Table 2.3 and Table 2.4 list contaminants regulated by federal primary and secondary drinking water standards.

Table 2.3 - Primary Drinking Water Standards

Microorganisms	Contaminant	MCLG (mg/L)	MCL or TT (mg/L)
	Cryptosporidium	0	TT
Giardia Lamblia	0	TT	
Heterotrophic plate count	n/a	TT	
Legionella	0	TT	
Total Coliform (including fecal coliform and E. coli)	0	5%	
Turbidity	n/a	TT	
Viruses (enteric)	0	TT	

MCLG: Maximum contaminant level goal

MCL: Maximum contaminant level

TT: Treatment technology

Disinfection Byproducts	Contaminant	MCLG (mg/L)	MCL or TT (mg/L)
	Bromate	0	0.01
Chlorite	0.8	1	
Haloacetic acids (HAA5)	n/a	0.06	
Total Trihalomethanes (TTHMs)	n/a	0.08	

Disinfectants	Contaminant	MRDLG (mg/L)	MRDL (mg/L)
	Chloramines (as Cl ₂)	4.0	4.0
Chlorine (as Cl ₂)	4.0	4.0	
Chlorine dioxide (as ClO ₂)	0.8	0.8	

MRDL: Maximum Residual Disinfectant Level

MRDLG: Maximum Residual Disinfectant Level Goal

Inorganic Chemicals	Contaminant	CAS number	MCLG (mg/L)	MCL or TT (mg/L)
	Antimony	07440-36-0	0.006	0.006
Arsenic	07440-38-2	0	0.01 as of 01/23/06	
Asbestos (fiber >10 micrometers)	01332-21-5	7 million fibers per liter	7 MFL	
Barium	07440-39-3	2	2	
Beryllium	07440-41-7	0.004	0.004	
Cadmium	07440-43-9	0.005	0.005	
Chromium (total)	07440-47-3	0.1	0.1	
Copper	07440-50-8	1.3	TT; Action Level=1.3	
Cyanide (as free cyanide)	00057-12-5	0.2	0.2	
Fluoride	16984-48-8	4	4	

Inorganic Chemicals

Contaminant	CAS number	MCLG (mg/L)	MCL or TT (mg/L)
Lead	07439-92-1	0	TT; Action Level=0.015
Mercury (inorganic)	07439-97-6	0.002	0.002
Nitrate (measured as Nitrogen)		10	10
Nitrite (measured as Nitrogen)		1	1
Selenium	07782-49-2	0.05	0.05
Thallium	07440-28-0	0.0005	0.002

Organic Chemicals

Contaminant	CAS number	MCLG (mg/L)	MCL or TT (mg/L)
Acrylamide	00079-06-1	0	TT
Alachlor	15972-60-8	0	0.002
Atrazine	01912-24-9	0.003	0.003
Benzene	00071-43-2	0	0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene (PAHs)	00050-32-8	0	0.0002
Carbofuran	01563-66-2	0.04	0.04
Carbon tetrachloride	00056-23-5	0	0.005
Chlordane	00057-74-9	0	0.002
Chlorobenzene	00108-907	0.1	0.1
2,4-Dichloro-phenoxyacetic acid (2,4-D)	00094-75-7	0.07	0.07
Dalapon	00075-99-0	0.2	0.2
1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane (DBCP)	00096-12-8	0	0.0002
o-Dichlorobenzene	00095-50-1	0.6	0.6
p-Dichlorobenzene	00106-46-7	0.075	0.075
1,2-Dichloroethane	00107-06-2	0	0.005
1,1-Dichloroethylene	00075-35-4	0.007	0.007
cis-1,2-Dichloroethylene	00156-59-2	0.07	0.07
trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene	00156-60-5	0.1	0.1
Dichloromethane	00074-87-3	0	0.005
1,2-Dichloropropane	00078-87-5	0	0.005
Di(2-ethylhexyl) adipate	00103-23-1	0.4	0.4
Di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate	00117-81-7	0	0.006
Dinoseb	00088-85-7	0.007	0.007
Dioxin (2,3,7,8-TCDD)	01746-01-6	0	0.00000003
Diquat		0.02	0.02
Endothall	00145-73-3	0.1	0.1
Endrin	00072-20-8	0.002	0.002
Epichlorohydrin		0	TT
Ethylbenzene	00100-41-4	0.7	0.7
Ethylene dibromide	00106-93-4	0	0.00005
Glyphosate	01071-83-6	0.7	0.7
Heptachlor	00076-44-8	0	0.0004

Organic Chemicals

Contaminant	CAS number	MCLG (mg/L)	MCL or TT (mg/L)
Heptachlor epoxide	01024-57-3	0	0.0002
Hexachlorobenzene	00118-74-1	0	0.001
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	00077-47-4	0.05	0.05
Lindane	00058-89-9	0.0002	0.0002
Methoxychlor	00072-43-5	0.04	0.04
Oxamyl (Vydate)	23135-22-0	0.2	0.2
Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs)		0	0.0005
Pentachlorophenol	00087-86-5	0	0.001
Picloram	01918-02-1	0.5	0.5
Simazine	00122-34-9	0.004	0.004
Styrene	00100-42-5	0.1	0.1
Tetrachloroethylene	00127-18-4	0	0.005
Toluene	00108-88-3	1	1
Toxaphene	08001-35-2	0	0.003
2,4,5-TP (Silvex)	00093-72-1	0.05	0.05
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	00120-82-1	0.07	0.07
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	00071-55-6	0.2	0.2
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	00079-00-5	0.003	0.005
Trichloroethylene	00079-01-6	0	0.005
Vinyl chloride	00075-01-4	0	0.002
Xylenes (total)		10	10

Radionuclides

Contaminant	MCLG (mg/L)	MCL or TT (mg/L)
Alpha particles	none ----- zero	15 picocuries per Liter (pCi/L)
Beta particles and photon emitters	none ----- zero	4 millirems per year
Radium 226 and Radium 228 (combined)	none ----- zero	5 pCi/L
Uranium	zero	30 ug/L

Table 2.4 - Secondary Drinking Water Standards

Contaminant	CAS number	Standard
Aluminum	07439-90-5	0.05 to 0.2 mg/L
Chloride		250 mg/L
Color		15 (color units)
Copper	07440-50-8	1.0 mg/L
Corrosivity		Non-corrosive
Fluoride	16984-48-8	2.0 mg/L
Foaming Agents (surfactants)		0.5 mg/L
Iron	07439-89-6	0.3 mg/L
Manganese	07439-96-5	0.05 mg/L
Odor		3 threshold odor number
pH		6.5-8.5
Silver	07440-22-4	0.10 mg/L
Sulfate	14808-79-8	250 mg/L
Total Dissolved Solids		500 mg/L
Zinc	07440-66-6	5 mg/L

New York State is a primacy state and has assumed responsibility for the implementation of the drinking water protection program.

2.4.3.2 New York State

Authorization to use water for a public drinking water system is subject to Article 15, Title 15 of the ECL administered by the Department, while the design and operation of a public drinking water system and quality of drinking water is regulated under the State Sanitary Code 10 NYCRR, Subpart 5-1 administered by NYSDOH.²⁷

Anyone planning to operate or operating a public water supply system must obtain a Water Supply Permit from the Department before undertaking any of the regulated activities.

Contact with the Department and submission of a Water Supply Permit application will automatically involve NYSDOH, which has a regulatory role in water quality and other sanitary aspects of a project relating to human health. Through the State Sanitary Code (Chapter 1 of 10 NYCRR), NYSDOH oversees the suitability of water for human consumption. Section 5-1.30 of

²⁷ 6 NYCRR 601 – <http://www.dec.ny.gov/regs/4445.html>.

10 NYCRR²⁸ prescribes the required minimum treatment for public water systems, which depends on the source water type and quality. To assure the safety of drinking water in New York, NYSDOH, in cooperation with its partners, the county health departments, regulates the operation, design and quality of public water supplies; assures water sources are adequately protected, and sets standards for constructing individual water supplies.

NYSDOH standards, established in regulations found at Section 5-1.51 of 10 NYCRR and accompanying Tables in Section 1.52, meet or exceed national drinking water standards. These standards address national primary standards, secondary standards and other contaminants, including those not listed in federal standards such as principal organic contaminants with specific chemical compound classification and unspecified organic contaminants.

2.4.4 Public Water Systems

Public water systems in New York range in size from that of NYC, the largest engineered water system in the nation, serving more than nine million people, to those run by municipal governments or privately-owned water supply companies serving municipalities of varying size and type, schools with their own water supply, and small retail outlets in rural areas serving customers water from their own wells. Privately owned, residential wells supplying water to individual households do not require a water supply permit. In total, there are nearly 10,000 public water systems in New York State. A majority of the systems (approximately 8,460) rely on groundwater aquifers, although a majority of the State's population is served by surface water sources. Public water systems include community water systems (CWS) and non-community water systems (NCWS). NCWSs include non-transient non-community (NTNC) and transient non-community (TNC) water systems. NYSDOH regulations contain the definitions listed in Table 2.5.

²⁸ 10 NYCRR 5-1.30 – <http://www.health.state.ny.us/nysdoh/phforum/nycrr10.htm>.

Table 2.5 - Public Water System Definition²⁹

Public water system means a community, non-community or non-transient non-community water system which provides water to the public for human consumption through pipes or other constructed conveyances, if such system has at least five service connections or regularly serves an average of at least 25 individuals daily at least 60 days out of the year. Such term includes:

- a. collection, treatment, storage and distribution facilities under control of the supplier of water of such system and used with such system; and
- b. collection or pretreatment storage facilities not under such control which are used with such system.

Community water system (CWS) means a public water system which serves at least five service connections used by year-round residents or regularly serves at least 25 year-round residents.

Noncommunity water system (NCWS) means a public water system that is not a community water system.

Non-transient noncommunity water system (NTNC) means a public water system that is not a community water system but is a subset of a noncommunity water system that regularly serves at least 25 of the same people, four hours or more per day, for four or more days per week, for 26 or more weeks per year.

Transient noncommunity water system (TNC) means a noncommunity water system that does not regularly serve at least 25 of the same people over six months per year.

2.4.4.1 Primary and Principal Aquifers

About one quarter of New Yorkers rely on groundwater as a source of potable water. In order to enhance regulatory protection in areas where groundwater resources are most productive and most vulnerable, the NYSDOH, in 1981, identified 18 Primary Water Supply Aquifers (also referred to simply as Primary Aquifers) across the State. These are defined in the Division of Water (DOW) Technical and Operational Guidance Series (TOGS) 2.1.3³⁰ as “highly productive aquifers presently utilized as sources of water supply by major municipal water supply systems.”

Many Principal Aquifers have also been identified and are defined in the DOW TOGS as “highly productive, but which are not intensively used as sources of water supply by major municipal systems at the present time.” Principal Aquifers are those known to be highly productive aquifers or where the geology suggests abundant potential supply, but are not presently being heavily used for public water supply. The 21 Primary and the many Principal Aquifers greater than one square mile in area within New York State (excluding Long Island) are shown on

²⁹ 10 NYCRR, Part 5, Subpart 5-1 Public Water Systems (Current as of: October 1, 2007); SUBPART 5-1; PUBLIC WATER SYSTEMS; 5-1.1 Definitions. (Effective Date: May 26, 2004).

³⁰ http://www.dec.ny.gov/docs/water_pdf/togs213.pdf.

Map No.	Aquifer Name	Number of Wells Within Mapped Aquifer Boundary		
		Gas Wells	Oil Wells	Other Wells*
1	Baldwinsville	37	0	3
2	Batavia	0	0	5
3	Corning	5	0	4
4	Cortland-Homer-Preble	0	0	2
5	Elmira-Horseheads-Big Flats	6	0	16
6	Endicott-Johnson City	0	0	3
7	Fulton	4	0	2
8	Jamestown	82	11	14
9	Lower Cohocton	4	0	24
10	Olean	7	310	81
11	Owego	0	0	2
12	Salamanca	14	2	6
13	Upper Cohocton	0	0	3
14	Waverly	0	0	1
	Principal Aquifer	1,664	749	1,344
	<i>Total</i>	<i>1,823</i>	<i>1,072</i>	<i>1,510</i>

Notes:
 * - Other wells include storage, solution brine, dry hole, injection, stratigraphic, geothermal, and not listed well types.




FIGURE 2.1

REGULATED OIL, GAS, & OTHER WELLS IN PRIMARY AND PRINCIPAL AQUIFERS IN NEW YORK STATE



Technical Support Document to the Draft Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement

Source:
 - "New York State Aquifers" by NYS Department of Health, Bureau of Public Water Supply Protection (April 2001) on <http://nysgis.state.ny.us/gis9/nyaquifers.zip>.
 - Well information from (February 2009) <http://www.dec.ny.gov/energy/1603.html>

Figure 2.1. The remaining portion of the State is underlain by smaller aquifers or low-yielding groundwater sources that typically are suitable only for small community and non-community public water systems or individual household supplies.³¹

2.4.4.2 Public Water Supply Wells

NYSDOH estimates that over two million New Yorkers outside of Long Island are served by public groundwater supplies.³² Most public water systems with groundwater sources pump and treat groundwater from wells. Public groundwater supply wells are governed by Subpart 5-1 of the State Sanitary Code under 10 NYCRR.³³

2.4.5 Private Water Wells and Domestic-Supply Springs

There are potentially tens to hundreds of thousands of private water supply wells in the State. To ensure that private water wells provide adequate quantities of water fit for consumption and intended uses, they need to be located and constructed to maintain long-term water yield and reduce the risk of contamination. Improperly constructed water wells can allow for easy transport of contaminants to the well and pose a significant health risk to users. New, replacement or renovated private wells are required to be in compliance with the New York State Residential Code, NYSDOH Appendix 5-B “Standards for Water Wells,”³⁴ installed by a certified Department-registered water well contractor and have groundwater as the water source. However, many private water wells installed before these requirements took effect are still in use. The 1992 GEIS describes how improperly constructed private water wells are susceptible to pollution from many sources, and proposes a 150-foot setback to protect vulnerable private wells.³⁵

NYSDOH includes springs – along with well points, dug wells and shore wells – as susceptible sources that are vulnerable to contamination from pathogens, spills and the effects of drought.³⁶

³¹ Alpha, 2009, p. 3-2.

³² http://www.health.state.ny.us/environmental/water/drinking/facts_figures.htm.

³³ <http://www.health.state.ny.us/environmental/water/drinking/part5/subpart5.htm>.

³⁴ <http://www.health.state.ny.us/environmental/water/drinking/part5/appendix5b.htm>.

³⁵ NYSDEC, 1992, GEIS, p. 8-22.

³⁶ http://www.health.state.ny.us/environmental/water/drinking/part5/append5b/fs5_susceptible_water_sources.htm.

Use of these sources for drinking water is discouraged and should be considered only as a last resort with proper protective measures. With respect to springs, NYSDOH specifically states:

Springs occur where an aquifer discharges naturally at or near the ground surface, and are broadly classified as either rock or earth springs. It is often difficult to determine the true source of a spring (that is, whether it truly has the natural protection against contamination that a groundwater aquifer typically has.) Even if the source is a good aquifer, it is difficult to develop a collection device (e.g., "spring box") that reliably protects against entry of contaminants under all weather conditions. (The term "spring box" varies, and, depending on its construction, would be equivalent to, and treated the same, as either a spring, well point or shore well.) Increased yield and turbidity during rain events are indications of the source being under the direct influence of surface water.³⁷

Because of their vulnerability, and because in addition to their use as drinking water supplies they also supply water to wetlands, streams and ponds, the 1992 GEIS proposes a 150-foot setback.³⁸

For oil and gas regulatory purposes, potable fresh water is defined as water containing less than 250 ppm of sodium chloride or 1,000 ppm TDS³⁹ and salt water is defined as containing more than 250 ppm sodium chloride or 1,000 ppm TDS.⁴⁰ Groundwater from sources below approximately 850 feet in New York typically is too saline for use as a potable water supply; however, there are isolated wells deeper than 850 feet that produce potable water and wells less than 850 feet that produce salt water. A depth of 850 feet to the base of potable water is commonly used as a practical generalization for the maximum depth of potable water; however, a variety of conditions affect water quality, and the maximum depth of potable water in an area should be determined based on the best available data.⁴¹

2.4.6 History of Drilling and Hydraulic Fracturing in Water Supply Areas

A tabulated summary of the regulated oil, gas, and other wells located within the boundaries of the Primary and Principal Aquifers in the State is provided on Figure 2.1. There are 482 oil and gas wells located within the boundaries of 14 Primary Aquifers and 2,413 oil and gas wells

³⁷ NYSDOH - http://www.health.ny.gov/environmental/water/drinking/part5/append5b/docs/fs5_susceptible_water_sources.pdf.

³⁸ NYSDEC, 1992, GEIS, p. 8-16.

³⁹ 6 NYCRR Part 550.3(ai).

⁴⁰ 6 NYCRR Part 550.3(at).

⁴¹ Alpha, 2009, p. 3-3.

located within the boundaries of Principal Aquifers. Another 1,510 storage, solution brine, injection, stratigraphic, geothermal, and other deep wells are located within the boundaries of the mapped aquifers. The remaining regulated oil and gas wells likely penetrate a horizon of potable freshwater that can be used by residents or communities as a drinking water source. These freshwater horizons include unconsolidated deposits and bedrock units.⁴²

Chapter 4, on Geology, includes a generalized cross-section (Figure 4.3) across the Southern Tier of New York State which illustrates the depth and thickness of rock formations including the prospective shale formations.

No documented instances of groundwater contamination from previous horizontal drilling or hydraulic fracturing projects in New York are recorded in the Department's well files or records of complaint investigations. No documented incidents of groundwater contamination in public water supply systems could be recalled by the NYSDOH central office and Rochester district office (NYSDOH, 2009a; NYSDOH, 2009b). References have been made to some reports of private well contamination in Chautauqua County in the 1980s that may be attributed to oil and gas drilling (Chautauqua County Department of Health, 2009; NYSDOH, 2009a; NYSDOH, 2009b; Sierra Club, undated). The reported Chautauqua County incidents, the majority of which occurred in the 1980s and which pre-date the current casing and cementing practices and fresh water aquifer supplementary permit conditions, could not be substantiated because pre-drilling water quality testing was not conducted, improper tests were run which yielded inconclusive results and/or the incidents of alleged well contamination were not officially confirmed.⁴³

An operator caused turbidity (February 2007) in nearby water wells when it continued to pump compressed air for many hours through the drill string in an attempt to free a stuck drill bit at a well in the Town of Brookfield, Madison County. The compressed air migrated through natural fractures in the shallow bedrock because the well had not yet been drilled to the permitted surface casing seat depth. This non-routine incident was reported to the Department and staff were dispatched to investigate the problem. The Department shut down drilling operations and ordered the well plugged when it became apparent that continued drilling at the wellsite would cause

⁴² Alpha, 2009, p. 3-3.

⁴³ Alpha, 2009, p. 3-3.

turbidity to increase above what had already been experienced. The operator immediately provided drinking water to the affected residents and subsequently installed water treatment systems in several residences. Over a period of several months the turbidity abated and water wells returned to normal. Operators that use standard drilling practices and employ good oversight in compliance with their permits would not typically cause the excessive turbidity event seen at the Brookfield wells. The Department has no records of similar turbidity caused by well drilling as occurred at this Madison County well. Geoffrey Snyder, Director Environmental Health Madison County Health Department, stated in a May 2009 email correspondence regarding the Brookfield well accident that, “Overall we find things have pretty much been resolved and the water quality back to normal if not better than pre-incident conditions.”

2.4.7 Regulated Drainage Basins

New York State is divided into 17 watersheds, or drainage basins, which are the basis for various management, monitoring, and assessment activities.⁴⁴ A watershed is an area of land that drains into a body of water, such as a river, lake, reservoir, estuary, sea or ocean. The watershed includes the network of rivers, streams and lakes that convey the water and the land surfaces from which water runs off into those water bodies. Since all of New York State’s land area is incorporated into watersheds, all oil and gas drilling that has occurred since 1821 has occurred within watersheds, specifically, in 13 of the State’s 17 watersheds. Watersheds are separated from adjacent watersheds by high points, such as mountains, hills and ridges. Groundwater flow within watersheds may not be controlled by the same topographic features as surface water flow.

The river basins described below are subject to additional jurisdiction by existing regulatory bodies with respect to certain specific activities related to high-volume hydraulic fracturing.

The delineations of the Susquehanna and Delaware River Basins in New York are shown on Figure 2.2.

2.4.7.1 Delaware River Basin

Including Delaware Bay, the Delaware River Basin comprises 13,539 square miles in four states (New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware and New Jersey). Approximately 18.5 % of the surface area

⁴⁴ See map at <http://www.dec.ny.gov/lands/26561.html>.

of the basin, or 2,362 square miles, lies within portions of Broome, Chenango, Delaware, Schoharie, Greene, Ulster, Sullivan and Orange Counties in New York. This acreage overlaps with NYC's West of Hudson Watershed; the Basin supplies about half of NYC's drinking water and 100% of Philadelphia's supply.

The DRBC was established by a compact among the federal government, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Delaware to coordinate water resource management activities and the review of projects affecting water resources in the basin. New York is represented on the DRBC by a designee of New York State's Governor, and the Department has the opportunity to provide input on projects requiring DRBC action.




DRBC has identified its areas of concern with respect to natural gas drilling as reduction of flow in streams or aquifers, discharge or release of pollutants into ground water or surface water, and treatment and disposal of hydraulic fracturing fluid. DRBC staff will also review drill site characteristics, fracturing fluid composition and disposal strategy prior to recommending approval of shale gas development projects in the Delaware River Basin.⁴⁵

2.4.7.2 Susquehanna River Basin

The Susquehanna River Basin comprises 27,510 square miles in three states (New York, Pennsylvania and Maryland) and drains into the Chesapeake Bay. Approximately 24 % of the basin, or 6,602 square miles, lies within portions of Allegany, Livingston, Steuben, Yates, Ontario, Schuyler, Chemung, Tompkins, Tioga, Cortland, Onondaga, Madison, Chenango, Broome, Delaware, Schoharie, Otsego, Herkimer and Oneida Counties in New York.

⁴⁵ <http://www.state.nj.us/drbc/naturalgas.htm>

Legend

-  Delaware River Basin
-  Susquehanna River Basin
-  Utica and Marcellus Shales in New York State





FIGURE 2.2

**MAJOR TRIBUTARIES IN THE
SUSQUEHANNA & DELAWARE
RIVER BASINS IN NEW YORK STATE**



Technical Support Document to the
Draft Supplemental Generic
Environmental Impact Statement

Sources:

- Delaware River Basin Commission Geographic Information System <http://www.state.nj.us/drbc/gis.htm>.
- Susquehanna River Basin Commission Map and Data Atlas <http://www.srbcc.net/atlas/whatgis.asp>

The SRBC was established by a compact among the federal government, New York, Pennsylvania and Maryland to coordinate water resource management activities and review of projects affecting water resources in the Basin. New York is represented on the SRBC by a designee of the Department's Commissioner, and the Department has the opportunity to provide input on projects requiring SRBC action.

The Susquehanna River is the largest tributary to the Chesapeake Bay, with average annual flow to the Bay of over 20 billion gallons per day (gpd). Based upon existing consumptive use approvals plus estimates of other uses below the regulatory threshold requiring approval, SRBC estimates current maximum use potential in the Basin to be 882.5 million gpd. Projected maximum consumptive use in the Basin for gas drilling, calculated by SRBC based on twice the drilling rate in the Barnett Shale play in Texas, is about 28 million gpd as an annual average.⁴⁶

2.4.7.3 Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin

In New York, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin is the watershed of the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River, upstream from Trois Rivieres, Quebec, and includes all or parts of 34 counties, including the Lake Champlain and Finger Lakes sub-watersheds. Approximately 80 percent of New York's fresh surface water, over 700 miles of shoreline, and almost 50% of New York's lands are contained in the drainage basins of Lake Ontario, Lake Erie, and the St. Lawrence River. Jurisdictional authorities in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin, in addition to the Department, include the Great Lakes Commission, the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, the International Joint Commission, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Water Resources Compact Council, and the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Sustainable Water Resources Regional Body.

2.4.8 Water Resources Replenishment⁴⁷

The ability of surface water and groundwater systems to support withdrawals for various purposes, including natural gas development, is based primarily on replenishment (recharge). The Northeast region typically receives ample precipitation that replenishes surface water (runoff and groundwater discharge) and groundwater (infiltration).

⁴⁶ <http://www.srbc.net/programs/projreviewmarcellustier3.htm>.

⁴⁷ Alpha, 2009, p. 3-26.

The amount of water available to replenish groundwater and surface water depends on several factors and varies seasonally. A “water balance” is a common, accepted method used to describe when the conditions allow groundwater and surface water replenishment and to evaluate the amount of withdrawal that can be sustained. The primary factors included in a water balance are precipitation, temperature, vegetation, evaporation, transpiration, soil type, and slope.

Groundwater recharge (replenishment) occurs when the amount of precipitation exceeds the losses due to evapotranspiration (evaporation and transpiration by plants) and water retained by soil moisture. Typically, losses due to evapotranspiration are large in the growing season and consequently, less groundwater recharge occurs during this time. Groundwater also is recharged by losses from streams, lakes, and rivers, either naturally (in influent stream conditions) or induced by pumping. The amount of groundwater available from a well and the associated aquifer is typically determined by performing a pumping test to determine the safe yield, which is the amount of groundwater that can be withdrawn for an extended period without depleting the aquifer. Non-continuous withdrawal provides opportunities for water resources to recover during periods of non-pumping.

Surface water replenishment occurs directly from precipitation, from surface runoff, and by groundwater discharge to surface water bodies. Surface runoff occurs when the amount of precipitation exceeds infiltration and evapotranspiration rates. Surface water runoff typically is greater during the non-growing season when there is little or no evapotranspiration, or where soil permeability is relatively low.

Short-term variations in precipitation may result in droughts and floods which affect the amount of water available for groundwater and surface water replenishment. Droughts of significant duration reduce the amount of surface water and groundwater available for withdrawal. Periods of drought may result in reduced stream flow, lowered lake levels, and reduced groundwater levels until normal precipitation patterns return.

Floods may occur from short or long periods of above-normal precipitation and rapid snow melt. Flooding results in increased flow in streams and rivers and may increase levels in lakes and reservoirs. Periods of above-normal precipitation that may cause flooding also may result in

increased groundwater levels and greater availability of groundwater. The duration of floods typically is relatively short compared to periods of drought.

The SRBC and DRBC have established evaluation processes and mitigation measures to ensure adequate replenishment of water resources. The evaluation processes for proposed withdrawals address recharge potential and low-flow conditions. Examples of the mitigation measures utilized by the SRBC include:

- Replacement – release of storage or use of a temporary source;
- Discontinue – specific to low-flow periods;
- Conservation releases;
- Payments; and
- Alternatives – proposed by applicant.

Operational conditions and mitigation requirements establish passby criteria and withdrawal limits during low-flow conditions. A passby flow is a prescribed quantity of flow that must be allowed to pass an intake when withdrawal is occurring. Passby requirements also specify low-flow conditions during which no water can be withdrawn.

2.4.9 Floodplains

Floodplains are low-lying lands next to rivers and streams. When left in a natural state, floodplain systems store and dissipate floods without adverse impacts on humans, buildings, roads or other infrastructure. Floodplains can be viewed as a type of natural infrastructure that can provide a safety zone between people and the damaging waters of a flood. Changes to the landscape outside of floodplain boundaries, like urbanization and other increases in the area of impervious surfaces in a watershed, may increase the size of floodplains. Floodplain information is found on Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) produced by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). These maps are organized on either a county, town, city or

village basis and are available through the FEMA Map Service Center.⁴⁸ They may also be viewed at local government facilities, the Department, and county and regional planning offices.

A floodplain development permit issued by a local government (town, city or village) must be obtained before commencing any floodplain development activity. This permit must comply with a local floodplain development law (often named Flood Damage Prevention Laws), designed to ensure that development will not incur flood damages or cause additional off-site flood damages. These local laws, which qualify communities for participation in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), require that any development in mapped, flood hazard areas be built to certain standards, identified in the NFIP regulations (44 CFR 60.3) and the Building Code of New York State and the Residential Code of New York State. Floodplain development is defined to mean any man-made change to improved or unimproved real estate, including but not limited to buildings or other structures (including gas and liquid storage tanks), mining, dredging, filling, paving, excavation or drilling operations, or storage of equipment or materials. Virtually all communities in New York with identified flood hazard areas participate in the NFIP.

The area that would be inundated by a 100-year flood (also thought of as an area that has a one percent or greater chance of experiencing a flood in any single year) is designated as a Special Flood Hazard Area. The 100-year flood is also known as the *base flood*, and the elevation that the base flood reaches is known as the base flood elevation (BFE). The BFE is the basic standard for floodplain development, used to determine the required elevation of the lowest floor of any new or substantially improved structure. For streams where detailed hydraulic studies have identified the BFE, the 100-year floodplain has been divided into two zones, the floodway and the floodway fringe. The floodway is that area that must be kept open to convey flood waters downstream. The floodway fringe is that area that can be developed in accordance with FEMA standards as adopted in local law. The floodway is shown either on the community's FIRM or on a separate "Flood Boundary and Floodway" map or maps published before about 1988. Flood Damage Prevention Laws differentiate between more hazardous floodways and other areas inundated by flood water. In particular for floodways, no encroachment can be permitted unless

⁴⁸ <http://msc.fema.gov>.

there is an engineering analysis that proves that the proposed development does not increase the BFE by any measurable amount at any location.

Each participating community in the State has a designated floodplain administrator. This is usually the building inspector or code enforcement official. If development is being considered for a flood hazard area, then the local floodplain administrator reviews the development to ensure that construction standards have been met before issuing a floodplain development permit.

2.4.9.1 Analysis of Recent Flood Events⁴⁹

The Susquehanna and Delaware River Basins in New York are vulnerable to frequent, localized flash floods every year. These flash floods usually affect the small tributaries and can occur with little advance warning. Larger floods in some of the main stem reaches of these same river-basins also have been occurring more frequently. For example, the Delaware River in Delaware and Sullivan Counties experienced major flooding along the main stem and in its tributaries during more than one event from September 2004 through June 2006 (Schopp and Firda, 2008). Significant flooding also occurred along the Susquehanna River during this same time period.

The increased frequency and magnitude of flooding has raised a concern for unconventional gas drilling in the floodplains of these rivers and tributaries, and the recent flooding has identified concerns regarding the reliability of the existing FEMA FIRMs that depict areas that are prone to flooding with a defined probability or recurrence interval. The concern focused on the Susquehanna and Delaware Rivers and associated tributaries in Steuben, Chemung, Tioga, Broome, Chenango, Otsego, Delaware and Sullivan Counties, New York.

2.4.9.2 Flood Zone Mapping⁵⁰

Flood zones are geographic areas that FEMA has defined according to varying levels of flood risk. These zones are depicted on a community's FIRM. Each zone reflects the severity or type of flooding in the area and the level of detailed analysis used to evaluate the flood zone.

⁴⁹ Alpha, 2009, p. 3-30.

⁵⁰ Alpha, 2009, p. 3-30.

Appendix 1 Alpha's Table 3.4 – FIRM Maps summarizes the availability of FIRMs for New York State as of July 23, 2009 (FEMA, 2009a). FIRMs are available for all communities in Broome, Delaware, and Sullivan Counties. The effective date of each FIRM is included in Appendix 1. As shown, many of the communities in New York use FIRMs with effective dates prior to the recent flood events. Natural and anthropogenic changes in stream morphology (e.g., channelization) and land use/land cover (e.g., deforestation due to fires or development) can affect the frequency and extent of flooding. For these reasons, FIRMs are updated periodically to reflect current information. Updating FIRMs and incorporation of recent flood data can take two to three years (FEMA, 2009b).

While the FIRMs are legal documents that depict flood-prone areas, the most up-to-date information on extent of recent flooding is most likely found at local or county-wide planning or emergency response departments (DRBC, 2009). Many of the areas within the Delaware and Susquehanna River Basins that were affected by the recent flooding of 2004 and 2006 lie outside the flood zones noted on the FIRMs (SRBC, 2009; DRBC, 2009; Delaware County 2009). Flood damage that occurs outside the flood zones often is related to inadequate maintenance or sizing of storm drain systems and is unrelated to streams. Mapping the areas affected by recent flooding in the Susquehanna River Basin currently is underway and is scheduled to be published in late 2012 (SRBC, 2011). Updated FIRMs are being prepared for communities in Delaware County affected by recent flooding and are expected to be released in late 2012 (Delaware County, 2011).

According to the DOW, preliminary county-wide FIRMs have been completed and adopted by Sullivan County. County-wide FIRMs for Broome and Delaware Counties are scheduled to be completed in late 2012.

2.4.9.3 Seasonal Analysis⁵¹

The historic and recent flooding events do not show a seasonal trend. Flooding in Delaware County, which resulted in Presidential declarations of disaster and emergency between 1996 and 2006, occurred during the following months: January 1996, November 1996, July 1998, August 2003, October 2004, August 2004 and April 2005 (Tetra Tech, 2005). The Delaware River and many of its tributaries in Delaware and Sullivan Counties experienced major flooding that caused

⁵¹ Alpha, 2009, p. 3-31.

extensive damage from September 2004 to June 2006 (Schopp and Firda, 2008). These data show that flooding is not limited to any particular season and may occur at any time during the year.

2.4.10 Freshwater Wetlands

Freshwater wetlands are lands and submerged lands, commonly called marshes, swamps, sloughs, bogs, and flats, supporting aquatic or semi-aquatic vegetation. These ecological areas are valuable resources, necessary for flood control, surface and groundwater protection, wildlife habitat, open space, and water resources. Freshwater wetlands also provide opportunities for recreation, education and research, and aesthetic appreciation. Adjacent areas may share some of these values and, in addition, provide a valuable buffer for the wetlands.

The Department has classified regulated freshwater wetlands according to their respective functions, values and benefits. Wetlands may be Class I, II, III or IV. Class I wetlands are the most valuable and are subject to the most stringent standards.

The Freshwater Wetlands Act (FWA), Article 24 of the ECL, provides the Department and the Adirondack Park Agency (APA) with the authority to regulate freshwater wetlands in the State. The NYS Legislature passed the Freshwater Wetlands Act in 1975 in response to uncontrolled losses of wetlands and problems resulting from those losses, such as increased flooding. The FWA protects wetlands larger than 12.4 acres (5 hectares) in size, and certain smaller wetlands of unusual local importance. In the Adirondack Park, the APA regulates wetlands, including wetlands above one acre in size, or smaller wetlands if they have free interchange of flow with any surface water. The law requires the Department and APA to map those wetlands that are protected by the FWA. In addition, the law requires the Department and APA to classify wetlands. Inside the Adirondack Park, wetlands are classified according to their vegetation cover type. Outside the Park, the Department classifies wetlands according to 6 NYCRR Part 664, Wetlands Mapping and Classification.⁵² Around every regulated wetland is a regulated adjacent area of 100 feet, which serves as a buffer area for the wetland.

FWA's main provisions seek to regulate those uses that would have an adverse impact on wetlands, such as filling or draining. Other activities are specifically exempt from regulation,

⁵² 6 NYCRR 664 - <http://www.dec.ny.gov/regs/4612.html>.

such as cutting firewood, continuing ongoing activities, certain agricultural activities, and most recreational activities like hunting and fishing. In order to obtain an FWA permit, a project must meet the permit standards in 6 NYCRR Part 663, Freshwater Wetlands Permit Requirement Regulations.⁵³ Intended to prevent despoliation and destruction of freshwater wetlands, these regulations were designed to:

- preserve, protect, and enhance the present and potential values of wetlands;
- protect the public health and welfare; and
- be consistent with the reasonable economic and social development of the State.


2.4.11 Socioeconomic Conditions⁵⁴

The Marcellus and Utica Shales are the most prominent shale formations in New York State. The prospective region for the extraction of natural gas from these formations generally extends from Chautauqua County eastward to Greene, Ulster, and Sullivan Counties, and from the Pennsylvania border north to the approximate location of the east-west portion of the New York State Thruway, between Schenectady and Auburn (Figure 2.3). This region covers all or parts of 30 counties. Fourteen counties are entirely within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales, and 16 counties are partially within the area.

Due to the broad extent of the prospective region for the extraction of natural gas from the Marcellus and Utica Shales, the socioeconomic analysis in the SGEIS focuses on representative regional and local areas of New York State where natural gas extraction may occur, and also provides a statewide analysis. The three regions were selected to evaluate differences between areas with a high, moderate and low production potential; areas that have experienced gas development in the past and areas that have not experienced gas development in the past; and differences in land use patterns. The three representative regions and the respective counties within the region are:

⁵³ 6 NYCRR 663 - <http://www.dec.ny.gov/regs/4613.html>.

⁵⁴ Subsection 2.4.11, in its entirety, was provided by Ecology and Environment Engineering, P.C., August 2011 and was adapted by the Department.



Representative Regions

- Region A
- Region B
- Region C

- Tribal Lands Boundary
- Marcellus Shale Extent in New York State
- Utica Shale Extent in New York State
- Extent of Marcellus and Utica Shales in NYS
- Place with Year 2010 Population Greater than 25,000
- Major Water Bodies
- County Boundary
- State Boundary

CDP = Census Designated Place

Figure 2.3: Representative Regions within the Marcellus Shale Extent in New York


Source: ESRI, 2010; USGS, 2002

- Region A: Broome County, Chemung County, and Tioga County (Figure 2.4a);
- Region B: Delaware County, Otsego County, and Sullivan County (Figure 2.4b); and
- Region C: Cattaraugus County and Chautauqua County (Figure 2.4c);

Region A is defined as a high-potential production area. Wells in Broome, Chemung, and Tioga Counties are expected to yield some of the highest production of shale gas, based on the geology, thermal maturity of the organic matter, and other geochemical factors of the Marcellus and Utica Shale formations. Due to the proximity to active gas drilling in these counties, and neighboring counties in Pennsylvania, the associated infrastructure (pipelines) has already been developed. With the associated infrastructure in place, developers are expected to begin development of wells in this area if development in New York State is approved. Region A encompasses urban/suburban land uses associated with the larger cities of Binghamton and Elmira, as well as rural settings. In addition, conventional natural gas development has occurred in this area.

Region B is defined as an average-potential production area. High-volume hydraulic-fracturing is expected to occur in portions of Delaware, Otsego, and Sullivan Counties, but the production of shale gas is not anticipated to reach the levels expected in Region A. Region B is largely rural and encompasses part of the Catskill Mountains. Development in this region would be limited by the exclusion of drilling from the New York City watershed and state-owned lands (e.g., the Forest Preserve) in the Catskill Mountains. To date, only exploratory natural gas well development has occurred in this region.

Region C is defined as a low-potential production area. Although Chautauqua and Cattaraugus Counties are within the footprints of both the Utica and Marcellus Shales, they are outside of the fairways for both shales; thus, horizontal wells in this region would not be expected to yield enough gas to be economically feasible. However, thousands of vertical gas wells exist in conventional formations, and additional vertical wells would likely be constructed. If the price of gas increases or drilling technology advances, gas production in the Utica or other formations in this region may become more feasible. Region C is largely rural, and conventional natural gas development has been occurring in this area for many years.




Pennsylvania



- Representative Region A
- County Boundary
- State Boundary
- Urban Area
- ~ River/Stream
- Highway/Major Road
- Secondary Road

Figure 2.4a: Representative Region A


Source: ESRI, 2010; USGS, 2002



- Representative Region B
- County Boundary
- State Boundary
- Urban Area
- ~ River/Stream
- Highway/Major Road
- Secondary Road

Figure 2.4b: Representative Region B

Source: NESRI, 2010; USGS, 2002



- Representative Region C
- County Boundary
- State Boundary
- Urban Area
- River/Stream
- Highway/Major Road
- Secondary Road
- Tribal Lands Boundary

Figure 2.4c: Representative Region C

Source: NESRI, 2010; USGS, 2002

While these regions are being analyzed as a way to assess the impacts on representative local communities, actual development would not be limited to these regions, and impacts similar to those described in Section 6 could occur anywhere where high-volume hydraulic-fracturing wells are developed. Therefore, this section also provides the socioeconomic baseline for the state as a whole.

A description of the baseline socioeconomic conditions includes Economy, Employment and Income (Subsection 2.4.11.1); Population (Subsection 2.4.11.2); Housing (Subsection 2.4.11.3); Government Revenues and Expenditures (Subsection 2.4.11.4); and Environmental Justice (EJ) (Subsection 2.4.11.5). Socioeconomic impacts are discussed in Chapter 6, and socioeconomic mitigation measures are discussed in Chapter 7.

2.4.11.1 *Economy, Employment, and Income*

This subsection provides a discussion of the economy, employment and income for New York State, and the local areas within each of the three representative regions (Region A, B and C), focusing on the agricultural and tourism industries, as well as existing natural gas development.

Natural gas development is expected to benefit other industries as equipment, material, and supplies are purchased by the natural gas industry and workers spend their wages in the local economy. These positive impacts are discussed in more detail in Section 6. However, as agriculture and tourism relate to uses of the land that may be impacted by natural gas development, those industries are discussed in more detail herein, and potential impacts from both a land use and economic perspective are discussed in Chapter 6.

Several data sources were used to describe the baseline economy, employment, and income for New York State and the local areas, including the U.S. Census Bureau (USCB) and the New York State Department of Labor (NYSDOL). Data from the 2010 Census of Population and Housing were used to identify major employment sectors for the state and the representative regions. Data from the census is self-reported by individuals and is aggregated to provide general information about the labor force from very small to large geographic areas on a cross-sectional or one-time basis.

Detailed data on employment and wages, by industry, was obtained from the NYSDOL's quarterly census of employment and wages (QCEW). The NYSDOL collects employment and wage data for all employers liable for unemployment insurance. These data were used to provide information on wages and for more detailed information on employment in the travel and tourism and oil and gas sectors. All of the labor statistics from the NYSDOL and USCB are based on the North American Industry Classification System, which is the standard system used by government agencies to classify businesses, although the data may be grouped differently for reporting purposes. Data on agricultural workers is taken from the U.S. Census of Agriculture, which is collected every 5 years, and provides information on the value of farm production and agricultural employment in the state and local areas. Although the data referenced within this section were collected by government agencies using different methodologies, all data were used to support an overall portrait of the statewide and local economies.

New York State

Table 2.6 presents total employment by industry within New York State. As shown, New York State has a large and diverse economy. The largest employment sector in the state is educational, health, and social services, accounting for approximately 26.2% of the total employed labor force (USCB 2009a). Other large sectors are professional, scientific, management, administrative, and waste management services (10.8%); and retail trade (10.5%). Several of the largest private employers in New York State include NY Presbyterian Healthcare System (29,000 employees); Walmart (28,000 employees); Citigroup (27,000 employees); IBM Corporation (21,000 employees); and JP Morgan Chase (21,000 employees).

Table 2.6 - New York State: Area Employment by Industry, 2009 (New August 2011)

Sector	Number of Jobs	% of Total
Agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting, and mining	54,900	0.6
Construction	548,018	6.0
Manufacturing	672,481	7.4
Wholesale trade	266,946	2.9
Retail trade	959,414	10.5
Transportation and warehousing, utilities	482,768	5.3
Information	299,378	3.3
Finance, insurance, real estate, and renting/leasing	789,372	8.7
Professional, scientific, management, administrative, and waste management services	981,317	10.8
Educational, health, and social services	2,385,864	26.2
Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation, and food services	764,553	8.4
Other services (except public administration)	449,940	4.9
Public administration	447,645	4.9
Total	9,102,596	

Source: USCB 2009a.

In 2010, New York State had a total gross domestic product (GDP, i.e., the value of the output of goods and services produced by labor and property located in New York State) of approximately \$1.16 trillion (USDOC 2010).

Each region of the state contributes to the state's GDP in different ways. New York City is the leading center of banking, finance, and communications in the United States, and thus has a large number of workers employed in these industrial sectors. In contrast, the economies of large portions of western and central New York are based on agriculture. Manufacturing also plays a significant role in the overall economy of New York State; most manufacturing occurs in the upstate regions, predominantly in the cities of Albany, Buffalo, Rochester, and Syracuse.

Table 2.7 provides total and average wages, by industry, as reported by NYSDOL for 2009.

Table 2.7 - New York State: Wages by Industry, 2009 (New August 2011)

Industry	Total Wages (\$ millions)	Average Wage
Total, all industries	\$481,690.6	\$57,794
Agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting	640.4	\$28,275
Mining	265.5	\$55,819
Construction	19,336.0	\$59,834
Manufacturing	27,098.4	\$57,144
Wholesale trade	22,797.7	\$69,282
Retail trade	25,130.8	\$29,202
Transportation and warehousing	9,302.9	\$42,477
Utilities	3,633.7	\$92,469
Information	22,124.3	\$87,970
Finance and insurance	86,303.4	\$173,899
Real estate and renting/leasing	9,360.2	\$52,417
Professional and technical services	48,815.9	\$87,136
Management of companies and enterprises	15,648.4	\$119,804
Administrative and waste services	16,354.4	\$40,546
Educational services	13,606.9	\$46,772
Health, and social assistance	55,486.7	\$44,104
Arts, entertainment, and recreation	6,154.3	\$44,246
Accommodation, and food services	12,178.7	\$21,369
Other services (except public administration)	10,732.4	\$33,602
Public administration	75,828.4	\$52,594

Source: NYSDOL 2009a.

The total labor force in New York State in 2010 was approximately 9,630,900 workers. In 2010, the annual average unemployment rate across New York State was 8.6% (Table 2.8). Between 2000 and 2010, the size of the labor force increased by 5.1%, while the unemployment rate nearly doubled.

Table 2.8 - New York State: Labor Force Statistics, 2000 and 2010 (New August 2011)

	2000	2010
Total labor force	9,167,000	9,630,900
Employed workers	8,751,400	8,806,800
Unemployed workers	415,500	824,100
Unemployment rate (%)	4.5	8.6

Source: NYSDOL 2010a.

In 2009, the per capita income for New York State was \$30,634, and 13.9% of the population lived below the poverty level (Table 2.9). Over the past decade, per capita income has increased by 31.0%, and the percentage of individuals living below the poverty level has decreased by 0.7%.

Table 2.9 - New York State: Income Statistics, 1999 and 2009 (New August 2011)

	1999	2009
Per capita income	\$23,389	\$30,634
% Below the poverty level ¹	14.6	13.9

Source: USCB 2000a, 2009b.

¹ If the total income for an individual falls below relevant poverty thresholds, updated annually relative to the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers, then the individual is classified as being "below the poverty level."

The Empire State Development Corporation has identified 16 industry clusters for New York State. Industry clusters define a set of interdependent and connected companies and businesses that help to support a local economy, such as automobile manufacturing in Detroit, Michigan, and information technology in the Silicon Valley of California. Industry clusters for the state include: back office and outsourcing; biomedical; communications, software, and media services; distribution; electronics and imaging; fashion, apparel, and textiles; financial services; food processing; forest products; front office and producer services; industrial machinery and services; information technology services; materials processing; miscellaneous manufacturing; transportation equipment; and travel and tourism.

Travel and tourism is a large industry in New York State, ranking third in employment of the 16 industry clusters in the state. New York State has many notable attractions, including natural areas (Niagara Falls, the Finger Lakes, and the Adirondack, Catskill, and Allegany Mountains); cultural attractions (museums, arts, theater), and historic sites, many of which are described in Section 2.4.12, Visual Resources. The travel and tourism sector draws from several industries, as shown in Table 2.10 and Table 2.11. Approximately 351,130 persons were employed in the travel and tourism sector in New York State in 2009, including food service (96,990 jobs); culture, recreation, and amusements (84,550 jobs); accommodations (81,780 jobs); passenger transportation (73,180 jobs); and travel retail (14,630) (see Table 2.10). In 2009, wages earned by persons employed in the travel and tourism sector was approximately \$12.9 billion dollars, or approximately 2.7% of all wages earned in New York State (NYSDOL 2009b) (see Table 2.11).

In 2009, visitors to New York State spent approximately \$4.5 billion in the state (Tourism Economics 2010).

Table 2.10 - New York State: Employment in Travel and Tourism, 2009 (New August 2011)

Industry Group	Number of Jobs	% of Total
Accommodations	81,780	23.3%
Culture, recreation and amusements	84,550	24.1%
Food service	96,990	27.6%
Passenger transportation	73,180	20.8%
Travel retail	14,630	4.2%
Total	351,130	100%

Source: NYSDOL 2009b.

Table 2.11 - New York State: Wages in Travel and Tourism, 2009 (New August 2011)

	Total Wages (\$ millions)	Average Wage
Accommodations	\$2,928.3	\$35,800
Culture, recreation and amusements	\$4,355.5	\$51,500
Food service	\$1,840.9	\$18,980
Passenger transportation	\$3,478.4	\$47,532
Travel retail	\$324.1	\$22,153
Total	\$12,927.3	\$36,800

Source: NYSDOL 2009b.

Agriculture is also an important industry for New York State. Table 2.12 provides agricultural statistics for New York State. Approximately 36,352 farms are located in New York State, encompassing 7.2 million acres of land, or 23% of the total land area of the state.

The value of agricultural production in 2009 was \$4.4 billion dollars. New York State is a leading producer of milk, fruits (apples, grapes, cherries, pears), and fresh vegetables (sweet corn, onions, and cabbage). Most of the state's field crops (corn, soybeans, and wheat) support its dairy industry (USDA 2007).

Most counties in New York State have placed agricultural land in state-certified agricultural districts, which are managed by the New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets. Farmlands within agricultural districts are provided legal protection, and farmers benefit from preferential real property tax assessment and protection from restrictive local laws, government-funded acquisition or construction projects, and private nuisance suits involving agricultural

practices. Article 25-AA of Agriculture and Markets Law authorizes the creation of local agricultural districts pursuant to landowner initiative, preliminary county review, state certification, and county adoption.

The acreage of land in agricultural districts in New York State is provided on Table 2.12.

Table 2.12 - New York State: Agricultural Data, 2007 (New August 2011)

Number of farms	36,352
Land in farms	7,174,743 acres
Average size of farm	197 acres
Market value of products sold	\$4,418.6 million
Principal operator by primary occupation	
Farming	19,624
Other	16,728
Hired farm labor	59,683
Land in state-designated agricultural districts	8,873,157 acres

Source: USDA 2007; NYSDAM 2011.

The oil and gas extraction industry is a relatively small part of the economy of New York State. According to data provided by the U.S. Department of Commerce (USDOC), Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), the oil and gas extraction industry accounted for only 0.004% of New York State's GDP in 2009. For comparison purposes, at the national level, the oil and gas extraction industry's 2009 share of the U.S. GDP was 1.01% (USDOC 2010). Consequently, the oil and gas extraction industry is currently of less relative economic importance in New York State than it is at the national level.

The natural gas extraction industry is linked to other industries in New York State through its purchases of their output of goods and services. As a natural gas extraction company increases the number of wells it drills, it needs additional supplies and materials (e.g., concrete) from other industries to complete the wells. The other industries, in turn, need additional goods and services from their suppliers to meet the additional demand. The interrelations between various industries are known as linkages in the economy.

To provide a sense of the direction and magnitude of the linkages for the oil and gas extraction industry, Table 2.13 shows the impact of a \$1 million increase in the final demand in the oil and gas extraction industry on the value of the output of other industries in New York State. The data

used to construct the table were drawn from the estimates contained in the BEA's Regional Input-Output Modeling System II (RIMS II). In constructing the table, the initial \$1 million increase in the final demand for the output of the oil and gas extraction industry was deducted from the change in its output value to leave just the increase in its output value caused by its purchases of goods and services from other companies in the mining industry, of which it forms a part.

Table 2.13 - New York: Impact of a \$1 Million Dollar Increase in the Final Demand in the Output of the Oil and Gas Extraction Industry on the Value of the Output of Other Industries (New August 2011)

Industry	Change in the Value of Output
Real estate and rental and leasing	\$47,100
Professional, scientific, and technical services	\$30,500
Management of companies and enterprises	\$27,600
Construction	\$24,300
Manufacturing	\$21,000
Finance and insurance	\$15,700
Utilities	\$12,300
Wholesale trade	\$10,800
Information	\$7,700
Administrative and waste management services	\$5,900
Transportation and warehousing	\$3,900
Retail trade	\$3,100
Other services	\$2,600
Arts, entertainment, and recreation	\$1,600
Mining	\$1,500
Food services and drinking places	\$700
Accommodation	\$600
Health care and social assistance	\$300
Educational services	\$200

Source: US Bureau of Economic Analysis 2011.

As shown in the table above, the oil and gas extraction industry is linked through its purchases of inputs to 18 other major industries (out of a total of 20 industries used by the Regional Input-Output Modeling System II). The largest linkages are to real estate and rental and leasing; professional, scientific, and technical services; management of companies and enterprises; and construction. In total, a \$1 million increase in the final demand for the output of the mining industry is estimated to lead to an increase of an additional \$217,400 in final output across all industries.

The oil and gas extraction industry accounts for a very small proportion of total employment in New York State. According to the NYSDOL, the oil and gas extraction industry employed 362 people in the state (i.e., less than 0.01% of the state's total employment) (NYSDOL 2009a). Although the number of people employed in the oil and gas extraction industry in New York State is relatively small, the industry has experienced sustained growth in employment during the last few years. Employment in the oil and gas extraction industry in New York State between 2000 and 2010 is shown on Table 2.14. As shown, employment in the industry more than doubled from 2003 to 2010, with the addition of 252 employees during that period.

Table 2.14 - New York State: Employment in the Oil and Gas Extraction Industry, 2000-2010 (New August 2011)

Year	Employment
2000	165
2001	188
2002	193
2003	196
2004	137
2005	163
2006	236
2007	281
2008	341
2009	362
2010	448

Source: NYSDOL 2000 -2008, 2009a, 2010b.

Note: 2010 data are provisional.

A general indication of the types of jobs held by those working in the natural gas extraction industry is provided by looking at the occupational distribution of employment within the oil and gas extraction industry at the national level. Table 2.15 presents employment data on the 20 occupations that accounted for the largest shares of employment in the oil and gas extraction industry at the national level in 2008 (BLS 2011).

Table 2.15 - Most Common Occupations in the U.S. Oil and Gas Extraction Industry, 2008 (New August 2011)

Occupation	% of Industry Employment
Roustabouts, oil and gas	7.45
Petroleum pump system operators, refinery operators, and gaugers	6.07
Petroleum engineers	5.43
Wellhead pumpers	5.41
Accountants and auditors	4.88
General and operations managers	4.18
Geoscientists, except hydrologists and geographers	3.88
Geological and petroleum technicians	3.27
Office clerks, general	3.03
Bookkeeping, accounting, and auditing clerks	2.93
Executive secretaries and administrative assistants	2.77
Secretaries, except legal, medical, and executive	2.49
Service unit operators, oil, gas, and mining	2.50
First-line supervisors/managers of construction trades and extraction workers	2.27
All other engineers	1.74
Business operation specialists, all others	1.72
Financial analysts	1.56
Maintenance and repair workers, general	1.43
Real estate sales agents	1.35
Rotary drill operators, oil and gas	1.33

Source: BLS 2011.

The oil and gas extraction industry is a relatively high-wage industry. In 2009, the average annual wage paid to employees in the industry was \$83,606, which is almost 45% above the average annual wages of \$57,794 paid to employees across all industries in the state (NYSDOL 2009a). However, national data show that workers in the mining, quarrying, and oil and gas extraction industry have the longest work week among all of the nonagricultural industries. The average work week for all workers aged over 16 in the nonagricultural industries was 38.1 hours long, while the average work week for those in the mining, quarrying, and oil and gas extraction industry was 49.4 hours long (i.e., an almost 30% longer average work week) (BLS 2010).

Table 2.16 presents total and average wages for the oil and gas industry and all industries in New York State. The oil and gas industry was a marginal contributor to total wages in New York State, accounting for \$30 million in 2009, or less than 1/100th of a percentage point of total wages across all industries (NYSDOL 2009a).

Table 2.16 - New York State: Wages in the Oil and Gas Industry, 2009 (New August 2011)

	Total Wages (\$ million)	Average Wage
Oil and gas industry	\$30.3	\$83,606
Total, all industries	\$481,690.6	\$57,794

Source: NYSDOL 2009a.

Compared to other parts of the country, New York State currently is a relatively minor natural gas producer. Based on data on natural gas gross withdrawals and production published by the Energy Information Administration (EIA), New York State accounted for 0.2% of the United States' total marketed natural gas production in 2009. During the same period, New York ranked 23rd out of 34 gas-producing areas in the U.S., which included states and the federal Offshore Gulf of Mexico (EIA 2011).

New York State is, however, a major natural gas consumer. Based on data on natural gas consumption by end-use published by the EIA, New York State accounted for 5% of the United States' total consumption of natural gas in 2009. During the same period, New York State was ranked as the 4th largest natural gas consumer among the nation's states (EIA 2011).

By combining the EIA's data on the total consumption and marketed production of natural gas in 2009, there was a difference of approximately 1.1 Tcf between New York State's total consumption and marketed production of natural gas. In 2009, New York State's marketed production was equal to 3.9% of its total consumption.

Table 2.17 shows natural gas production in New York State between 1985 and 2009.

Table 2.17 - New York State: Natural Gas Production, 1985-2009 (New August 2011)

Year	Natural Gas Production (Bcf)
1985	33.1
1986	34.8
1987	29.5
1988	28.1
1989	25.7
1990	25.1
1991	23.4
1992	23.6
1993	22.1
1994	20.5
1995	18.7
1996	18.3
1997	16.2
1998	16.7
1999	16.1
2000	17.7
2001	28.0
2002	36.8
2003	36.0
2004	46.9
2005	55.2
2006	55.3
2007	54.9
2008	50.3
2009	44.9

Source: NYSDEC 1994-2009.

As shown in the table, natural gas production in New York State generally declined between 1986 and 1999, increased steeply until 2005, and then declined toward the end of that decade.

Other indicators of the level of activity in the natural gas extraction industry in New York State are the number of well permits granted, the number of wells completed, and the number of active wells in each year. Table 2.18 shows the number of permits granted for gas wells, the number of gas wells completed, and the number of active gas wells in New York State between 1994 and 2009.

Table 2.18 - Permits Issued, Wells Completed, and Active Wells, NYS Gas Wells, 1994-2009 (New August 2011)

Year	Permits for Gas Wells	Gas Wells Completed	Active Gas Wells
1994	58	97	6,019
1995	38	31	6,216
1996	45	31	5,869
1997	53	22	5,741
1998	68	41	5,903
1999	74	28	5,756
2000	78	112	5,775
2001	127	103	5,949
2002	97	43	5,773
2003	81	31	5,906
2004	133	70	6,076
2005	180	104	5,957
2006	353	191	6,213
2007	386	271	6,683
2008	429	270	6,675
2009	246	134	6,628

Source: NYSDEC 1994-2009.

As with natural gas production, well permits and completions experienced a considerable increase in the 2000s compared to the 1990s, before declining in the late 2000s. This trend most likely reflects the discovery and development of commercial natural gas reserves in the Black River formation in the southern Finger Lakes area along with the impact of higher natural gas prices in the 2000s compared to the 1990s (see Table 2.19). As shown in Table 2.18, active natural gas wells reached a low point in 1997 when only 5,741 wells were active. By 2007, this figure had reached a peak of 6,683 wells.

The level of activity in the natural gas extraction industry is related to the price of natural gas. Table 2.19 shows the average wellhead price for New York State's natural gas for the years 1994 to 2009 inclusive.

Table 2.19 - Average Wellhead Price for New York State's Natural Gas, 1994-2009 (New August 2011)

Year	Price per Mcf
1994	\$2.35
1995	\$2.30
1996	\$2.21
1997	\$2.56
1998	\$2.46
1999	\$2.19
2000	\$3.75
2001	\$4.85
2002	\$3.03
2003	\$5.78
2004	\$6.98
2005	\$7.78
2006	\$7.13
2007	\$8.85
2008	\$8.94
2009	\$4.25

Source: NYSDEC 1994-2009.

As shown in the table, the average wellhead price for natural gas remained at relatively low levels in the 1990s, generally increased thereafter, reaching a peak in 2008, and then fell sharply in 2009.

Table 2.20 shows the market value of New York State's natural gas production, which is the price multiplied by the total production.

Table 2.20 - Market Value of New York State's Natural Gas Production, 1994-2009 (New August 2011)

Year	Millions of Dollars
1994	\$48.1
1995	\$43.0
1996	\$40.6
1997	\$41.5
1998	\$41.1
1999	\$34.7
2000	\$66.4
2001	\$135.5
2002	\$111.7
2003	\$207.4
2004	\$327.7
2005	\$429.5
2006	\$394.6
2007	\$486.0
2008	\$450.0
2009	\$188.8

Source: NYSDEC 1994-2009.

The combination of generally rising natural gas production and increasing average wellhead prices for much of the 2000s resulted in a substantial increase in the market value of New York State's natural gas production in the 2000s compared to the 1990s. The peak value of \$486 million in 2007 was approximately 12 times larger than the average value for the years 1994 to 1999 inclusive (i.e., \$41.51 million). However, between 2008 and 2009 the combination of a 10.7% decline in natural gas production and a 52.5% decline in the average wellhead price of natural gas resulted in a 58% decline in the market value of New York State's natural gas production.

Region A

Table 2.21 presents employment, by industry, within Tioga, Broome, and Chemung Counties, and for Region A. The largest employment sector in Region A is the educational, health, and social services sector, with approximately 28.7% of total employment in Region A (USCB 2009a). Manufacturing was the next largest employment sector, accounting for approximately 14.6% of total employment within the region. The economic center for Broome and Tioga Counties is the tri-city area of Binghamton, Endicott, and Johnson City, within the Binghamton Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). For Chemung County, the economic center is the city of Elmira.

Table 2.21 - Region A: Area Employment by Industry, 2009 (New August 2011)

Sector	Region A		Broome County		Chemung County		Tioga County	
	Number of Jobs	% of Total	Number of Jobs	% of Total	Number of Jobs	% of Total	Number of Jobs	% of Total
Agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting, and mining	1,464	1.0	558	0.6	335	0.9	571	2.3
Construction	8,572	5.6	4,846	5.3	2,054	5.4	1,672	6.8
Manufacturing	22,522	14.6	11,957	13.1	6,030	15.8	4,535	18.5
Wholesale trade	4,749	3.1	3,123	3.4	959	2.5	667	2.7
Retail trade	18,358	11.9	10,721	11.8	4,599	12.1	3,038	12.4
Transportation and warehousing, utilities	5,808	3.8	3,840	4.2	1,228	3.2	740	3.0
Information	3,096	2.0	2,016	2.2	706	1.9	374	1.5
Finance, insurance, real estate, and renting/leasing	7,554	4.9	5,022	5.5	1,719	4.5	813	3.3
Professional, scientific, management, administrative, and waste management services	11,847	7.7	7,140	7.8	2,575	6.8	2,132	8.7

Sector	Region A		Broome County		Chemung County		Tioga County	
	Number of Jobs	% of Total	Number of Jobs	% of Total	Number of Jobs	% of Total	Number of Jobs	% of Total
Educational, health, and social services	44,084	28.7	26,764	29.3	10,869	28.5	6,451	26.4
Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation, and food services	11,723	7.6	7,198	7.9	2,928	7.7	1,597	6.5
Other services (except public administration)	6,620	4.3	3,898	4.3	1,786	4.7	936	3.8
Public administration	7,435	4.8	4,154	4.6	2,348	6.2	933	3.8
Total	153,832		91,237		38,136		24,459	

Source: USCB 2009a.

Table 2.22 presents total and average wages across all industries for Region A. The average wages for persons employed across all industries in Region A was \$37,875 in 2009.

Table 2.22 - Region A: Wages by Industry, 2009 (New August 2011)

	2009	
	Total Wages (\$ millions)	Average Wages
Region A		
Total, all industries	\$5,435.03	\$37,875
Broome County		
Total, all industries	\$3,390.12	\$36,802
Chemung County		
Total, all industries	\$1,379.61	\$36,979
Tioga County		
Total, all industries	\$665.30	\$47,268

Source: NYSDOL 2009a, 2010b.

The total labor force for Region A is approximately 162,000 workers, of which 60% are in Broome County, 25% are in Chemung County, and 15% are in Tioga County. The annual average unemployment rate in Region A in 2010 was consistent with the overall state average unemployment rate of approximately 8.6% (Table 2.23). The rate of unemployment was slightly higher in Broome County than in Chemung or Tioga Counties. Overall, the size of the labor force has declined between 2000 and 2010 across the region, while the unemployment rate has generally doubled.

Table 2.23 - Region A: Labor Force Statistics, 2000 and 2010 (New August 2011)

	2000	2010
Region A		
Total labor force	167,700	162,000
Employed workers	161,400	148,000
Unemployed workers	6,300	14,000
Unemployment rate (%)	3.8	8.6
Broome County		
Total labor force	98,300	95,700
Employed workers	94,800	87,200
Unemployed workers	3,600	8,500
Unemployment rate (%)	3.6	8.9
Chemung County		
Total labor force	42,800	40,700
Employed workers	41,000	37,300
Unemployed workers	1,800	3,400
Unemployment rate (%)	4.3	8.4
Tioga County		
Total labor force	26,600	25,600
Employed workers	25,600	23,500
Unemployed workers	900	2,100
Unemployment rate (%)	3.4	8.2

Source: NYSDOL 2010a.

Table 2.24 presents per capita income for Region A. Per capita income rose approximately 26.8% between 1999 and 2009. The percentage of individuals living below the poverty level in Region A increased from 12.2% in 1999 to 14.4% in 2009. During the same period, individuals living below the poverty level in New York State as a whole decreased from 14.6% to 13.9% (USCB 2000a, 2009b).

Table 2.24 - Region A: Income Statistics, 1999 and 2009 (New August 2011)

	1999	2009
Region A		
Per capita income	\$18,854	\$23,912
% Below the poverty level ¹	12.2	14.4
Broome County		
Per capita income	\$19,168	\$24,432
% Below the poverty level ¹	12.8	15.0
Chemung County		
Per capita income	\$18,264	\$22,691
% Below the poverty level ¹	13.0	15.8
Tioga County		
Per capita income	\$18,673	\$24,034
% Below the poverty level ¹	8.4	10.0

Source: USCB 2000a, 2009b.

¹ If the total income for an individual falls below relevant poverty thresholds, updated annually relative to the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers, then the individual is classified as being "below the poverty level."

The five largest employers in the Binghamton MSA, which includes Broome and Tioga Counties are United Health Services, (3,300 employees); Lockheed Martin, (3,000 employees); Broome County (2,500 employees); the State University of New York Binghamton University (2,300 employees); and Lourdes Hospital (2,300 employees) (BCIDA 2010). The largest employer in Chemung County is St. Joseph's Hospital (1,000-1,200 employees) (STC Planning 2009).

The Empire State Development Corporation has identified 16 industry clusters for the Southern Tier Region of the state, which encompasses Region A (Broome, Chemung, and Tioga Counties) as well as Chenango, Delaware, Schuyler, Steuben, and Tompkins Counties. The industry clusters that support the largest number of jobs are industrial machinery and services, travel and tourism, financial services, front office and producer services, and electronics and imaging.

Travel and tourism is a large industry for the Southern Tier Region (which includes Region A), ranking second in employment of the 16 industry clusters in the Southern Tier Region. Broome and Tioga Counties are part of the Susquehanna Heritage Area, and Chemung County considers itself the gateway to the Finger Lakes Region. Various attractions and natural areas are described in more detail in Section 2.4.11, Visual Resources, and Section 2.4.14, Community Character. The travel and tourism industry employs approximately 4,590 persons throughout Region A (NYSDOL 2009b), primarily in food service (2,000 workers) and accommodations (1,190 workers) (Table 2.25). In 2009, wages earned by persons employed in the travel and tourism sector were approximately \$78.6 million, or about 1.5% of all wages earned in Region A (NYSDOL 2009b) (Table 2.26).

Table 2.25 - Region A: Employment in Travel and Tourism, 2009 (New August 2011)

Industry Group	Region A		Broome County		Chemung County		Tioga County	
	Number of Jobs	% of Total	Number of Jobs	% of Total	Number of Jobs	% of Total	Number of Jobs	% of Total
Accommodations	1,190	25.9	830	27.8	210	18.3	150	33.3
Culture, recreation, and amusements	530	11.5	320	10.7	100	8.7	110	24.4
Food service	2,000	43.6	1,340	44.8	530	46.1	130	28.9
Passenger transportation	540	11.8	330	11.0	210	18.3	0	-
Travel retail	330	7.2	170	5.7	100	8.7	60	13.3
Total	4,590		2,990		1,150		450	

Source: NYSDOL 2009b.

Table 2.26 - Region A: Wages in Travel and Tourism, 2009 (New August 2011)

	2009	
	Total Wages (millions)	Average Wages
Region A	\$78.6	\$17,100
Broome County	\$50.3	\$16,800
Chemung County	\$20.9	\$18,100
Tioga County	\$7.4	\$16,100

Source: NYSDOL 2009b.

Agriculture is also an important industry within Region A. Table 2.27 provides agricultural statistics for Broome, Chemung, and Tioga Counties. Approximately 1,518 farms are located in Region A, encompassing 258,571 acres of land. The value of agricultural production in 2009 was \$83.2 million dollars (USDA 2007). The principal source of farm income is dairy products, which account for 70% of the agricultural sales in Broome County, and 75% of the sales in Tioga County (USDA 2007).

Table 2.27 - Region A: Agricultural Data, 2007 (New August 2011)

	Region A	Broome County	Chemung County	Tioga County
Number of farms	1,518	580	373	565
Land in farms (acres)	258,571	86,613	65,124	106,834
Average size of farm (acres)	170	149	175	189
Market value of Products Sold (\$ millions)	83.2	29.9	16.6	36.7
Principal operator by primary occupation				
Farming	681	252	183	246
Other	837	328	190	319
Hired farm labor	971	340	238	393
Land in state-designated agricultural districts	278,935	153,233	41,966	83,736

Source: USDA 2007; NYSDAM 2011.


Approximately 125 persons are employed in the oil and gas industry in Region A, or about 34.5% of persons working in the oil and gas industry in New York State (NYSDOL 2009a, 2010b). Workers are primarily employed in Chemung County, as the data on oil and gas industry employment in Broome and Tioga Counties is so low as to not be reported due to business confidentiality reasons.

The oil and gas industry was a marginal contributor to total wages in Region A in 2009. Total wages for persons employed in the oil and gas industry in Chemung County were \$12.5 million, or about 0.2% of total wages across all industries (NYSDOL 2009a, 2010b). The average annual wage for workers employed in the oil and gas sector in Chemung County was \$99,600 in 2009.

In the 1990s, Region A was a minor contributor to New York State's natural gas production. However, starting in 2001, Region A experienced a substantial increase in its gas production, reaching a peak in 2006 before declining in each of the following three years (Figure 2.5).

Table 2.28 shows the number of active natural gas wells operating in Region A from 1994 to 2009. As shown on the table, the number of active wells in Region A has been steadily increasing since 1995.

Figure 2.5 - Region A: Natural Gas Production, 1994 to 2009 (New August 2011)



Source: NYSDEC 1994-2009.

Table 2.28 - Region A: Number of Active Natural Gas Wells, 1994-2009 (New August 2011)

Year	No. of Gas Wells
1994	15
1995	12
1996	15
1997	16
1998	17
1999	20
2000	19
2001	25
2002	29
2003	30
2004	36
2005	38
2006	37
2007	40
2008	41
2009	46

Source: NYSDEC 1994-2009.

In 2009, the average annual output per well in Region A was 317.9 MMcf of natural gas. The average production per well in Region A was greater (by a factor of 47) than the statewide average of 6.8 MMcf (NYSDEC 2009).

Table 2.29 shows the production of natural gas and the number of active wells, by town, within each county in Region A for 2009. As shown in the table, Chemung County accounted for nearly all of the natural gas production and active wells in Region A. There were no active natural gas wells in Broome County in 2009.

Table 2.29 – Natural Gas Production and Active Wells by Town within each County in Region A, 2009 (New August 2011)

Location	Natural Gas Production (Mcf)	Number of Active Gas Wells
Region A	14,623,232	46
Chemung County	13,890,161	45
Baldwin	327,738	1
Big Flats	2,095,184	4
Catlin	1,441,322	9
Elmira City	2,685	1
Erin	4,037,072	6
Horseheads	4,910	0
Southport	1,752,131	5
Van Etten	3,048,850	12
Veteran	1,180,269	7
Tioga County	733,071	1
Spencer	733,071	1

Source: NYSDEC 2009.

Region B

Table 2.30 presents employment, by industry, within Sullivan, Delaware, and Otsego Counties (Region B). The largest employment sectors are educational, health, and social services (30.1% of workers); retail trade (11.6%) arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation, and food services (10.1%). This region also has a comparatively high number of employment in the agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting, and mining sector (2.9%), particularly Delaware County (5.2%), compared to New York State as a whole (0.6%) (USCB 2009a).

Table 2.30 - Region B: Area Employment, by Industry, 2009 (New August 2011)

Industry Sector	Region B		Sullivan County		Delaware County		Otsego County	
	Number of Jobs	% of Total	Number of Jobs	% of Total	Number of Jobs	% of Total	Number of Jobs	% of Total
Agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting, and mining	2,498	2.9	591	1.7	1,102	5.2	805	2.7
Construction	7,276	8.5	3,178	9.2	2,051	9.7	2,047	6.8
Manufacturing	6,442	7.5	1,504	4.4	2,565	12.2	2,373	7.9
Wholesale Trade	2,134	2.5	924	2.7	432	2.0	778	2.6
Retail Trade	9,900	11.6	3,740	10.9	2,362	11.2	3,798	12.6
Transportation and warehousing, utilities	3,626	4.3	1,710	5.0	897	4.2	1,019	3.4
Information	1,493	1.7	696	2.0	323	1.5	474	1.6
Finance, insurance, real estate, and renting/leasing	4,373	5.1	2,034	5.9	737	3.5	1,602	5.3
Professional, scientific, management, administrative, and waste management services	4,618	5.4	2,006	5.8	1,113	5.3	1,499	5.0
Educational, health, and social services	25,788	30.1	10,368	30.1	5,564	26.4	9,856	32.8
Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation, and food services	8,630	10.1	3,494	10.1	1,845	8.7	3,291	11.0
Other services (except public administration)	4,248	5.0	1,818	5.3	1,069	5.1	1,361	4.5
Public administration	4,571	5.3	2,377	6.9	1,051	5.0	1,143	3.8
Total	85,597		34,440		21,111		30,046	

Source: USCB 2009a.

Table 2.31 presents total and average wages across all industries for Region B. The average wages for persons employed across all industries in Region B was \$35,190 in 2009.

Table 2.31 - Region B: Wages, by Industry, 2009 (New August 2011)

	2009	
	Total Wages (millions)	Average Wages
Region B		
Total, all industries	\$2,266.66	\$35,190
Delaware County		
Total, all industries	\$544.78	\$34,655
Chemung County		
Total, all industries	\$830.49	\$35,310
Tioga County		
Total, all industries	\$891.39	\$35,412

Source: NYSDOL 2000ba, 2010b.

The total labor force for Region B is approximately 88,500 workers, of which 40% are in Sullivan County, 35% are in Otsego County, and 25% are in Delaware County. As shown in Table 2.32, the 2010 annual average unemployment rate in Region B was approximately 8.5%, similar to New York State as a whole. Among the counties that comprise Region B, Sullivan County had the highest average unemployment rate, approximately 9.2% (NYSDOL 2010a).

Table 2.32 - Region B: Labor Force Statistics, 2000 and 2010 ((New August 2011))

	2000	2010	Percent Change
Region B			
Total labor force	85,200	88,500	3.9
Employed workers	81,500	81,000	-0.6
Unemployed workers	3,600	7,500	108.3
Unemployment rate	4.2	8.5	102.3
Delaware County			
Total labor force	22,200	22,000	-0.9
Employed workers	21,300	20,100	-5.6
Unemployed workers	900	1,900	111.1
Unemployment rate (%)	4.2	8.7	107.1
Otsego County			
Labor force	29,800	31,500	5.7
Employed workers	28,500	29,100	2.1
Unemployed workers	1,300	2,400	84.6
Unemployment rate (%)	4.2	7.7	83.3
Sullivan County			
Labor force	33,200	35,000	5.4
Employed workers	31,700	31,800	0.3
Unemployed workers	1,400	3,200	128.6
Unemployment rate (%)	4.3	9.2	114.0

Source: NYSDOL 2010a.

Table 2.33 presents per capita income data for Region B. From 1999 to 2009, per capita income across the region increased by 27.9%. Individuals living below the poverty level in Region B increased from 14.9% in 1999 to 15.0% in 2009 (USCB 2000a, 2009b).

Table 2.33 - Region B: Income Statistics, 1999 and 2009 (New August 2011)

	1999	2009
Region B		
Per capita income	\$17,790	\$22,750
% Below the poverty level ¹	14.9	15.0
Delaware County		
Per capita income	\$17,357	\$22,199
% Below the poverty level ¹	12.9	15.1
Otsego County		
Per capita income	\$16,806	\$22,255
% Below the poverty level ¹	14.9	15.2
Sullivan County		
Per capita income	\$18,892	\$23,491
% Below the poverty level ¹	16.3	14.7

Source: U.S. Census 2000a, 2009b.

¹ If the total income for an individual falls below relevant poverty thresholds, updated annually relative to the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers, then the individual is classified as being "below the poverty level."

The five largest employers in Delaware and Otsego Counties are: Bassett Healthcare (3,200+ employees), Amphenol Corporation (1,400 employees), State University of New York College Oneonta (1,181 employees); New York Central Mutual Fire Insurance Company (1,000 employees) and A.O. Fox Hospital (1,000 employees) (Bassett Healthcare 2011; Delaware County Economic Development 2010; Otsego County 2010).

The counties within Region B are part of three economic development regions, as defined by the Empire State Development Corporation, including the Southern Tier Region (Delaware County), Mid-Hudson Region (Sullivan County), and Mohawk Valley Region (Otsego County). Ranked by employment, travel and tourism is the lead employment industry cluster for the Mid-Hudson Region, and the second largest employment industry cluster in the Southern Tier and Mohawk Valley Regions. The tourism industry is an important economic driver in Region B, particularly in Otsego and Sullivan Counties, with the Catskill Mountains, as well as popular destinations such as the Baseball Hall of Fame in the village of Cooperstown (Otsego County) and the Monticello Raceway in the village of Monticello (Sullivan County). Approximately 4,560 persons were employed in the travel and tourism sector in Region B in 2009, including accommodations (1,820 jobs), and culture, recreation, and amusements (960 jobs), food service (930 jobs), passenger transportation (250 jobs), and travel retail (600 jobs) (Table 2.34). In 2009

wages earned by persons employed in the travel and tourism sector was approximately \$72.3 million, or about 3.4% of all wages earned in Region B (NYSDOL 2009b) (Table 2.35).

Table 2.34 - Region B: Travel and Tourism, by Industrial Group, 2009 (New August 2011)

Industry Group	Region B		Delaware County		Otsego County		Sullivan County	
	Number of Jobs	% of Total	Number of Jobs	% of Total	Number of Jobs	% of Total	Number of Jobs	% of Total
Accommodations	1,820	39.9%	150	11.7%	530	35.3%	1,140	64.0%
Culture, recreation, and amusements	960	21.1%	100	7.8%	500	33.3%	360	20.2%
Food service	930	20.4%	360	28.1%	360	24.0%	210	11.8%
Passenger transportation	250	5.5%	150	11.7%	60	4.0%	40	2.2%
Travel retail	600	13.2%	520	40.6%	50	3.3%	30	1.7%
Total	4,560		1,280		1,500		1,780	

Source: NYSDOL 2009b.

Table 2.35 - Region B: Wages in Travel and Tourism, 2009 (New August 2011)

	2009	
	Total Wages (millions)	Average Wage
Region B	\$72.3	\$19,500
Delaware County	\$6.5	\$15,400
Otsego County	\$28.6	\$19,200
Sullivan County	\$37.2	\$20,900

Source: NYSDOL 2009b.

Agriculture also is an important industry within Region B. Table 2.36 provides agricultural statistics for Delaware, Otsego, and Sullivan Counties. Approximately 2,050 farms are located in Region B, encompassing 392,496 acres of land. The value of agricultural production in 2009 was \$148.7 million dollars (USDA 2007). The principal sources of farm income in the region are dairy products (particularly in Otsego and Delaware Counties, where dairy products accounted for 70% and 62% of the agricultural sales in the county, respectively) and poultry and eggs (particularly in Sullivan County, where poultry and eggs accounted for 65% of the sales in the county) (USDA 2007).

Table 2.36 - Region B: Agricultural Data, 2007 (New August 2011)

	Region B	Delaware County	Otsego County	Sullivan County
Number of farms	2,050	747	980	323
Land in farms (acres)	392,496	165,572	176,481	50,443
Average size of farm (acres)	191	222	180	156
Market value of Products Sold (\$ millions)	\$148.7	\$55.1	\$51.4	\$42.1
Principal operator by primary occupation				
Farming	1,139	437	538	164
Other	911	310	442	159
Hired farm labor	1,746	760	574	412
Land in state designated agricultural districts	588,443	237,385	189,291	161,767

Source: USDA 2007; NYSDAM 2011.

Currently, there are no producing natural gas wells in Region B, although some exploratory well activity occurred in 2007 and 2009.

Region C

Table 2.37 presents employment by industry within Chautauqua and Cattaraugus Counties, and for Region C. The largest employment sectors in Region C are education, health, and social services sector (26.7% of total employment), manufacturing (16.5% of total employment), and retail trade (11.6%). The agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting, and mining sector accounted for about 2.9% of total employment in the region, which is relatively high compared to New York State as a whole, which had 0.6% of its workforce employed in this sector (USCB 2009a).

Table 2.37 - Region C: Area Employment by Industry, 2009 (New August 2011)

Sector	Region C		Cattaraugus County		Chautauqua County	
	Number of Jobs	% of Total	Number of Jobs	% of Total	Number of Jobs	% of Total
Agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting, and mining	2,813	2.9	1,136	3.1	1,677	2.8
Construction	6,042	6.2	2,825	7.6	3,217	5.3
Manufacturing	16,194	16.6	5,752	15.5	10,442	17.2
Wholesale trade	2,620	2.3	879	2.4	1,741	2.9
Retail trade	11,392	11.7	4,432	11.9	6,960	11.5
Transportation and warehousing, utilities	4,116	4.2	1,398	3.7	2,718	4.4
Information	1,578	1.6	525	1.4	1,053	1.7
Finance, insurance, real estate, and renting/leasing	3,486	3.6	1,289	3.5	2,197	3.6
Professional, scientific, management, administrative, and waste management services	4,816	4.9	1,898	5.1	2,918	4.8
Educational, health, and social services	26,161	26.8	9,575	25.7	16,586	27.3
Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation, and food services	9,581	9.8	3,893	10.4	5,688	9.4
Other services (except public administration)	4,225	4.3	1,468	3.9	2,757	4.5
Public administration	4,960	5.1	2,150	5.8	2,810	4.6
	97,984		37,220		60,764	

Source: USCB 2009a.

Table 2.38 presents total and average wages across all industries for Region C. The average wages for persons employed across all industries in Region C was \$32,971 in 2009.

Table 2.38 - Region C: Wages, by Industry, 2009 (New August 2011)

	2009	
	Total Wages (millions)	Average Wages
Region C		
Total, all industries	\$2,732.72	\$32,971
Cattaraugus County		
Total, all industries	\$1,046.92	\$34,428
Chautauqua County		
Total, all industries	\$1,685.80	\$32,127

Source: NYSDOL 2009a, 2010b.

The total labor force for Region C is approximately 105,800 workers, of which 61% are in Chautauqua County, and 39% are in Cattaraugus County. As shown in Table 2.39, the 2010 annual average unemployment rate in Region C was approximately 8.9%. The size of the labor force decreased by 3.1% between 2000 and 2010 across the region, and the unemployment rate has generally doubled.

Table 2.39 - Region C: Labor Force Statistics, 2000 and 2010 (New August 2011)

	2000	2010
Region C		
Labor force	109,200	105,800
Employed workers	104,700	96,400
Unemployed workers	4,600	9,400
Unemployment rate (%)	4.2	8.9
Cattaraugus County		
Labor force	41,100	41,200
Employed workers	39,300	37,400
Unemployed workers	1,900	3,800
Unemployment rate (%)	4.5	9.2
Chautauqua County		
Labor force	68,100	64,600
Employed workers	65,400	59,000
Unemployed workers	2,700	5,600
Unemployment rate (%)	4.0	8.7

Source: NYSDOL 2010a.

Table 2.40 presents per capita income data for Region C. Per capita income in Region C rose approximately 26.2% between 1999 and 2009. The number of individuals living below the poverty level in Region C increased from 13.8% in 1999 to 16.1% in 2009.

Table 2.40 - Region C: Income Statistics, 1999 and 2009 (New August 2011)

	1999	2009
Region C		
Per capita income	\$16,509	\$20,830
% Below the poverty level ¹	13.8	16.1
Cattaraugus County		
Per capita income	\$15,959	\$20,508
% Below the poverty level ¹	13.7	15.7
Chautauqua County		
Per capita income	\$16,840	\$21,023
% Below the poverty level ¹	13.8	16.3

Source: U.S. Census 2000a, 2009b.

¹ If the total income for an individual falls below relevant poverty thresholds, updated annually relative to the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers, then the individual is classified as being "below the poverty level."

The five largest employers in Region C are Dresser-Rand Company (3,300 employees); The Resource Center, Chautauqua County (1,748 employees); Chautauqua County (1,366 employees); Cummins Engine, Chautauqua County (1,300 employees); and Cattaraugus County (1,180 employees) (Buffalo Business First 2011).

The Empire State Development Corporation has identified 16 industry clusters for the Western New York Region of the state, which encompasses Cattaraugus and Chautauqua Counties, as well as Erie (City of Buffalo), Niagara (City of Niagara Falls), and Allegany Counties. The industry clusters that support the largest number of jobs are front office and producer services, financial services, travel and tourism, industrial machinery and services, and distribution. Travel and tourism is the third largest industry cluster in terms of employment in the Western New York Region.

Tourism is a significant component of the economy in Region C. Cattaraugus County, known as the Enchanted Mountains Region, boasts abundant recreational opportunities that primarily revolve around its natural resources. Popular tourist destinations include Allegany State Park, the Amish Trail, Holiday Valley Ski Resort, Rock City Park, Griffis Sculpture Park, and the Seneca-Allegany Casino. Chautauqua County is also recognized for its natural resources and unique learning destinations associated with the Chautauqua Institute. Approximately 4,040 persons were employed in the travel and tourism sector in Region C in 2009, including accommodations (1,110 jobs); culture, recreation, and amusements (1,220 jobs); food service (1,210 jobs); passenger transportation (280 jobs); and travel retail (220 jobs) (Table 2.41). In 2009, wages earned by persons employed in the travel and tourism sector were approximately \$77.5 million, or about 3.0% of all wages earned in Region C (NYSDOL 2009b) (Table 2.42).

Table 2.41 - Region C: Travel and Tourism, by Industrial Group, 2009 (New August 2011)

Industry Group	Region C		Cattaraugus County		Chautauqua County	
	Number of Jobs	% of Total	Number of Jobs	% of Total	Number of Jobs	% of Total
Accommodations	1,110	27.5%	180	10.5%	930	40.1%
Culture, Recreation and Amusements	1,220	30.2%	1,050	61.0%	170	7.3%
Food Service	1,210	30.0%	380	22.1%	830	35.8%
Passenger Transportation	280	6.9%	30	1.7%	250	10.8%
Travel Retail	220	5.4%	80	4.7%	140	6.0%
Total	4,040		1,720		2,320	

Source: NYSDOL 2009b.

Table 2.42 - Region C: Wages in Travel and Tourism, 2009 (New August 2011)

	2009	
	Total Wages (millions)	Average Wage
Region C	\$77.5	\$19,200
Cattaraugus County	\$39.7	\$23,300
Chautauqua County	\$37.8	\$16,300

Source: NYSDOL 2009b.

Agriculture is also an important industry within Region C. Table 2.43 provides agricultural statistics for Cattaraugus and Chautauqua Counties. Approximately 2,770 farms are located in Region C, encompassing 419,297 acres of land. The value of agricultural production in 2009 was \$213.7 million dollars (USDA 2007). Dairy products account for approximately 68% of agricultural sales in Cattaraugus County. In Chautauqua County, the principal sources of farm income are grape and dairy products (USDA 2007). Grapes and grape products account for approximately 30% of agricultural sales in Chautauqua County, and dairy products account for approximately 51% of agricultural sales (USDA 2007).

Table 2.43 - Region C: Agricultural Data, 2007 (New August 2011)

	Region C	Cattaraugus County	Chautauqua County
Number of farms	2,770	1,112	1,658
Land in farms (acres)	419,297	183,439	235,858
Average size of farm (acres)	151	163	142
Market value of Products Sold (\$ millions)	\$213.7	\$75.2	\$138.6
Principal operator by primary occupation			
Farming	1,437	550	887
Other	1,343	572	771
Hired farm labor	4,341	994	3,347
Land in state-designated agricultural districts	631,686	239,641	392,045


Source: USDA 2007; NYSDAM 2011.

Approximately 157 persons are employed in the oil and gas industry in Region C, or approximately 43.4% of all persons working in the oil and gas industry in New York State in 2009 (NYSDOL 2009a, 2010b).

The oil and gas industry was a marginal contributor to total wages in Region C in 2009. The total wages for persons employed in the oil and gas industry in the region were \$10.8 million, or about 0.4% of the total wages across all industries (NYSDOL 2009a). The average annual wages for workers employed in the oil and gas sector varied greatly between the counties in Region C. The average annual wage for oil and gas workers in Cattaraugus County was \$44,978 in 2009, whereas the average annual wage for oil and gas workers in Chautauqua County was \$76,970 during the same time period (NYSDOL 2009a).

Natural gas production in Region C is shown on Figure 2.6. In the mid-1990s, Region C produced nearly 12 MMcf of natural gas per year. Production has declined from that level over the last 15 years, and the region is now producing slightly more than 8 MMcf of natural gas per year.

Figure 2.6 - Region C: Natural Gas Production, 1994-2009 (New August 2011)



Source: NYSDEC 1994-2009.

The total number of active natural gas wells in Region C over the period 1994 to 2009 is shown on Table 2.44. As shown in the table, the number of active natural gas wells in Region C has increased by nearly 400 wells since 1994, to a total of 3,917 wells.

Table 2.44 - Number of Active Natural Gas Wells in Region C, 1994-2009 (New August 2011)

Year	No. of Gas Wells
1994	3,523
1995	3,759
1996	3,512
1997	3,427
1998	3,585
1999	3,590
2000	3,545
2001	3,579
2002	3,350
2003	3,470
2004	3,645
2005	3,629
2006	3,740
2007	3,935
2008	3,984
2009	3,917

Source: NYSDEC 1994-2009.

In 2009 the average annual output per well in Region C was only 2.1 MMcf of natural gas. Production per well was significantly less than the average annual output per well in Region A (317.9 MMcf) or the statewide average per well (6.8 MMcf) (NYSDEC 2009). Because of this low productivity per well, Region C is currently a minor contributor to New York State's natural gas production, even though it accounts for the largest number of active wells in the state (NYSDEC 2009).

Table 2.45 shows the production of natural gas and the number of active wells, by town, within each county in Region C in 2009. As shown in the table, in 2009 there were 530 active gas wells in Cattaraugus County and 3,387 active gas wells in Chautauqua County (NYDEC 2009).

Table 2.45 - Natural Gas Production and the Number of Active Gas Wells by Town within each County in Region C, 2009 (New August 2011)

Location	Natural Gas Production (Mcf)	Number of Active Gas Wells
Region C	14,623,232	46
Cattaraugus County	1,615,243	530
Allegany	255,057	6
Ashford	10,416	11
Carrollton	89,633	3
Conewango	154,745	76
Dayton	113,159	59
East Otto	96,897	15
Ellicottville	737	3
Farmersville	214	2
Freedom	3,845	4
Leon	249,247	88
Machias	100	1
Napoli	1,187	2
New Albion	7,220	9
Olean	7,163	5
Otto	69,647	70
Perrysburg	343,006	42
Persia	99,100	43
Randolph	72,434	72
South Valley	892	2
Yorkshire	40,544	17
Chautauqua County	6,473,408	3,387
Arkwright	106,655	122
Busti	321,152	121
Carroll	181,427	70
Charlotte	230,836	127

Location	Natural Gas Production (Mcf)	Number of Active Gas Wells
Chautauqua	469,915	314
Cherry Creek	179,037	123
Clymer	159,828	101
Dunkirk	69,003	36
Dunkirk City	10,169	6
Ellery	180,187	82
Ellicott	204,129	66
Ellington	264,581	180
French Creek	26,003	40
Gerry	437,202	152
Hanover	450,439	152
Harmony	231,897	116
Jamestown	4,183	3
Kiantone	425,027	84
Mina	53,986	71
North Harmony	352,930	159
Poland	554,983	159
Pomfret	189,905	174
Portland	235,705	149
Ripley	185,487	182
Sheridan	142,294	86
Sherman	106,236	84
Stockton	169,836	118
Villanova	141,171	57
Westfield	389,205	253

Source: NYSDEC 2009.

2.4.11.2 Population

The following subsection discusses the past, current and projected population for New York State, and the local areas within each of the three regions (Region A, B and C).

New York State

New York State is the third most populous state in the country, with a 2010 population of approximately 19.38 million (USCB 2010) (see Table 2.46). The population density of the state is 410 persons per square mile. Nearly half of the population in the state is located within NYC (8.1 million persons). Subtracting out the population of NYC, the average population density of the rest of New York State is 237.3 persons per square mile. New York State's population has continually increased during the past 20 years, though the rate of growth was faster from 1990 to 2000 than it was from 2000 to 2010 (see Table 2.46).

Table 2.46 - New York State: Historical and Current Population, 1990, 2000, 2010 (New August 2011)

	Total Population	Percent Change	Average Annual Growth Rate	Average Population Density
2010	19,378,102	2.1%	0.2%	410.4
2000	18,976,457	5.5%	0.5%	401.9
1990	17,990,455	--	--	381.0

Source: USCB 1990a, 2000b, and 2010.

Table 2.47 shows the state's total 2010 population and presents population projections for 2015 to 2030. As shown, the population in New York State is projected to continue to grow through 2030. The state's population is projected to grow at an average annual rate of 0.2% between 2015 and 2030. By 2030, New York State's population is projected to reach 20,415,446 persons.

Table 2.47 - New York State: Projected Population, 2015 to 2030 (New August 2011)

Population 2010^a (actual)	Population 2015^b (projected)	Population 2020^b (projected)	Population 2025^b (projected)	Population 2030^b (projected)	Average Annual Growth Rate 2015-2030
19,378,102	19,876,073	20,112,402	20,299,512	20,415,446	0.2%

Sources:

^a USCB 2010.

^b Cornell University 2009.

Region A

Table 2.48 provides the 1990, 2000 and 2010 population for Region A and for each of the three counties within this region. The population of Region A is 342,390 persons (USCB 2010), with an average population density of 209 persons per square mile. Since 1990, all three counties within Region A have lost population. Between 1990 and 2000, the region lost population at a rate of approximately 0.5% per year, and between 2000 and 2010, the region lost population at a rate of approximately 0.1% per year.

Table 2.48 - Region A: Historical and Current Population, 1990, 2000, 2010 (New August 2011)

Year	1990	2000	2010
Region A			
Total Population	359,692	343,390	340,555
Percent Change	--	-4.5%	-0.8%
Average Annual Growth Rate	--	-0.5%	-0.1%
Average Population Density	220.1	210.2	208.5
Broome County			
Population	212,160	200,536	200,600
Percent Change	--	-5.5%	<0.1%
Average Annual Growth Rate	--	-0.6%	< 0.1%
Average Population Density	300.2	283.7	283.8
Chemung County			
Population	95,195	91,070	88,830
Percent Change	--	-4.3%	-2.5%
Average Annual Growth Rate	--	-0.4%	-0.3%
Average Population Density	233.2	223.1	217.6
Tioga County			
Population	52,337	51,784	51,125
Percent Change	--	-1.1%	-1.3%
Average Annual Growth Rate	--	-0.1%	-0.1%
Average Population Density	100.9	99.8	98.6

Source: USCB 1990a, 2000b, and 2010.

The City of Binghamton has the largest population in the region, with a population in 2010 of 47,376; this is 13.9% of Region A's population as a whole. Other large population centers in the region include City of Elmira (29,200 persons), Village of Johnson City (15,174), and Village of Endicott (13,392 persons).

Region A's population has continually decreased during the past 20 years, though the rate of decline was faster from 1990 to 2000 than it was from 2000 to 2010 (see Table 2.48).

Table 2.49 shows Region A's total 2010 population and presents population projections for 2015 to 2030 (Cornell University 2009). As shown in Table 2.49, the population of Region A is projected to continue to decrease through 2030. The population of the Region is projected to decrease at an average annual rate of 0.7% between 2015 and 2030. By 2030, Region A's population is projected to be 279,675, which would be a decrease of 19% from the 2010 census population.

Table 2.49 - Region A: Population Projections, 2015 to 2030 (New August 2011)

County/ Region	Population 2010 ^a (actual)	Population 2015 ^b (projected)	Population 2020 ^b (projected)	Population 2025 ^b (projected)	Population 2030 ^b (projected)	Average Annual Growth Rate 2015-2030
Broome	200,600	183,115	176,715	169,968	162,750	-0.7%
Chemung	88,830	83,282	80,643	77,773	74,614	-0.7%
Tioga	51,125	48,089	46,412	44,481	42,311	-0.8%
Region A Total	340,555	314,486	303,770	292,222	279,675	-0.7%

Sources: ^a USCB 2010; ^b Cornell University 2009.

Region B

Table 2.50 provides the 1990, 2000 and 2010 population for Region B and for each of the three counties within this region. The population of Region B is 187,786 persons (USCB 2010), with an average population density of 59.6 persons per square mile. The region has gained population over the last 20 years, primarily in Sullivan County. Between 1990 and 2000, the population grew at a rate of approximately 0.4% per year, and between 2000 and 2010, population increased at a rate of approximately 0.2% per year. Since 1990 the population of Region B has increased by 10,767, which is an increase of approximately 6.1%.

Table 2.50 - Region B: Historical and Current Population - 1990, 2000, 2010 (New August 2011)

	1990	2000	2010
Region B			
Population	177,019	183,697	187,786
Percent Change	--	3.8%	2.2%
Average Annual Growth Rate	--	0.4%	0.2%
Average Population Density	56.2	58.3	59.6
Delaware County			
Population	47,225	48,055	47,980
Percent Change	--	1.8%	-0.2%
Average Annual Growth Rate	--	0.2%	< 0.0%
Average Population Density	32.7	33.2	33.2
Otsego County			
Population	60,517	61,676	62,259
Percent Change	--	1.9%	1.0%
Average Annual Growth Rate	--	0.2%	0.1%
Average Population Density	60.4	61.5	62.1
Sullivan County			
Population	69,277	73,966	77,547
Percent Change	--	6.8%	4.8%
Average Annual Growth Rate	--	0.7%	.5%
Average Population Density	71.4	76.3	80.0

Source: USCB 1990a, 2000b, and 2010.

The two largest population centers in Region B are the City of Oneonta (13,901 persons) in Otsego County and the Village of Monticello (6,726 persons) in Sullivan County.

Region B's population has continually increased during the past 20 years, though the rate of growth has declined from the 1990 to 2000 period to the 2000 to 2010 period (see Table 2.50). Table 2.51 shows Region B's total 2010 population and presents population projections for 2015 to 2030 (Cornell University 2009). As shown in Table 2.51, the population in Region B overall is projected to decrease through 2030, although the population in Otsego County will increase slightly through 2025, then decline in 2030, and the population in Sullivan County will increase slightly between 2015 and 2030. By 2030, Region B's population is projected to be 183,031, which would be a decrease of 2.5% from the 2010 census population.

Table 2.51 - Region B: Population Projections, 2015 to 2030 (New August 2011)

County/ Region	Population 2010 ^a (actual)	Population 2015 ^b (projected)	Population 2020 ^b (projected)	Population 2025 ^b (projected)	Population 2030 ^b (projected)	Average Annual Growth Rate 2015-2030
Delaware	47,980	44,644	42,995	40,980	38,631	-0.9%
Otsego	62,259	63,820	64,344	64,597	64,508	0.1%
Sullivan	77,547	78,329	79,322	79,845	79,892	0.1%
Region B Total	187,786	186,793	186,661	185,422	183,031	-0.1%

Sources: ^aUSCB 2010; ^bCornell University 2009.

Region C

Table 2.52 provides the 1990, 2000 and 2010 population for Region C and for Cattaraugus and Chautauqua Counties. The population of Region C is 215,222 persons (USCB 2010), with an average population density of 90.7 persons per square mile. Between 2000 and 2010, the region lost population at an average annual rate of 0.4%. This rate was higher than the rate at which the region lost population between 1990 and 2000 (0.1% per year). Since 1990 the population of Region C has decreased by 10,907, or 4.8%.

Table 2.52 - Region C: Historical and Current Population - 1990, 2000, 2010 (New August 2011)

	1990	2000	2010
Region C			
Population	226,129	223,705	215,222
Percent Change	--	-1.1%	-3.8%
Average Annual Growth Rate	--	-0.1%	-0.4%
Average Population Density	95.3	94.3	90.7
Cattaraugus County			
Population	84,234	83,955	80,317
Percent Change	--	-0.3%	-4.3%
Average Annual Growth Rate	--	< 0.0%	-0.4
Average Population Density	64.3	64.1	61.3
Chautauqua County			
Population	141,895	139,750	134,905
Percent Change	--	-1.5%	-3.5%
Average Annual Growth Rate	--	-0.2%	-0.4%
Average Population Density	133.6	131.6	127.0

Source: USCB 1990a, 2000b, and 2010.

The largest population centers in Region C are the City of Jamestown (31,146 persons), City of Olean (14,452 persons), City of Dunkirk (12,563 persons), and Village of Fredonia (11,230 persons).

Region C's population has continually decreased during the past 20 years, though the rate of decline was faster from 2000 to 2010 than it was from 1990 to 2000. As shown in Table 2.53, the population of Region C is projected to continue to decrease through 2030. The population of Region C is projected to decrease at an average annual rate of 0.6% between 2015 and 2030. By 2030, Region C's population is projected to be 188,752 people, which would be a decrease of 12% from the 2010 census population.

Table 2.53 - Region C: Population Projections, 2015 to 2030 (New August 2011)

County/ Region	Population 2010 ^a (actual)	Population 2015 ^b (projected)	Population 2020 ^b (projected)	Population 2025 ^b (projected)	Population 2030 ^b (projected)	Average Annual Growth Rate 2015-2030
Cattaraugus	80,317	77,870	75,651	73,048	70,075	-0.7%
Chautauqua	134,905	129,596	126,521	122,906	118,677	-0.6%
Region C Total	215,222	207,466	202,172	195,954	188,752	-0.6%

Source:

^a USCB 2010.

^b Cornell University 2009.

2.4.11.3 *Housing*

New York State

The total number of housing units in New York State in 2010 was 8.1 million. The total number of housing units has been growing over the past two decades; however, with the advent of the recent housing market crisis and recession, the rate of growth has slowed in the past few years. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, in 1990 there were a total of 7.2 million housing units in New York State. By 2000, the total number of housing units increased by 6.3% to approximately 7.7 million. Between 2000 and 2010, the total number of housing units increased by 5.6% (see Table 2.54) (USCB 1990b, 2000c, 2010).

Table 2.54 - New York State: Total Housing Units - 1990, 2000, 2010 (New August 2011)

Year	Total Housing Units	Percent Change
2010	8,108,103	5.6
2000	7,679,307	6.3
1990	7,226,891	--

Source: USCB 1990b, 2000c, and 2010.

Nearly half of all housing units in New York State are single-family units. In 2009 an estimated 3.7 million units, or 47.0% of all housing units in the state, were single-family units. Multi-family units, i.e., structures that have three or more units in them, accounted for 39.5% of the total housing units (see Table 2.55) (USCB 2009c).

Table 2.55 - New York State: Type of Housing Units, 2009¹ (New August 2011)

Type of Structure	Total Number of Units	% of Total
Single Family	3,735,364	47.0
Duplex	866,157	10.9
Multi-family	3,142,770	39.5
Mobile Home	202,773	2.6
Other	2,971	<0.1
Total	7,905,035	100

Source: USCB 2009c.

¹ Data from the 2010 Census of Population and Housing on housing units by type of structure had not been released at the time of this report; therefore, estimated 2009 data from the 2005-2009 American Community Survey estimates is included herein.

Table 2.56 provides the number of sales and annual median sale price of single family homes sold in New York State over the past three years. The number of annual sales has declined over the

past three years, while the median sales price has fluctuated. In 2008 the median sales price for single-family homes was \$210,000. During the height of the housing market crisis in 2009, the median sales price fell to \$195,000. By 2010 prices in the statewide housing market had recovered, and median sales prices rose to \$215,000 (NYS Association of Realtors 2011a, 2011b). Although the statewide housing market statistics have improved over the last year, housing is intrinsically a local or regional market; many areas of New York State are still experiencing downward pressures on house prices.

Table 2.56 - New York State: Number of Sales and Annual Median Sale Price of Single-Family Homes Sold, 2008-2010 (New August 2011)

	2008	2009	2010
Number of Sales	80,521	78,327	74,718
Median Sale Price	\$210,000	\$195,000	\$215,000

Source: NYS Association of Realtors 2011a, 2011b.

In 2010, New York State had approximately 3.9 million owner-occupied housing units and 3.4 million renter-occupied housing units (USCB 2010).

The homeowner vacancy rate was 1.9% and the rental vacancy rate was 5.5% (USCB 2010) (see Table 2.57).

Table 2.57 - New York State: Housing Characteristics, 2010 (New August 2011)

	Housing Units
Occupied	7,317,755
Owner Occupied	3,897,837
Renter Occupied	3,419,918
Vacant	790,348
For Rent	200,039
Rented, Not Occupied	12,786
For Sale Only	77,225
Sold, Not Occupied	21,027
For Seasonal, Recreational, or Occasional Use	289,301
All Other Vacant	189,970
Total	8,108,103
Homeowner Vacancy Rate	1.9%
Rental Vacancy Rate	5.5%

Source: USCB 2010.

Region A

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the housing market in Region A has experienced little growth over the past two decades. As shown in Table 2.58, the region experienced an increase of 1.7% in the total number of housing units from 1990 to 2000, and a 2.1% increase from 2000 to 2010 (USCB 1990b, 2000c, 2010).

Table 2.58 - Region A: Total Housing Units - 1990, 2000, 2010 (New August 2011)

	Total Housing Units (1990)	Total Housing Units (2000)	Total Housing Units (2010)	Percent Change (1990-2000)	Percent Change (2000-2010)
Region A	145,513	147,972	151,135	1.7%	2.1%
Broome County	87,969	88,817	90,563	1.0%	2.0%
Chemung County	37,290	37,745	38,369	1.2%	1.7%
Tioga County	20,254	21,410	22,203	5.7%	3.7%

Source: USCB 1990b, 2000c, 2010.

A majority of housing units in Region A are single-family units. In 2009 an estimated 96,956 units, or 65.0% of all housing units in the region, were single-family units. Multi-family units, i.e., structures that contained three or more housing units, accounted for 17.0% of the total housing units (see Table 2.59).

Table 2.59 - Region A: Total Housing Units by Type of Structure, 2009¹ (New August 2011)

	Number of Units	% of Total
Region A		
Single Family	96,956	65.0
Duplex	15,901	10.8
Multi-family	25,389	17.0
Mobile Home	10,756	7.2
Other	64	<0.1
	149,066	100
Broome County		
Single Family	56,225	63.1
Duplex	10,436	11.7
Multi-family	17,646	19.8
Mobile Home	4,795	5.4
Other	15	<0.1
	89,117	100

	Number of Units	% of Total
Chemung County		
Single Family	25,739	67.5
Duplex	4,291	11.3
Multi-family	5,749	15.1
Mobile Home	2,325	6.1
Other	12	<0.1
	38,116	100
Tioga County		
Single Family	14,992	68.7
Duplex	1,174	5.4
Multi-family	1,994	9.1
Mobile Home	3,636	16.7
Other	37	0.1
Total	21,833	100

Source: USCB 2009c.

1 Data from the 2010 Census of Population and Housing on housing units by type of structure had not been released at the time of this report; therefore, estimated 2009 data from the 2005-2009 American Community Survey are provided herein.

Table 2.60 provides the number of sales and annual median sale price of single family homes sold in Region A over the past three years (New York State Association of Realtors 2011a, 2011b).

Table 2.60 - Region A: Number of Sales and Annual Median Sale Price of Single-Family Homes Sold, 2008-2010 (New August 2011)

	2008		2009		2010	
	Number of Sales	Median Sale Price	Number of Sales	Median Sales Price	Number of Sales	Median Sales Price
Broome County	1,412	\$109,438	1,287	\$115,000	1,193	\$106,000
Chemung County	629	\$85,000	593	\$86,000	638	\$100,000
Tioga County	275	\$136,170	304	\$120,000	227	\$122,500
Region A	2,316	NA	2,184	NA	2,058	NA

Source: NYS Association of Realtors 2011a, 2011b.
NA = Not available.

In 2010, Region A had approximately 93,074 owner-occupied housing units and 44,905 renter-occupied housing units. The homeowner vacancy rate was 1.1%, and the rental vacancy rate was 7.8% (see Table 2.61) (USCB 2010).

Table 2.61 - Region A: Housing Characteristics, 2010 (New August 2011)

	Housing Units			
	Region A	Broome County	Chemung County	Tioga County
Occupied	137,979	82,167	35,462	20,350
Owner Occupied	93,074	53,260	24,011	15,803
Renter Occupied	44,905	28,907	11,451	4,547
Vacant	13,156	8,396	2,907	1,853
For Rent	3,824	2,522	917	385
Rented, Not Occupied	226	143	56	27
For Sale Only	1,516	956	377	183
Sold, Not Occupied	471	226	151	94
For Seasonal, Recreational, or Occasional Use	2,774	1,843	376	555
All Other Vacant	4,345	2,706	1,030	609
Total	151,135	90,563	38,369	22,203
Homeowner Vacancy Rate	1.1%	1.8%	1.5%	1.1%
Rental Vacancy Rate	7.8%	8.0%	7.4%	7.8%

Source: USCB 2010.

The 2010 Census of Population and Housing identified 2,774 housing units in Region A that are considered seasonal, recreational, or occasional use. In addition to the permanent housing discussed above, there are also numerous short-term accommodations including hotels, motels, inns, and campgrounds available in the area. Table 2.62 lists the numbers of hotels/motels available in Region A that were registered with the I Love New York Tourism Agency. As of 2011 there were 40 hotels/motels with approximately 3,110 rooms in Region A.

Table 2.62 - Region A: Short-Term Accommodations (Hotels/Motels), 2011 (New August 2011)

	Total Hotels/Motels	Total Rooms
Broome County	27	2,202
Chemung County	9	676
Tioga County	4	232
Region A	40	3,110

Source: Official New York State Tourism Site (ILOVENY) 2011.

Region B

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the rate of growth of the housing supply in Region B has increased since 1990. The total number of housing units in the region grew from 95,560 in 1990 to 102,163 in 2000, an increase of 6.9%. Between 2000 and 2010, the total number of housing units increased to 111,185, an increase of 8.8%. (see Table 2.63) (USCB 1990b, 2000c, 2010).

Table 2.63 - Region B: Total Housing Units - 1990, 2000, 2010 (New August 2011)

	Total Housing Units (1990)	Total Housing Units (2000)	Total Housing Units (2010)	Percent Change (1990-2000)	Percent Change (2000-2010)
Delaware County	27,361	28,952	31,222	5.8%	7.8%
Otsego County	26,385	28,481	30,777	7.9%	8.1%
Sullivan County	41,814	44,730	49,186	7.0%	10.0%
Region B	95,560	102,163	111,185	6.9%	8.8%

Source: USCB 1990b, 2000c, 2010.

A majority of housing units in Region B are single-family units. In 2009 an estimated 76,883 units, or 70.7% of all housing units in the region, were single-family units. Mobile homes accounted for 12.7% of the total housing units (see Table 2.64).

Table 2.64 - Region B: Total Housing Units by Type of Structure 2009¹ (New August 2011)

	Number of Units	% of Total
Region B		
Single Family	76,883	70.7
Duplex	6,025	5.5
Multi-family	12,097	11.1
Mobile Home	13,731	12.7
Other	6	<0.1
Total	108,742	100
Delaware		
Single Family	21,876	73.6
Duplex	1,502	5.0
Multi-family	2,400	8.1
Mobile Home	3,949	13.3
Other	0	0
Total	29,727	100
Otsego		
Single Family	20,576	67.1
Duplex	1,791	5.9

	Number of Units	% of Total
Multi-family	3,868	12.6
Mobile Home	4,405	14.4
Other	6	<0.1
Total	30,646	100
Sullivan		
Single Family	34,431	71.2
Duplex	2,732	5.6
Multi-family	5,829	12.1
Mobile Home	5,377	11.1
Other	0	0
Total	48,369	100

Source: USCB 2009c.

¹ Data from the 2010 Census of Population and Housing on housing units by type of structure had not been released at the time of this report; therefore, estimated 2009 data from the 2005-2009 American Community Survey are provided herein.

As shown in Table 2.65, the housing market in Region B experienced a general decline in total sales and price in the single-family home market from 2008 to 2010. In the region as a whole, the number of single-family homes sold each year from 2008 to 2010 declined by 8.7%, from 785 homes in 2008 to 717 homes in 2010.

Median sale prices in the region experienced similar trends. From 2008 to 2010, the median sale price of single-family homes in Sullivan and Otsego Counties decreased by 16.4% and 8.8%, respectively. In contrast, the median sale price of homes in Delaware County remained relatively constant from 2008 to 2010 (see Table 2.65).

Table 2.65- Region B: Number of Sales and Annual Median Sale Price of Single-Family Homes Sold, 2008-2010 (New August 2011)

	2008		2009		2010	
	Number of Sales	Median Sale Price	Number of Sales	Median Sales Price	Number of Sales	Median Sales Price
Delaware County	160	\$109,250	171	\$110,000	149	\$110,000
Otsego County	309	\$131,000	304	\$126,523	319	\$119,500
Sullivan County	316	\$149,450	269	\$125,000	249	\$125,000
Region B	785	NA	744	NA	717	NA

Source: NYS Association of Realtors 2011a, 2011b.

NA = Not available.

In 2010, Region B had approximately 52,860 owner-occupied housing units and 21,797 renter-occupied housing units. The homeowner vacancy rate was 2.6%, and the rental vacancy rate was 10.6% (USCB 2010).

There were 2,604 units for rent, 1,989 units for sale, and 27,240 units for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use in the area (see Table 2.66). The percentage of vacant seasonal, recreational, or occasional use units was very high, largely due to the region's proximity to the Catskill Mountains (USCB 2010).

Table 2.66 - Region B: Housing Characteristics, 2010 (New August 2011)

	Housing Units			
	Region B	Delaware County	Otsego County	Sullivan County
Occupied	74,657	19,898	24,620	30,139
Owner Occupied	52,860	14,768	17,885	20,207
Renter Occupied	21,797	5,130	6,735	9,932
Vacant	36,528	11,324	6,157	19,047
For Rent	2,604	565	615	1,424
Rented, Not Occupied	157	36	45	76
For Sale Only	1,989	446	514	1,029
Sold, Not Occupied	461	117	127	217
For Seasonal, Recreational, or Occasional Use	27,240	9,276	3,621	14,343
All Other Vacant	4,077	884	1,235	1,958
Total	111,185	31,222	30,777	49,186
Homeowner Vacancy Rate	2.6%	2.9%	2.8%	4.8%
Rental Vacancy Rate	10.6%	9.9%	8.3%	12.5%

Source: USCB 2010.

In addition to the permanent housing discussed above, there are also numerous short-term accommodations including hotels, motels, inns, and campgrounds available in the area. Table 2.67 lists the number of hotels/motels available in Region B that was registered with the I Love New York Tourism Agency. As of 2011 there were 78 hotels/motels with approximately 3,705 rooms in Region B (see Table 2.67).

Table 2.67 - Region B: Short-Term Accommodations (Hotels/Motels) (New August 2011)

	Total Hotels/Motels	Total Rooms
Delaware County	27	1,123
Otsego County	34	1,373
Sullivan County	17	1,209
Region B	78	3,705

Source: Official New York State Tourism Site (ILOVENY) 2011.

Region C

In 2010, Region C had a total of 108,031 housing units. The total number of housing units increased by 8.1% between 1990 and 2000, and by 3.2% between 2000 and 2010 (see Table 2.68) (USCB 1990b, 2000c, 2010). Approximately 62% of the housing units are located in Chautauqua County, and 38% are located in Cattaraugus County.

Table 2.68 - Region C: Total Housing Units - 1990, 2000, 2010 (New August 2011)

	Total Housing Units (1990)	Total Housing Units (2000)	Total Housing Units (2010)	Percent Change (1990-2000)	Percent Change (2000-2010)
Cattaraugus County	36,839	39,839	41,111	8.1%	3.2%
Chautauqua County	62,682	64,900	66,920	3.5%	3.1%
Region C	99,521	104,739	108,031	5.2%	3.1%

Source: USCB 1990b, 2000c, 2010.

Most of the housing units in Region C are single-family units. In 2009 an estimated 106,519 units, or 68.7% of all housing units in the region, were single-family units (see Table 2.69)

Table 2.69 - Region C: Total Housing Units by Type of Structure, 2009¹ (New August 2011)

	Number of Units	% of Total
Region C		
Single Family	73,183	68.7
Duplex	10,802	10.1
Multi-family	12,432	11.7
Mobile Home	10,090	9.5
Other	12	<0.1
Total	106,519	100
Cattaraugus		
Single Family	28,451	70.1
Duplex	2,850	7.0
Multi-family	3,797	9.3
Mobile Home	5,502	13.6
Other	12	<0.1
Total	40,612	100
Chautauqua		
Single Family	44,732	67.9
Duplex	7,952	12.0
Multi-family	8,635	13.1
Mobile Home	4,588	7.0
Other	0	0
Total	65,907	100

Source: USCB 2009c.

¹ Data from the 2010 Census of Population and Housing on housing units by type of structure had not been released at the time of this report; therefore, estimated 2009 data from the 2005-2009 American Community Survey are provided herein.

As shown on Table 2.70, the market for single-family homes in Region C declined over the past three years. In the region as a whole, the number of single-family homes sold each year from 2008 to 2010 declined by 14.1%, from 1,492 homes in 2008 to 1,281 homes in 2010 (NYS Association of Realtors 2011a, 2011b).

Table 2.70 - Region C: Number of Sales and Annual Median Sale Price of Single-Family Homes Sold, 2008-2010 (New August 2011)

	2008		2009		2010	
	Number of Sales	Median Sale Price	Number of Sales	Median Sales Price	Number of Sales	Median Sales Price
Cattaraugus County	577	\$69,000	501	\$70,000	434	\$73,000
Chautauqua County	915	\$75,000	843	\$74,521	847	\$80,000
Region C	1,492	NA	1,344	NA	1,281	NA

Source: NYS Association of Realtors 2011a, 2011b.
NA = Not available.

In 2010 Region C had approximately 60,182 owner-occupied housing units and 26,325 renter-occupied housing units. The homeowner vacancy rate was 1.4%, and the rental vacancy rate was 9.0% (see Table 2.71) (USCB 2010).

Table 2.71 - Region C: Housing Characteristics, 2010 (New August 2011)

	Region C	Cattaraugus County	Chautauqua County
Occupied	86,507	32,263	54,244
Owner Occupied	60,182	23,306	36,876
Renter Occupied	26,325	8,857	17,368
Vacant	21,524	8,848	12,676
For Rent	2,624	748	1,876
Rented, Not Occupied	178	82	96
For Sale Only	1,278	483	795
Sold, Not Occupied	426	157	269
For Seasonal, Recreational, or Occasional Use	13,308	6,035	7,573
All Other Vacant	3,410	1,343	2,067
Total	108,031	41,111	66,920
Homeowner Vacancy Rate	1.4%	2.0%	2.1%
Rental Vacancy Rate	9.0%	7.6%	9.7%

Source: USCB 2010.

There were 2,624 units for rent, 1,278 units for sale, and 13,608 units for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use in the area. The percentage of vacant seasonal, recreational, or occasional use units was very high, largely due to the cottages around Lake Chautauqua, Chautauqua Institute, and other natural areas in these counties (USCB 2010).

In addition to the permanent housing discussed above, there are also numerous short-term accommodations including hotels, motels, inns, and campgrounds available in the area. Table 2.72 lists the number of hotels/motels available in Region C that was registered with the I Love New York Tourism Agency. As of 2011 there were 41 hotels/motels with approximately 1,987 rooms in Region C (see Table 2.72).

Table 2.72 - Region C: Short-Term Accommodations (Hotels/Motels) (New August 2011)

	Total Hotels/Motels	Total Rooms
Cattaraugus County	17	634
Chautauqua County	24	1,353
Region C	41	1,987

Source: Official New York State Tourism Site (ILOVENY) 2011.

2.4.11.4 Government Revenues and Expenditures

New York State

Table 2.73 lists the main sources of tax revenues for New York State. For fiscal year (FY) ending March 31, 2010, revenues collected in New York State totaled approximately \$55 billion.

Revenue from personal income taxes is the largest source of tax revenue for the state, accounting for approximately 63% of the total revenue (New York State Department of Taxation and Finance [NYSDTF] 2010a, 2010b).

Table 2.73 - New York State Revenues Collected for FY Ending March 31, 2010 (New August 2011)

	Personal Income Taxes	Corporation and Business Taxes	Sales and Excise Taxes and User Fees	Property Transfers	Other Taxes and Fees	Total Revenues
Total Revenues (\$ billions)	\$34.8	\$6.6	\$12.2	\$1.4	\$0.2	\$55.2
Percent of Total	63.0	12.0	22.1	2.5	0.4	100.0

Source: NYSDTF 2010a, 2010b.

Totals may not equal sum of components due to rounding.

Currently, no specific state tax is levied on the extraction of natural gas in New York State; however, the state government receives revenues from the natural gas industry and from natural gas development primarily through income and sales taxes. The state assesses personal income tax on wages earned by workers in the industry, and income received by individuals as royalty payments and lease payments from natural gas operators. Further, the state also collects revenue from sales taxes receipts from the purchase of non-exempt materials and equipment needed to construct and operate natural gas wells. In some cases, the state may receive revenue from corporate and business taxes assessed on the corporate income of natural gas operators, though these taxes are subject to various exemptions and incentives that reduce the amount of revenue that the state is able to collect from the natural gas industry. In addition, New York State receives revenues from leases for oil and natural gas development on state lands. Lease revenues are acquired through delay rentals; bonus bids; royalties; and storage fees. Delay rentals are the annual fees that oil and natural gas developers pay to hold a leased property before development occurs. Bonus bids are additional fees above the delay rental fee for a specific tract. All bonus bids are subject to a sealed competitive bidding process. Once the gas well is developed, the delay rental payments are waived and the developer is assessed royalty fees of 12.5% of gross revenues. Storage fees are fees that are levied on the operators of underground natural gas storage facilities. A summary of the acreage and number of leases on state lands is provided in Table 2.74. Table 2.75 provides a summary of state revenues received between 2000 and 2010 from oil and gas lease payments.

Table 2.74 - New York State: Number of Leases and Acreage of State Land Leased for Oil and Natural Gas Development, 2010 (New August 2011)

County	Acreage of State Land Leased				Number of Leases			
	Rental	Royalty	Storage	Total	Rental	Royalty	Storage	Total
Allegany		126		126		1		1
Broome	512			512	1			1
Cattaraugus		62	9,981	10,043		2	8	10
Cayuga		62		62		4		4
Chautauqua		15,715		15,715		29		29
Chemung	730	667		1,397	3	10		13
Cortland	7,791			7,791	4			4
Erie		10	255	265		2	2	4
Ontario			55	55			1	1
Schuyler	2,416	10,019	1	12,436	1	6	1	8
Seneca		17		17		1		1
Steuben	685	5,859	1,620	8,164	1	8	2	11
Tioga	6,179			6,179	6			6
Tompkins	915			915	1			1
Total	19,228	32,537	11,912	63,677	17	63	14	94

Source: NYSDEC 2010.

Table 2.75 - 2000-2010 Leasing Revenue by Payment Type for New York State (New August 2011)

Year	Bonus Bids	Delay Rentals	Royalties	Storage Fees	Yearly Total
2000	-	\$42,280	\$75,327	\$9,781	\$127,388
2001	-	\$118,732	\$150,922	\$178,128	\$447,782
2002	-	\$79,435	\$96,620	\$73,617	\$249,672
2003	\$4,583,239	\$16,486	\$609,821	\$117,381	\$5,326,927
2004	-	\$130,746	\$525,050	\$109,986	\$765,782
2005	-	\$80,534	\$3,235,206	\$123,930	\$3,439,670
2006	-	\$75,305	\$3,096,620	\$125,007	\$3,296,932
2007	\$9,001,335	\$166,868	\$2,466,312	\$133,298	\$11,767,813
2008	-	\$97,269	\$1,866,519	\$211,927	\$2,175,715
2009	-	\$96,136	\$637,254	\$50,960	\$784,350
2010	\$2,922	\$96,377	\$581,824	\$65,010	\$746,133

Source: NYSDEC 2010.

In New York State, local government entities have taxing authority for real property tax purposes.

However, the New York State Department of Taxation and Finance provides a uniform, statewide method of valuing natural-gas-producing properties for real property tax purposes. Valuations of natural-gas-producing properties are based on a “unit of production” value - a dollar amount per Mcf of gas produced. The total valuation is then equalized across four natural gas producing regions within the state, and then taxed at the local millage rate, similar to any other real property within the local jurisdiction.

Spending on community services is generally divided between the state and local governments (i.e., counties, municipalities, fire districts, and school districts). For public safety, New York State funds state troopers, counties fund county sheriffs, and municipalities commonly fund local police services.

Emergency services such as fire protection/EMT are largely volunteer efforts in smaller towns, with some financial support received from smaller cities, suburban and rural towns, and villages. Major cities generally support their own fire departments, which generally have their own EMT operation.

Roadways are also supported by various levels of government. New York State provides funding for state and local highways, the operation of which is the responsibility of the NYSDOT as well as the New York State Thruway Authority. Counties finance county highways, while municipalities generally provide the funds to administer and maintain local roadways.

In regards to education, New York State financially supports the State University of New York (SUNY), a system of higher education institutions. Funding for K-12 education is generally provided by local school districts, which in turn receive revenues from a variety of sources, including federal aid, state aid, and real property taxes, among others.

Recreation services, including public parks, are another expenditure in which both state and local governments contribute. New York State provides funding to OPRHP, which operates recreational facilities at the state level, including the state park system. County governments generally provide funds for recreational facilities in towns and villages, while cities and larger suburban areas generally support their own recreational services.

Health, including Medicaid, is an expenditure that is largely carried by the state. Medicaid is a joint federal-state program. However, counties and major cities in New York State also contribute funds. Counties and local governments also have miscellaneous health care costs, including public health administration, public health services, mental health services, environmental services, and public health facilities, among others.

Expenditures for water and waste water treatment are generally made by counties and local municipalities.

Region A

Table 2.76 lists the main sources of public revenues for Region A. Revenues collected in Region A totaled approximately \$736 million for the fiscal year ending December 31, 2009. The majority of revenues were derived from local sources. Local revenue, including ad valorem (real and personal property) tax receipts and services, accounted for approximately 67.5% of total revenues in Region A (NYS Office of the State Comptroller 2010a).

Table 2.76 - Region A: Total Revenue for FY Ending December 31, 2009 (\$ millions) (New August 2011)

	Taxes¹ (% of total)	Services² (% of total)	Subtotal Local Revenue (% of total)	State/Federal Aid (% of total)	Subtotal Local// (% of total)	Other Sources³ (% of total)	Total Revenue⁴
Broome County	\$169.4 (37.0)	\$139.6 (30.4)	\$309.0 (67.4)	\$127.5 (27.8)	\$436.5 (95.2)	\$22.1 (4.8)	\$458.6
Chemung County	\$80.6 (42.0)	\$47.3 (24.7)	\$127.9 (66.7)	\$54.8 (28.6)	\$182.7 (95.3)	\$9.1 (4.7)	\$191.8
Tioga County	\$39.4 (46.2)	\$20.6 (24.1)	\$60.0 (70.2)	\$20.4 (23.9)	\$80.4 (94.0)	\$5.1 (6.0)	\$85.5
Region A	\$289.4 (39.4)	\$207.5 (28.2)	\$496.9 (67.5)	\$202.7 (27.5)	\$699.6 (95.1)	\$36.3 (4.9)	\$735.9

Source: NYS Office of the State Comptroller 2010a.

¹ Taxes include real property taxes and assessments, other real property tax items, sales and use taxes, and other non-property taxes.

² Services include charges for services, charges to other governments, use and sale of property, and other local revenues.

³ Other revenues include proceeds of debt and all other sources of revenue.

⁴ Totals may not equal sum of components due to rounding.

As shown in Table 2.77, the total local tax revenue collected in Region A during the FY ending on December 31, 2009, was approximately \$289.4 million. Of the total tax collected, 59.8% was derived from sales tax and distribution. Real property taxes, special assessments, and other real property tax items accounted for about 39.1% of the total local revenue (NYS Office of the State Comptroller 2010a).

Table 2.77 - Region A: Local Tax Revenue for FY Ending December 31, 2009 (\$ millions) (New August 2011)

	Real Property Taxes (% of total)	Special Assessments (% of total)	Other Real Property Tax Items¹ (% of total)	Sales Tax and Distribution (% of total)	Miscellaneous Use Taxes (% of total)	Other Non-Property Taxes² (% of total)	Total Tax Collection³
Broome County	\$59.1 (34.9)	\$0 (0)	\$4.0 (2.4)	\$104.1 (61.4)	\$1.5 (0.9)	\$0.7 (0.4)	\$169.4
Chemung County	\$26.8 (33.3)	\$0 (0)	\$1.9 (2.4)	\$51.2 (63.5)	\$0.6 (0.7)	\$0.1 (0.1)	\$80.6
Tioga County	\$19.2 (48.7)	\$0 (0)	\$2.2 (5.6)	\$17.7 (44.9)	\$0.1 (0.3)	\$0.2 (0.5)	\$39.4
Region A	\$105.1 (36.3)	\$0 (0)	\$8.1 (2.8)	\$173.0 (59.8)	\$2.2 (0.7)	\$1.0 (0.4)	\$289.4

Source: NYS Office of the State Comptroller 2010a.

¹ Other real property tax items include STAR payments, payments in lieu of taxes, interest penalties, gain from sale of tax acquired property, and miscellaneous tax items.

² Other non-property taxes include franchises, emergency telephone system surcharges, city income taxes, and other miscellaneous non-property taxes.

³ Totals may not equal sum of components due to rounding.

The production value (e.g., gas economic profile), state equalization rate, and millage rate for gas-producing properties in Region A are shown in Table 2.78. Broome, Chemung, and Tioga Counties are within the Medina Region 3, natural-gas-producing region designated by New York State. The final gas unit of production value for gas-producing properties within Medina Region 3 was \$11.19 in 2010 (NYSDTF 2011). The overall full-value millage rates for Broome, Chemung, and Tioga Counties were 35.50, 34.30 and 30.80, respectively. These rates have already been equalized and include the rates of all taxing districts in the county, including county, town, village, school district, and other special district rates.

Table 2.78 - Gas Economic Profile for Medina Region 3 (New August 2011)

	2010 Final Gas Unit of Production Value^a	Millage Rate^b (2010)
Broome County	\$11.19	35.50
Chemung County	\$11.19	34.30
Tioga County	\$11.19	30.80

Sources:

^a NYSDTF 2011.

^b NYS Office of the State Comptroller 2010b. Millage rates represent the “overall full-value tax rate” and include the rates of all taxing districts in the county, including county, town, village, school district, and special districts rates.

Table 2.79 presents local government expenditures for Region A during the FY ending December 31, 2009. Social services combined to create the largest single expenditure in each of the counties of Region A. Approximately 28.7% of the counties' collective operating and capital budgets were spent on social services during the FY ending December 31, 2009. Expenditure categories within social services include social service administration, financial assistance, Medicaid, non-Medicaid medical assistance, housing assistance, employment services, youth services, public facilities, and miscellaneous social services. Other major expenditures in Region A included general government (20.5%), employee benefits (15.3%), and health (9.9%). Public safety accounted for approximately 7.0% of total expenditures in Region A, including \$15,299,556 for police and \$118,376 for fire protection. No county in Region A spent any monies on emergency response. Broome and Chemung Counties did not financially support any fire protection services (NYS Office of the State Comptroller 2010a).

Table 2.79 - Region A: Expenditures for FY Ending December 31, 2009 (\$ millions) (New August 2011)

	Broome County		Chemung County		Tioga County		Region A	
	Total \$	% of Total	Total \$	% of Total	Total \$	% of Total	Total \$	% of Total
General Government	\$91,817,010	20.4	\$33,090,334	17.8	\$21,682,356	27.0	\$146,589,700	20.5
Education	\$20,406,276	4.5	\$4,412,651	2.4	\$5,191,138	6.5	\$30,010,065	4.2
Public Safety	\$30,483,583	6.8	\$12,944,032	7.0	\$6,467,954	8.1	\$49,895,569	7.0
Health	\$39,151,049	8.7	\$24,028,632	12.9	\$7,398,260	9.2	\$70,577,941	9.9
Transportation	\$22,685,968	5.1	\$14,625,859	7.9	\$6,181,134	7.7	\$43,492,961	6.1
Social Services	\$122,931,621	27.4	\$61,987,864	33.4	\$20,346,458	25.4	\$205,265,943	28.7
Economic Development	\$6,005,330	1.3	\$60,000	<0.1	\$636,502	0.8	\$6,701,832	0.9
Culture and Recreation	\$10,186,350	2.3	\$2,349,947	1.3	\$232,827	0.3	\$12,769,124	1.8
Community Services	\$6,768,148	1.5	\$2,978,999	1.6	\$569,025	0.7	\$10,316,172	1.4
Utilities	\$0	0.0	\$0	0.0	\$0	0.0	\$0	0.0
Sanitation	\$954,025	0.2	\$5,780,216	3.1	\$1,176,043	1.5	\$7,910,284	1.1
Employee Benefits	\$82,228,270	18.3	\$17,926,465	9.6	\$9,460,820	11.8	\$109,615,555	15.3
Debt Service	\$15,410,760	3.4	\$5,620,336	3.0	\$862,138	1.1	\$21,893,234	3.1
Total Expenditures	\$449,028,390	100.0	\$185,805,335	100.0	\$80,204,655	100.0	\$715,038,380	100.0

Source: NYS Office of the State Comptroller 2010a.

Region B

Table 2.80 lists 2.4 the main sources of county government revenues for Region B. Revenues collected in Region B totaled approximately \$429.0 million for the fiscal year ending December 31, 2009. Most of the revenues were derived from local sources. Local revenue, including ad valorem (real and personal property) tax receipts and services, accounted for approximately 65.6% of total revenues in Region B (NYS Office of the State Comptroller 2010a).

Table 2.80 - Region B: Total Revenue for FY Ending December 31, 2009 (\$ millions) (New August 2011)

	Taxes¹ (% of total)	Services² (% of total)	Subtotal Local Revenue (% of total)	State/Federal Aid (% of total)	Subtotal Local// (% of total)	Other Sources³ (% of total)	Total Revenue⁴
Delaware County	\$43.1 (37.6)	\$21.1 (18.4)	\$64.2 (56.0)	\$33.0 (28.8)	\$97.1 (84.8)	\$17.4 (15.2)	\$114.5
Otsego County	\$44.7 (41.6)	\$30.7 (28.5)	\$75.4 (70.1)	\$25.2 (23.4)	\$100.6 (93.5)	\$7.0 (6.5)	\$107.6
Sullivan County	\$84.2 (40.7)	\$57.5 (27.8)	\$141.7 (68.5)	\$44.2 (21.4)	\$186.0 (89.9)	\$20.9 (10.1)	\$206.9
Region B	\$172.0 (40.1)	\$109.3 (25.5)	\$281.3 (65.6)	\$102.4 (23.9)	\$383.7 (89.4)	\$45.3 (10.6)	\$429.0

Source: NYS Office of the State Comptroller 2010a.

¹ Taxes include real property taxes and assessments, other real property tax items, sales and use taxes, and other non-property taxes.

² Services includes charges for services, charges to other governments, use and sale of property, and other local revenues.

³ Other revenues include proceeds of debt and all other sources of revenue.

⁴ Totals may not equal sum of components due to rounding.

As shown in Table 2.81, the total local tax revenue in Region B during the fiscal year ending on December 31, 2009, was approximately \$173.7 million. Of the total tax collected, 49.2% was derived from taxes levied on real property, special assessments, and other real property tax items. Sales tax and distribution accounted for approximately 48.4% of the total (NYS Office of the State Comptroller 2010a).

Table 2.81 - Region B: Local Tax Revenue for FY Ending December 31, 2009 (\$ millions) (New August 2011)

	Real Property Taxes (% of total)	Special Assessments (% of total)	Other Real Property Tax Items¹ (% of total)	Sales Tax and Distribution (% of total)	Miscellaneous Use Taxes (% of total)	Other Non-Property Taxes² (% of total)	Total Revenue
Delaware County	\$23.4 (54.2)	\$0 (0)	\$1.7 (3.9)	\$17.9 (41.4)	\$0 (0)	\$0.2 (0.5)	\$43.2
Otsego County	\$9.5 (20.5)	\$1.1 (2.4)	\$1.4 (3.0)	\$33.1 (71.3)	\$1.1 (2.4)	\$0.2 (0.4)	\$46.4
Sullivan County	\$42.1 (50.1)	\$0 (0)	\$6.3 (7.5)	\$33.1 (39.4)	\$1.1 (1.3)	\$1.5 (1.8)	\$84.1
Region B	\$75.0 (43.2)	\$1.1 (0.6)	\$9.4 (5.4)	\$84.1 (48.4)	\$2.2 (1.3)	\$1.9 (1.1)	\$173.7

Source: NYS Office of the State Comptroller 2010a.

¹ Other real property tax items include STAR payments, payments in lieu of taxes, interest penalties, gain from sale of tax acquired property, and miscellaneous tax items.

² Other non-property taxes include franchises, emergency telephone system surcharges, city income taxes, and other miscellaneous non-property taxes.

³ Totals may not equal sum of components due to rounding.

Delaware, Otsego, and Sullivan Counties are within Medina Region 4, natural-gas-producing region designated by New York State. The final gas unit of production value for gas-producing properties within the Medina Region 4 was \$11.19 in 2010; the 2011 tentative gas unit of production value is \$11.32 (NYSDTF 2011). The 2010 overall full-value millage rates for Delaware, Otsego, and Sullivan Counties were 21.20, 19.60 and 26.20, respectively (see Table 2.82). These rates have already been equalized and include the rates of all taxing districts in the county, including county, town, village, school district, and other special district rates.

Table 2.82 - Gas Economic Profile for Medina Region 4 and State Equalization Rates and Millage Rates for Region B (New August 2011)

	Final Gas Unit of Production Value (2010)^a	Millage Rate^b (2010)
Delaware County	\$11.19	21.20
Otsego County	\$11.19	19.60
Sullivan County	\$11.19	26.20

Sources:

^a NYSDTF 2011.

^b NYS Office of the State Comptroller 2010b. Millage rates represent the “overall full-value tax rate” and include the rates of all taxing districts in the county, including county, town, village, school district, and special districts rates.

Table 2.83 presents local government expenditures for Region B during the FY ending December 31, 2009. Social services combined to create the largest single expenditure in each of the counties in Region B. Approximately 30% of the counties' collective operating and capital budgets were spent on social services during the FY ending December 31, 2009. Expenditure categories within social services include social service administration, financial assistance, Medicaid, non-Medicaid medical assistance, housing assistance, employment services, youth services, public facilities, and miscellaneous social services. Other major expenditures in Region B included employee benefits (14.5%), general government (12.4%), and transportation (12.3%). Public safety accounted for approximately 7.7% of total expenditures in Region B, including \$9,103,208 for police and \$70,719 for fire protection. No county in Region B spent any monies on emergency response. Delaware and Otsego Counties did not financially support any fire protection services (NYS Office of the State Comptroller 2010a).

Table 2.83 - Region B: Expenditures for FY Ending December 31, 2009 (\$ millions) (New August 2011)

	Delaware County		Otsego County		Sullivan County		Region B	
	Total \$	% of Total	Total \$	% of Total	Total \$	% of Total	Total \$	% of Total
General Government	\$8,960,337	9.7	\$18,661,059	17.9	\$20,991,003	10.7	\$48,612,399	12.4
Education	\$623,530	0.7	\$2,546,555	2.4	\$6,342,470	3.2	\$9,512,555	2.4
Public Safety	\$5,541,817	6.0	\$6,882,871	6.6	\$17,902,819	9.1	\$30,327,507	7.7
Health	\$8,405,703	9.1	\$5,563,650	5.3	\$29,995,278	15.3	\$43,964,631	11.2
Transportation	\$18,081,013	19.5	\$11,588,286	11.1	\$18,465,889	9.4	\$48,135,188	12.3
Social Services	\$28,776,564	31.1	\$37,215,496	35.6	\$51,657,658	26.4	\$117,649,718	30.0
Economic Development	\$610,060	0.7	\$1,069,964	1.0	\$2,390,941	1.2	\$4,070,965	1.0
Culture and Recreation	\$702,837	0.8	\$277,033	0.3	\$2,802,213	1.4	\$3,782,083	1.0
Community Services	\$3,172,734	3.4	\$2,047,629	2.0	\$1,087,185	0.6	\$6,307,548	1.6
Utilities	\$0	0.0	\$0	0.0	\$0	0.0	\$0	0.0
Sanitation	\$3,906,766	4.2	\$1,065,180	1.0	\$4,312,952	2.2	\$9,284,898	2.4
Employee Benefits	\$10,972,513	11.9	\$15,976,297	15.3	\$30,048,837	15.4	\$56,997,647	14.5
Debt Service	\$2,826,085	3.1	\$1,606,314	1.5	\$9,742,478	5.0	\$14,174,877	3.6
Total Expenditures	\$92,579,959	100.0	\$104,500,334	100.0	\$195,739,723	100.0	\$392,820,016	100.0

Source: NYS Office of the State Comptroller 2010a.

Region C

Table 2.84 lists the main sources of county government revenues for Region C. Revenues collected in Region C totaled approximately \$501.4 million for the fiscal year ending December 31, 2009. Most of the revenues were derived from local sources. Local revenue, including ad valorem (real and personal property) tax receipts and services, accounted for approximately 70.8% of total revenues in Region C (NYS Office of the State Comptroller 2010a).

Table 2.84 - Region C: Revenues for FY Ending December 31, 2009 (\$ millions) (New August 2011)

	Taxes¹ (% of total)	Services² (% of total)	Subtotal Local Revenue (% of total)	State/Federal Aid (% of total)	Subtotal Local// (% of total)	Other Sources³ (% of total)	Total Revenue⁴
Cattaraugus County	\$78.1 (36.4)	\$73.6 (34.3)	\$151.7 (70.6)	\$42.7 (19.9)	\$194.4 (90.5)	\$20.4 (9.5)	\$214.8
Chautauqua County	\$114.8 (40.1)	\$88.5 (30.9)	\$203.3 (70.9)	\$65.0 (22.7)	\$268.3 (93.6)	\$18.3 (6.4)	\$286.6
Region C	\$192.9 (38.5)	\$162.1 (32.3)	\$355.0 (70.8)	\$107.7 (21.5)	\$462.7 (92.3)	\$38.7 (7.7)	\$501.4

Source: NYS Office of the State Comptroller 2010a.

¹ Taxes include real property taxes and assessments, other real property tax items, sales and use taxes, and other non-property taxes.

² Services include charges for services, charges to other governments, use and sale of property, and other local revenues.

³ Other revenues include proceeds of debt and all other sources of revenue.

⁴ Totals may not equal sum of components due to rounding

As shown in Table 2.85, the total local tax revenue in Region C during the fiscal year ending on December 31, 2009, was approximately \$192.8 million. Of the total receipts, 53.2% was derived from taxes levied on real property, special assessments, and other real property tax items. Sales tax and distribution accounted for approximately 45.1% of the total (NYS Office of the State Comptroller 2010a).

Table 2.85 - Region C: Local Tax Revenue for FY Ending December 31, 2009 (\$ millions) (New August 2011)

	Real Property Taxes (% of total)	Special Assessments (% of total)	Other Real Property Tax Items¹ (% of total)	Sales Tax and Distribution (% of total)	Miscellaneous Use Taxes (% of total)	Other Non-Property Taxes² (% of total)	Total Tax Collection³
Cattaraugus County	\$42.0 (53.8%)	\$0 (0%)	\$2.6 (3.3%)	\$33.1 (42.4%)	\$0 (0%)	\$0.3 (0.4%)	\$78.0
Chautauqua County	\$54.2 (47.2%)	\$0 (0%)	\$3.7 (3.2%)	\$53.8 (46.9%)	\$1.2 (1.0%)	\$1.9 (1.7%)	\$114.8
Region C	\$96.2 (49.9%)	\$0 (0%)	\$6.3 (3.3%)	\$86.9 (45.1%)	\$1.2 (0.6%)	\$2.2 (1.1%)	\$192.8

Source: NYS Office of the State Comptroller 2010a.

¹ Other real property tax items include STAR payments, payments in lieu of taxes, interest penalties, gain from sale of tax acquired property, and miscellaneous tax items.

² Other non-property taxes include franchises, emergency telephone system surcharges, city income taxes, and other miscellaneous non-property taxes.

³ Totals may not equal sum of components due to rounding.

Cattaraugus and Chautauqua Counties are both split between Medina Region 2 and Medina Region 3, natural-gas-producing regions designated by New York State. The final gas unit of production value for Medina Region 2 and Medina Region 3 was \$11.19 in 2010; the 2011 tentative gas unit of production value is \$11.32 (NYSDTF 2011). The 2010 overall full-value millage rates for Cattaraugus and Chautauqua Counties were 35.50 and 32.10, respectively (see Table 2.86). These rates have already been equalized and include the rates of all taxing districts in the county, including county, town, village, school district, and other special district rates.

Table 2.86 - Gas Economic Profile for Medina Region 2 and State Equalization Rates and Millage Rates for Region C (New August 2011)

	Final Gas Unit of Production Value (2010)^a	Millage Rate^b (2010)
Cattaraugus County	\$11.19	35.50
Chautauqua County	\$11.19	32.10

Sources:

^a NYSDTF 2011.

^b NYS Office of the State Comptroller 2010b. Millage rates represent the “overall full-value tax rate” and include the rates of all taxing districts in the county, including county, town, village, school district, and special districts rates.

Table 2.87 presents local government expenditures for Region C during the fiscal year ending December 31, 2009. Social services combined to create the largest single expenditure in both Cattaraugus and Chautauqua Counties, and thus in Region C. Approximately 30% of the counties' collective operating and capital budgets were spent on social services during the fiscal year ending December 31, 2009. Expenditure categories within social services include social service administration, financial assistance, Medicaid, non-Medicaid medical assistance, housing assistance, employment services, youth services, public facilities, and miscellaneous social services. Other major expenditures in Region C included general government (19.7%), employee benefits (13.4%), and transportation (10.2%). Public safety accounted for approximately 7.2% of total expenditures in Region C, including \$12,866,430 for police, \$260,959 for fire protection, and \$100,667 for emergency response (NYS Office of the State Comptroller 2010a).

Table 2.87 - Region C: Expenditures for FY Ending December 31, 2009 (New August 2011)

	Cattaraugus County		Chautauqua County		Region B	
	Total \$	% of Total	Total \$	% of Total	Total \$	% of Total
General Government	\$38,547,702	20.2	\$51,753,045	19.4	\$90,300,747	19.7
Education	\$6,779,075	3.5	\$10,119,356	3.8	\$16,898,431	3.7
Public Safety	\$13,349,284	7.0	\$19,805,376	7.4	\$33,154,660	7.2
Health	\$23,233,153	12.2	\$14,164,348	5.3	\$37,397,501	8.2
Transportation	\$20,346,282	10.7	\$26,489,032	9.9	\$46,835,314	10.2
Social Services	\$49,828,802	26.1	\$87,553,524	32.8	\$137,382,326	30.0
Economic Development	\$1,278,250	0.7	\$3,395,624	1.3	\$4,673,874	1.0
Culture and Recreation	\$1,489,536	0.8	\$694,416	0.3	\$2,183,952	0.5
Community Services	\$2,877,290	1.5	\$3,752,921	1.4	\$6,630,211	1.4
Utilities	\$0	0.0	\$21,402	<0.1	\$21,402	<0.1
Sanitation	\$2,004,345	1.0	\$7,288,201	2.7	\$9,292,546	2.0
Employee Benefits	\$23,122,461	12.1	\$38,268,359	14.4	\$61,390,820	13.4
Debt Service	\$8,144,509	4.3	\$3,368,753	1.3	\$11,513,262	2.5
Total Expenditures	\$191,000,689	100.0	\$266,674,357	100.0	\$457,675,046	100.0

Source: NYS Office of the State Comptroller 2010a.

2.4.11.5 *Environmental Justice*

New York State

Nearly each county in New York State has census block groups that may be considered potential EJ areas. The term "environmental justice" refers to a Federal policy established by Executive Order 12898 (59 Federal Register [FR] 7629) under which each Federal agency identifies and

addresses, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority or low-income populations. In response to EO 12898 the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency developed a definition of EJ as follows:

The fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. Fair treatment means that no group of people, including a racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic group, should bear a disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial, municipal, and commercial operations or the execution of federal, state, local, and tribal programs and policies.

The Department's Commissioner Policy 29 (the Policy) on Environmental Justice and Permitting expands upon Executive Order 12898, defining a potential EJ area as a minority or low-income community that bears a disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial, municipal, and commercial operations or the execution of federal, state, local, and tribal programs and policies.

The New York State Policy defines a minority population as a group of individuals that are identified or recognized as African-American, Asian American/Pacific Islander, American Indian, or Hispanic. A minority community exists where a census block group, or multiple census block groups, has a minority population equal to or greater than 51.1% in urban areas or 33.8% in rural areas. Rural and urban area classifications are established by the USCB. Urban area means all territory, population, and housing units located in urbanized areas and in places of 2,500 or more inhabitants outside of an urbanized area. An urbanized area is a continuously built-up area with a population of 50,000 or more. Rural area means territory, population, and housing units that are not classified as an urban area.

A low-income population is defined by the Policy as a group of individuals having an annual income that is less than the poverty threshold established by the USCB. A low-income community is a census block group, or area with multiple census block groups, having a low-

income population equal to or greater than 23.59% of the total population for whom poverty status is determined.

The Policy applies to applications for major projects and major modifications for the permits authorized by the following sections of the Environmental Conservation Law:

- Titles 7 and 8 of Article 17, SPDES (implemented by 6 NYCRR Part 750 et seq.);
- Article 19, Air Pollution Control (implemented by 6 NYCRR Part 201 et seq.);
- Title 7 of Article 27, solid waste management (implemented by 6 NYCRR Part 360): including minor modifications involving any tonnage increases beyond the approved design capacity and minor modifications involving an increase in the amount of putrescible solid waste beyond the amount that has already been approved in the existing permit;
- Title 9 of Article 27, industrial hazardous waste management (implemented by 6 NYCRR Part 373); and
- Title 11 of Article 27, siting of industrial hazardous waste facilities (implemented by 6 NYCRR Part 361).

A Department permit applicant must conduct a preliminary screen to identify whether the proposed action is located in a potential EJ area. The applicant also must identify potential adverse environmental impacts within the area to be affected. The Department provides online mapping for each New York State county to assist applicants in identifying potential EJ areas. Census block data is utilized to identify these areas. The mapping referenced in this section was last updated in 2005.

The following provides a discussion of the minority and low-income populations in the state and in each of the representative regions for background information.

In 2010, the percent minority population in New York State was 34.25%. The Hispanic population was 17.6% in 2010; and the percent of persons living below poverty level in 2009 was 13.9%.

According to the 2010 Census of Population and Housing, approximately 97.0% of residents of New York State identify themselves as being of a single race: 65.8% of the population of New

York State self-identify as White; 15.9% as Black or African American; 0.6% as American Indian and Alaska Native; 7.3% as Asian; less than (<) 0.1% as Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Island; and 7.4% as some other race (USCB 2010). The remaining 3.0% of the population self-identifies as two or more races (see Table 2.88).

Persons of Hispanic or Latino origin are defined as individuals who identified themselves as Hispanic or Latino on the 2010 Census, regardless of race. In New York State, 17.6% of the population self-identifies as being Hispanic or Latino.

Table 2.88 presents a summary of the total population of New York State by the race/ethnicity categories defined by the USCB.

Table 2.88 - Racial and Ethnicity Characteristics for New York State (New August 2011)

Population Category	Population	Percentage of Total 2010 Population
Total 2010 Population	19,378,102	100.0%
White Only	12,740,940	65.8%
Black or African American Only	3,073,800	15.9%
American Indian and Alaska Native Only	106,906	0.6%
Asian Only	1,420,244	7.3%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Only	8,766	< 0.1%
Some Other Race Only	1,441,563	7.4%
Total Population of One Race	18,792,219	97.0%
Two or more races	585,849	3.0%
Hispanic or Latino	3,416,922	17.6

Source: USCB 2010.

The categories presented in this table are defined by the USCB. A person must have self-identified during the 2010 census to be included within any of these categories in the *2010 Census of Population and Housing*.

Region A


In 2010, the combined percent minority for Region A was 10.51%. Chemung and Broome Counties had similar percentages of minority population, while Tioga County had a relatively low percentage (3.07% minority). Region A had a combined percent Hispanic population of 1.82%. The counties which comprise Region A, both collectively and individually, are not considered minority communities.

The combined poverty level of Region A in 2009 was 14.4% in 2009, while Tioga County had a lower percentage (10.0%) than Broome and Chemung Counties. The poverty level for Region A is lower than the New York State EJ threshold for a low-income community (23.59%).


The Department's 2005 preliminary screen mapping for each county identifies potential EJ areas at the census block group level. These maps were combined to illustrate potential EJ areas in Region A (Figure 2.7). The mapping indicates that some census blocks in Chemung County (towns of Elmira and Ashland); Tioga County (towns of Barton and Owego); and Broome County (towns of Vestal and Kirkwood) are potential EJ areas based on their minority and/or low-income populations.

According to the 2010 Census of Population and Housing, approximately 97.6% of the individuals in Region A identify themselves as being of a single race: 89.5% of the population of Region A self-identifies as White; 4.6% as Black or African American; 0.2% as American Indian and Alaska Native; 2.5% as Asian; less than (<) 0.1% as Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Island; and 0.8% as some other race (USCB 2010). The remaining 2.4% self-identifies as two or more races.

In Region A, 1.8% of the population self-identifies as being Hispanic or Latino. Table 2.89 presents a summary of the total population of Region A by the race/ethnicity categories defined by the USCB.



Pennsylvania



- Representative Region A
- County Boundary
- State Boundary
- Urban Area
- ~ River/Stream
- Highway/Major Road
- Secondary Road
- Potential Environmental Justice Area

Figure 2.7: Potential Environmental Justice Areas for Region A

Source: NY DEC, 2005, http://www.dec.ny.gov/docs/permits_ej_operations_pdf/broomeco.pdf; USGS, 2002

Table 2.89 - Region A: Racial and Ethnicity Characteristics (New August 2011)

Population Category	Population	Percentage of Total 2010 Population
Broome County		
Total 2010 Population	200,600	100.0%
White Only	176,444	88.0%
Black or African American Only	9,614	4.8%
American Indian and Alaska Native Only	396	0.2%
Asian Only	7,065	3.5%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Only	82	<0.1%
Some Other Race Only	1,912	1.0%
Total Population of One Race	195,513	97.5%
Two or more races	5,087	2.5%
Hispanic or Latino	4,334	2.2%
Chemung County		
Total 2010 Population	88,830	100.0%
White Only	78,771	88.7%
Black or African American Only	5,828	6.6%
American Indian and Alaska Native Only	233	0.3%
Asian Only	1,057	1.2%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Only	20	< 0.1%
Some Other Race Only	539	0.6%
Total Population of One Race	86,448	97.4%
Two or more races	2,372	2.7%
Hispanic or Latino	1,436	1.6%
Tioga County		
Total 2010 Population	51,125	100.0%
White Only	49,556	96.9%
Black or African American Only	375	0.7%
American Indian and Alaska Native Only	86	0.2%
Asian Only	372	0.7%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Only	15	<0.1%
Some Other Race Only	146	0.3%
Total Population of One Race	50,550	98.9%
Two or more races	575	1.1%
Hispanic or Latino	412	0.8%
Region A Total		
Total 2010 Population	340,555	100.0%
White Only	304,771	89.5%
Black or African American Only	15,817	4.6%
American Indian and Alaska Native Only	715	0.2%
Asian Only	8,494	2.5%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Only	117	< 0.1%
Some Other Race Only	2,597	0.8%
Total Population of One Race	332,511	97.6%
Two or more races	8,034	2.4%
Hispanic or Latino	6,182	1.8%

Source: USCB 2010.

The categories presented in this table are defined by the USCB. A person must have self-identified during the 2010 census to be included within any of these categories in the *2010 Census of Population and Housing*.

Region B

Region B comprises three counties: Sullivan, Delaware, and Otsego Counties. The 2010 combined percent minority for Region B was 10.45%. Delaware and Otsego Counties had similar percentages of minority population, while Sullivan County had a relatively higher percentage (18.04% minority). Region B had a combined percent Hispanic population of 5.02%, with Sullivan County having a slightly higher percentage of Hispanic persons at approximately 9% of total population. The counties which comprise Region B are not considered minority communities. The combined poverty level of Region B was 15.0% in 2009. The poverty level for Region B is lower than the New York State EJ threshold for a low-income community (23.59%).

The Department's 2005 preliminary screen mapping for each county identifies potential EJ areas at the census block group level. These maps were combined to illustrate potential EJ areas in Region B (Figure 2.8). The mapping indicates that some census blocks in Otsego County (town of Oneonta) and Sullivan County (towns of Delaware, Rockland, Liberty, Fallsburg, Bethel, and Thompson) are potential EJ areas based on their minority and/or low-income populations. There are no mapped potential EJ areas in Delaware County.

According to the 2010 Census of Population and Housing, approximately 97.9% of the individuals in Region B identify themselves as being of a single race: 89.6% of the population of Region B self-identifies as White; 4.7% as Black or African American; 0.3% as American Indian and Alaska Native; 1.1% as Asian; less than (<) 0.01% as Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Island; and 2.1% as some other race (USCB 2010). The remaining 2.1% self-identify as being of two or more races.

Persons of Hispanic or Latino origin are defined as individuals who identified themselves as a Hispanic or Latino on the 2010 Census, regardless of race. In Region B, 5.0% of the population self-identifies as being Hispanic or Latino.

Table 2.90 presents a summary of the total population of Region B by the race/ethnicity categories defined by the USCB.





Figure 2.8: Potential Environmental Justice Areas for Region B

Source: NY DEC, 2005, http://www.dec.ny.gov/docs/permits_ej_operations_pdf/broomeco.pdf; USGS, 2002

Table 2.90 - Region B: Racial and Ethnicity Characteristics (New August 2011)

Population Category	Population	Percentage of Total 2010 Population
Delaware County		
Total 2010 Population	47,980	100.0%
White Only	45,675	95.2%
Black or African American Only	779	1.6%
American Indian and Alaska Native Only	131	0.3%
Asian Only	367	0.8%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Only	12	< 0.1%
Some Other Race Only	394	0.8%
Total Population of One Race	47,358	98.7%
Two or more races	622	1.3%
Hispanic or Latino	1,058	2.2%
Otsego County		
Total 2010 Population	62,259	100.0%
White Only	58,935	94.7%
Black or African American Only	1,066	1.7%
American Indian and Alaska Native Only	121	0.2%
Asian Only	674	1.1%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Only	18	< 0.1%
Some Other Race Only	413	0.7%
Total Population of One Race	61,227	98.4%
Two or more races	1,032	1.7%
Hispanic or Latino	1,391	2.2%
Sullivan County		
Total 2010 Population	77,547	100.0%
White Only	63,560	82.0%
Black or African American Only	7,039	9.1%
American Indian and Alaska Native Only	354	0.5%
Asian Only	1,075	1.4%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Only	24	< 0.1%
Some Other Race Only	3,229	4.2%
Total Population of One Race	75,281	97.2%
Two or more races	2,266	2.9%
Hispanic or Latino	6,986	9.0%
Region B Total		
Total 2010 Population	187,786	100.0%
White Only	168,170	89.6%
Black or African American Only	8,884	4.7%
American Indian and Alaska Native Only	606	0.3%
Asian Only	2,116	1.1%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Only	54	< 0.1%
Some Other Race Only	4,036	2.1%
Total Population of One Race	183,866	97.9%
Two or more races	3,920	2.1%
Hispanic or Latino	9,435	5.0%

Source: USCB 2010.

The categories presented in this table are defined by the USCB. A person must have self-identified during the 2010 census to be included within any of these categories in the *2010 Census of Population and Housing*.


Region C

Region C comprises Chautauqua and Cattaraugus Counties. The 2010 combined percent minority for Region C was 7.30%. Region C had a combined percent Hispanic population of 2.68%, with Chautauqua County having a higher percentage (3.70%) than Cattaraugus County. Region C is not considered a minority community. The combined poverty level of Region C was 2.3% in 2009. The poverty level for Region C is lower than the New York State EJ threshold for a low-income community (23.59%).

The Department's 2005 preliminary screen mapping was combined to illustrate potential EJ areas in Region C (Figure 2.9). The mapping indicates that some census blocks in Cattaraugus County are potential EJ areas based on their minority and/or low-income populations. These municipalities include Perrysburg, Leon, New Albion, Conewango, Albion, South Valley, Cold Spring, Red House, Salamanca, Carrolton, and Allegany. Some census blocks in Chautauqua County (Jamestown, Portland, Pomfret, Dunkirk and Hanover) are potential EJ areas.

According to the 2010 Census of Population and Housing, 98.2% of the individuals in Region C identify themselves as being of a single race: 92.7% of the population of Region C self-identifies as White; 2.0% as Black or African American; 1.5% as American Indian and Alaska Native; 0.6% as Asian; less than 0.1% as Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Island; and 1.4% as some other race (USCB 2010). The remaining 1.9% self-identify as being of two or more races.

Persons of Hispanic or Latino origin are defined as individuals who identified themselves as Hispanic or Latino on the 2010 Census, regardless of race. In Region C, 2.7% of the population self-identifies as being Hispanic or Latino.












-  Representative Region C
-  River/Stream
-  Potential Environmental Justice Area
-  County Boundary
-  Highway/Major Road
-  Secondary Road
-  State Boundary
-  Urban Area
-  Tribal Lands Boundary

Figure 2.9: Potential Environmental Justice Areas for Region C

Source: NY DEC, 2005, http://www.dec.ny.gov/docs/permits_ej_operations_pdf/broomeco.pdf; USGS, 2002

Table 2.91 presents a summary of the total population of Region C by the race/ethnicity categories defined by the USCB.

Table 2.91 - Region C: Racial and Ethnicity Characteristics (New August 2011)

Population Category	Population	Percentage of Total 2010 Population
Cattaraugus County		
Total 2010 Population	80,317	100.0%
White Only	74,639	92.9%
Black or African American Only	1,024	1.3%
American Indian and Alaska Native Only	2,443	3.0%
Asian Only	528	0.7%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Only	15	< 0.1%
Some Other Race Only	305	0.4%
Total Population of One Race	78,954	98.3%
Two or more races	1,363	1.7%
Hispanic or Latino	786	1.0%
Chautauqua County		
Total 2010 Population	134,905	100.0%
White Only	124,875	92.6%
Black or African American Only	3,197	2.4%
American Indian and Alaska Native Only	689	0.5%
Asian Only	688	0.5%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Only	36	< 0.1%
Some Other Race Only	2,669	2.0%
Total Population of One Race	132,154	98.0%
Two or more races	2,751	2.0%
Hispanic or Latino	4,991	3.7%
Region C Total		
Total 2010 Population	215,222	100.0%
White Only	199,514	92.7%
Black or African American Only	4,221	2.0%
American Indian and Alaska Native Only	3,132	1.5%
Asian Only	1,216	0.6%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Only	51	< 0.1%
Some Other Race Only	2,974	1.4%
Total Population of One Race	211,108	98.2%
Two or more races	4,114	1.9%
Hispanic or Latino	5,777	2.7%

Source: USCB 2010.


The categories presented in this table are defined by the USCB. A person must have self-identified during the 2010 census to be included within any of these categories in the *2010 Census of Population and Housing*.

2.4.12 Visual Resources⁵⁵

As stated in Section 1.3, oil and gas drilling is expected to occur statewide, with the exceptions of (1) state-owned lands that constitute the Adirondack and Catskill Forest Preserves (the state constitution requires that these areas remain forever wild and not be leased or sold), and (2) those areas of the Adirondacks region, NYC, and Long Island where subsurface geology renders drilling for hydrocarbons unlikely. No site-specific project locations are being evaluated in the SGEIS; however, the Marcellus and Utica Shales are the most prominent shale formations in New York State, and the prospective region for the extraction of natural gas from these formations generally extends from Chautauqua County eastward to Greene, Ulster, and Sullivan Counties, and from the Pennsylvania border north to the approximate location of the east-west portion of the New York State Thruway between Schenectady and Auburn (Figure 2.10). This region covers all or parts of 30 counties. Fourteen counties are located entirely within this area, and 16 counties are located partially within the area.

For the purposes of impact analysis, visual resources located within the areas underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York may be considered representative of the types of visual resources that would be encountered statewide. Therefore, this section describes the existing federally and state-designated visual resources within the boundaries of this area in New York. The potential for other visual resources and visually sensitive areas within the areas underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York, which are defined by regional planning entities, county and town agencies, and local communities and their residents, is also acknowledged in this section. All of these types of visual resources and visually sensitive areas (federal, state, and local) also contribute to the ‘sense of place’ that defines the character of a community, which is discussed in Section 2.4.10.

⁵⁵ Subsection 2.4.12, in its entirety, was provided by Ecology and Environment Engineering, P.C., August 2011 and was adapted by the Department.



- City with Year 2000 Population Greater than 25,000
- Major Water Bodies
- County Boundary
- State Boundary
- Boundary of Area of Interest for Visual Resources
- Marcellus Shale Extent in New York State
- Utica Shale Extent in New York State
- /// Extent of Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York State

Figure 2.10: Area of Interest for Visual Resources

Source: ESRI, 2010; USGS, 2002

Criteria for identifying visual resources are defined in the Department's Program Policy DEP-00-2, "Assessing and Mitigating Visual Impacts" (NYSDEC 2000). Federally designated visual resources include, but are not limited to, National Historic Landmarks (NHL); properties listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP); National Natural Landmarks (NNL); National Wildlife Refuges; National Parks, Recreation Areas, Seashores and Forests, as applicable; National Wild and Scenic Rivers and American Heritage Rivers; and National Scenic, Historic and Recreation Trails.

State-designated visual resources include, but are not limited to, properties listed or eligible for listing in the State Register of Historic Places; Heritage Areas (formerly Urban Cultural Parks); State Forest Preserves; State Game Refuges, State Wildlife Management Areas and Multiple Use Areas; State Parks, Day Use Areas, Nature Preserves and Historic Preserves; State Wild, Scenic and Recreational Rivers; State Scenic Byways, Parkways and Roads; State Conservation Areas and other sites, areas, lakes, or reservoirs designated or eligible for designation as scenic in accordance with ECL Article 49 or the DOT equivalent; Critical Environmental Areas; Scenic Areas of Statewide Significance; State Trails; and Bond Act Properties purchased under the Exceptional Scenic Beauty or Open Space Category. The New York Statewide Trails Plan, Open Space Conservation Plan, and Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan were also consulted during the development of the existing environmental setting for visual resources (OPRHP 2008, 2009, 2010).

Based on NYSDEC Program Policy DEP-00-2, the visual resources analysis for this draft SGEIS includes the following:

- The definitions of the specific visual resource or visually sensitive area, including descriptions of relevant regulations, where appropriate.
- The number of the specific visual resources or visually sensitive areas within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York organized by county, where appropriate.
- Figures showing the locations of specific visual resources or visually sensitive areas within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York.

- Where appropriate, a table summarizing information for specific visual resources or visually sensitive areas, generally focusing on visual, aesthetic, or scenic qualities of the resource, if known, and organized by county.

2.4.12.1 Historic Properties and Cultural Resources

This section discusses historic properties and other cultural resources that are considered visual resources per NYSDEC Program Policy DEP-00-2, including properties listed in the National and State Registers of Historic Places (including National Historic Landmarks), state historic sites, state historic parks, and state heritage areas (formerly urban cultural parks) (NYSDEC 2000). Historic properties and cultural resources are often considered significant partly because of their associated visual or aesthetic qualities. These visual or aesthetic qualities may be related to the integrity of the appearance of these properties or resources, or to the integrity of their settings. Viewsheds can also contribute to the significance of historic properties or cultural resources, and viewsheds that contain historic properties and cultural resources may be considered significant because of their presence in the landscape.

A property on or eligible for inclusion in the National or State Register of Historic Places (16 U.S.C. §470a et seq., Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation Law Section 14.07)

Historic properties are defined as those properties that have been listed in, or determined eligible for listing in, the NRHP (Advisory Council on Historic Preservation 2011). The NRHP, which is the official list of the nation's historic places worthy of preservation, was established under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (NPS 2011a; OPRHP 2011a). In general, historic properties are 50 years old or older, and they retain much of their original appearance because of the integrity of their location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association (OPRHP 2011a).

The National Park Service (NPS) maintains a database of properties listed in the NRHP. (This database does not include information for other properties determined to be eligible for listing in the NRHP.) At least 1,050 NRHP-listed properties have been identified within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (Table 2.92) (NPS 2011b, ESRI 2011). The significance of properties listed or eligible for listing on the NRHP may be derived in varying degrees from scenic or aesthetic qualities that may be considered visually sensitive.

Table 2.92 - Number of NRHP-Listed Historic Properties within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011)

County Name	Number of NRHP-listed Historic Properties within Entire County
Albany*	7
Allegany	27
Broome	52
Cattaraugus	26
Cayuga*	44
Chautauqua	45
Chemung	32
Chenango	39
Cortland	25
Delaware	62
Erie*	28
Genesee*	6
Greene*	45
Livingston*	74
Madison*	48
Oneida*	2
Onondaga*	18
Ontario*	37
Orange*	3
Otsego*	53
Schoharie*	15
Schuyler	14
Seneca*	10
Steuben	49
Sullivan*	64
Tioga	53
Tompkins	57
Ulster*	32
Wyoming	18
Yates	65
Total	1,050

Sources: NPS 2011b; ESRI 2010.

* Only a portion of the county is located within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York.

The State Register of Historic Places, which is the official list of New York State’s historic places worthy of preservation, was established under the New York State Historic Preservation act of 1980. The eligibility criteria for properties listed in the State Register of Historic Places are the same as the eligibility criteria for the NRHP (OPRHP 2011a). The OPRHP maintains the database of records for properties listed in, or determined eligible for listing in, the State and

National Registers of Historic Places (OPRHP 2011b). Over 250,000 properties located across New York State are included in this database, and the database provides information on whether the properties have been evaluated for State and/or National Register eligibility, and if evaluated, the eligibility status of the resource (OPRHP 2011c). The significance of properties listed or eligible for listing in the State Register of Historic Places may be derived in varying degrees from scenic or aesthetic qualities that may be considered visually sensitive.

National Heritage Areas

National Heritage Areas (NHAs) are designated by Congress. For an area to be considered for designation, certain key elements must be present. Of primary importance, the landscape must have nationally distinctive natural, cultural, historic, and scenic resources that, when linked together, tell a unique story about the nation. NHAs are not units of the NPS, nor are they owned or managed by the NPS. Each NHA is governed by separate authorizing legislation and operates under provisions unique to its resources and desired goals. The heritage area concept offers an innovative method for citizens, in partnership with local, state, and federal governments and nonprofit and private sector interests, to shape the long-term future of their communities (NPS 2010d, 2011g).

Two NHAs are located partially within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (Figure 2.11): portions of the Erie Canalway National Heritage Corridor in Erie, Ontario, Yates, Seneca, Cayuga, Schuyler, and Tompkins Counties; and portions of the Hudson River Valley NHA in Albany, Greene, Ulster, and Sullivan Counties (OPRHP 2007; NPS 2010d, 2011e; Erie Canalway National Heritage Corridor 2008; Hudson River Valley National Heritage Corridor 2011). These NHAs are likely to contain scenic or aesthetic areas that may be considered visual resources or visually sensitive.

Properties Designated as National Historic Landmarks

National Historic Landmarks (NHLs) are nationally significant historic places designated by the Secretary of the Interior because they possess exceptional value or quality in illustrating or interpreting the heritage of the United States (NPS 2011c). There are 19 NHLs located within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (Table 2.93 and Figure 2.11). Generally, these NHLs are historic buildings (residences, churches, civic buildings, and

institutional buildings), but other types of historic properties are also represented, including battlefields and canals (Table 2.93). The significance of NHL-designated properties may be derived in varying degrees from scenic or aesthetic qualities that may be considered visual resources or visually sensitive.

State Historic Sites and Historic Parks

State Historic Sites and State Historic Parks are historic and cultural places that tell the story of the New York State's rich heritage. Owned by New York State, these places are preserved and interpreted for the public's enjoyment, education, and enrichment (OPRHP 2011d). There are 12 State Historic Sites and two State Historic Parks in the counties located entirely or partially within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (OPRHP 2008). Of these 14 historic and cultural places, only two are within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York: Genesee Valley Canal State Historic Site in Livingston County and Lorenzo State Historic Site in Madison County (see Figure 2.11) (OPRHP 2011d). State Historic Sites and State Historic Parks may contain scenic or aesthetic qualities that may be considered visually sensitive.

Local Visually Sensitive Resources or Areas

The counties that are entirely or partially located within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York are expected to contain numerous other local visual resources or visually sensitive areas. These local visual resources or visually sensitive areas would be identified, defined and/or designated by regional planning entities and local (county and town) communities and their residents and would be in addition to the visual resources or visually sensitive areas described above that are defined or designated by federal and state agencies and guidance.

Table 2.93 - National Historic Landmarks (NHLs) Located within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011)

County Name*	Number of NHLs within County	Names of NHLs
Broome	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● New York State Inebriate Asylum
Cayuga**	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● William H. Seward House ● Harriet Tubman Home for the Aged ● Harriet Tubman Residence ● Thompson A.M.E. Zion Church ● Willard Memorial Chapel-Welch Memorial Hall ● Jethro Wood House
Chautauqua	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Chautauqua Historic District ● Lewis Miller Cottage, Chautauqua Institute
Chemung	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Newton Battlefield
Delaware	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● John Burroughs Memorial (Woodchuck Lodge)
Erie**	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Millard Fillmore House ● Roycroft Campus
Madison**	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Gerrit Smith Estate
Orange**	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Delaware and Hudson Canal***
Otsego**	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hyde Hall
Seneca**	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Rose Hill
Sullivan**	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Delaware and Hudson Canal***
Tompkins	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Morrill Hall, Cornell University
Ulster**	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● John Burroughs Riverby Study ● Delaware and Hudson Canal***
Total	19	

Sources: ESRI 2010; NPS 2011d; OPRHP 2008.


* There are no NHLs within other counties located entirely or partially within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York.

** Only a portion of the county is located within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York.

*** The Delaware and Hudson Canal NHL traverses portions of three counties (Orange, Sullivan, and Ulster).

State Heritage Areas (former Urban Cultural Parks [Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation Law Section 35.15])

The State Heritage Area System, formerly known as the Urban Cultural Park System, is a state and local partnership established to preserve and develop areas that have special significance to New York State (OPRHP 2011e). New York State Heritage Areas are places where unique qualities of geography, history, and culture create a distinctive identity that becomes the focus of four heritage goals: preservation of significant resources; education that interprets lessons from the past; recreation and leisure activities; and economic revitalization for sustainable communities (OPRHP 2011f). Four regional or urban heritage areas or corridors are located entirely or partially within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (Figure 2.11): the Concord Grape Belt (Lake Erie) Heritage Area in Chautauqua and Cattaraugus Counties; portion of the Western Erie Canal Heritage Area in southern Erie County; portions of the Mohawk Valley Heritage Area in Oneida, Schoharie, and Albany Counties; and the Susquehanna Heritage Area in Broome County (OPRHP 2007, 2011e; 2011f; Concord Grape Belt Heritage Association 2011; Western Erie Canal Alliance 2010-2011). These State Heritage Areas are likely to contain scenic or aesthetic areas that may be considered visual resources or visually sensitive.



- | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| Major Water Bodies | Erie Canalway NHA | State Regional Heritage Area | National Register of Historic Places Site |
| County Boundary | Hudson River Valley NHA | Western Erie Canal | National Historic Landmark |
| State Boundary | State Urban Heritage Area | Concord Grape Belt | State Historic Site |
| Boundary of Area of Interest for Visual Resources | Mohawk Valley | | |
| | North Shore | | |

Figure 2.11: Visually Sensitive Areas Associated with Historic Properties and Cultural Resources

Source: ESRI, 2010; USGS, 2002; OPRHP, 2007, 2009, 2011; NYCSCIC, 2005; NPS, 2007

2.4.12.2 Parks and Other Recreation Areas

This section discusses parks and other recreation areas that are considered visual resources per NYSDEC Program Policy DEP-00-2, “Assessing and Mitigating Visual Impacts,” including state parks; properties included in the National Park System and areas defined as national recreation areas, seashores and forests; and state or federally designated trails (NYSDEC 2000). These recreation areas often contain scenic areas and/or are developed partly because of their associated visual or aesthetic qualities.

State Parks [Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation Law Section 14.07]

State Parks contain natural, historic, cultural, and/or recreational resources of significance to New York State. (Note that State Historic Parks are discussed separately in Section 2.4.12.1). Owned by New York State, these parks are maintained for the public’s use. Thirty-four state parks are located partially or entirely within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (Table 2.94 and Figure 2.12) (OPRHP 2008). These parks may contain scenic or aesthetic areas that may be considered visual resources or visually sensitive.

Table 2.94 - State Parks Located within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011)

County Name*	Number of State Parks within County	Names of State Parks within County
Albany**	1	● John Boyd Thacher State Park
Broome	2	● Chenango Valley State Park ● Oquaga Creek State Park
Cattaraugus	1	● Allegany State Park
Cayuga**	2	● Fillmore Glen State Park ● Long Point State Park
Chautauqua	2	● Lake Erie State Park ● Long Point on Lake Chautauqua State Park
Chemung	1	● Mark Twain State Park
Chenango	2	● Hunts Pond State Park ● Bowman Lake State Park
Delaware	1	● Oquaga Creek State Park
Erie**	3	● Evangola State Park ● Woodlawn Beach State Park ● Knox Farm State Park
Genesee**	1	● Darien Lakes State Park
Livingston**	1	● Letchworth State Park
Madison**	2	● Chittenango Falls State Park ● Helen L McNitt State Park (undeveloped)
Otsego**	3	● Gilbert Lake State Park ● Betty and Wilbur Davis State Park ● Glimmerglass State Park
Schoharie**	2	● Max V. Shaul State Park ● Mine Kill State Park
Schuyler	1	● Watkins Glen State Park
Seneca**	3	● Seneca Lake State Park ● Sampson State Park ● Taughannock Falls State Park
Steuben	2	● Stony Brook State Park ● Pinnacle State Park
Sullivan**	1	● Lake Superior State Park
Tompkins	3	● Taughannock Falls State Park ● Robert H. Treman State Park ● Buttermilk Falls State Park
Wyoming	2	● Letchworth State Park ● Silver Lake State Park (undeveloped)
Yates	1	● Keuka Lake State Park
Total	34***	

Sources: ESRI 2010; OPRHP 2008.

* No state parks within other counties entirely or partially within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in NYS.

** Only a portion of the county is located within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York.

***Letchworth State Park is in two counties (Wyoming and Livingston); Oquaga Creek State Park is in two counties (Broome and Delaware); Taughannock Falls State Park is in two counties (Seneca and Tompkins).

The National Park System, Recreation Areas, Seashores, Forests (16 U.S.C. 1c)

Properties included in the National Park System and areas defined as National Recreation Areas, Seashores and Forests contain natural, historic, cultural, and recreational resources of significance to the nation. Owned by the U.S. government and operated by various federal agencies, they are maintained for the public's use. At least five properties included in the National Park System are located in counties that are partially or entirely within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York: Women's Rights National Historic Park in Seneca County; Fort Stanwix National Monument in Oneida County; the North Country National Scenic Trail, which traverses New York State; Old Blenheim Covered Bridge in Schoharie County; and the Upper Delaware Scenic & Recreational River in Orange, Sullivan, and Delaware Counties (OPRHP 2008). One National Forest, the Finger Lakes National Forest in Seneca and Schuyler Counties, is located within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (Figure 2.12) (OPRHP 2008). No National Recreation Areas or National Seashores are located within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (OPRHP 2008). The federally-owned National Park System properties and the National Forest may contain scenic or aesthetic areas that may be considered visual resources or visually sensitive.

A state or federally designated trail, or one proposed for designation (16 U.S.C. Chapter 27 or equivalent)

New York State's natural and cultural resources provide for a broad range of land and water-based trails that offer multiple recreational experiences (Table 2.95). Each region of the state offers a unique setting and different opportunities for trails (OPRHP 2008). New York State breaks the existing system of trails into three general categories: primary trails that are of national, statewide, or regional significance and that are considered long-distance trails; secondary trails, which typically connect to a primary trail system but are generally within parks or open space areas; and stand-alone trails, which are trails of local significance that do not connect to a primary trail system. Stand-alone trails are generally loop trails, trails that connect to points of interest, or trails that provide short connections between parks, open spaces, historic sites and/or communities, or elements of a community (OPRHP 2008).

Additional state-designated trails include heritage trails, greenway trails, and/or water trails. Heritage trails are existing non-linear resources associated with historical movements or themes (OPRHP 2007, 2010). Greenway trails are existing and proposed multi-use trails located within linear corridors of open space that connect public places, connect people with nature, and protect areas for environmentally sustainable purposes that include recreation, conservation, and transportation (OPRHP 2007, 2010). Water trails, also known as blueways, are existing and proposed designated recreational water routes suitable for canoes, kayaks, and small motorized watercraft (OPRHP 2010).

One federally recognized trail, the North Country National Scenic Trail, traverses portions of the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York. The North Country National Scenic Trail, an approximately 3,200-mile-long trail extending from eastern New York State to North Dakota, is administered by the NPS (NPS 2010a, 2010b). The portion of the trail in New York is included in the system of trails shown on Figure 2.12. National Scenic Trails are designated under Section 5 of the National Trails System Act and are defined as extended trails located to provide for maximum outdoor recreation potential and for the conservation and enjoyment of the nationally significant scenic, historic, natural, or cultural qualities of the areas through which they pass (NPS 2010a). A number of these types of trails are shown on Figure 2.12. All of these types of trails are likely to contain scenic or aesthetic areas that may be considered visual resources or visually sensitive




Figure 2.12: Parks and Recreational Resources that May be Visually Sensitive

Source: ESRI, 2010; USGS, 2002; NYCSCIC, 2005; NPS, 2010; National Atlas US and USGS, 2010; OPRHP, 2011; NYSDOT, 2011

Table 2.95 - Select Trails Located within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011)

Name of Trail	Type of Trail
North County National Scenic Trail*	● Long-distance trail of national significance
Long Path*	● Long-distance trail of statewide significance
Finger Lakes Trail*	● Long-distance trail of statewide significance
Canalway Trail*	● Long-distance trail of statewide significance
Hudson River Valley Greenway Trail System*	● Long-distance trail of statewide significance
Hudson River Greenway Water Trail*	● Long-distance trail of statewide significance
Genesee Valley Greenway*	● Long-distance trail of statewide significance
The statewide Snowmobile Trail System*	● Long-distance trail of statewide significance
Conservation Trail*	● Long-distance hiking trail of regional significance
Letchworth Trail*	● Long-distance hiking trail of regional significance
Bristol Hills Trail*	● Long-distance hiking trail of regional significance
Link Trail*	● Long-distance hiking trail of regional significance
Shawangunk Ridge Trail	● Long-distance hiking trail of regional significance
Abraham Lincoln Heritage Trail	● State-designated Heritage Trail consisting of resources in Chautauqua, Onondaga, and Albany Counties
Women Heritage Trail	● State-designated Heritage Trail consisting of resources in Chautauqua, Wyoming, Ontario, Seneca, and Cayuga Counties
Underground Railroad Heritage Trail	● State-designated Heritage Trail consisting of resources in Wyoming, Chemung, Seneca, Cayuga, Onondaga, and Madison Counties
Revolutionary War Heritage Trail	● State-designated Heritage Trail consisting of resources in Chemung, Broome Madison, Otsego Schoharie, Sullivan and Orange Counties
French and Indian Heritage Trail	● State-designated Heritage Trail consisting of resources in Sullivan County
Catherine Valley Trail	● Multi-use trail located within linear corridors of open space in Chemung and Schuyler Counties
Catskill Scenic Trail	● Multi-use trail located within linear corridors of open space in Delaware County
Delaware & Hudson Canal Trail	● Multi-use trail located within linear corridors of open space in Sullivan and Ulster Counties
Erie Canalway Trail*	● Multi-use trail located within linear corridors of open space
Genesee Valley Greenway*	● Multi-use trail located within linear corridors of open space
Ontario Pathways Rail Trail	● Multi-use trail located within linear corridors of open space in Ontario County
Orange Heritage Trail	● Multi-use trail located within linear corridors of open space in Orange County
Pat McGee Trail	● Multi-use trail located within linear corridors of open space in Cattaraugus County
Wallkill Valley Rail Trail	● Multi-use trail located within linear corridors of open space in Ulster County
Marden Cobb Waterway Trail	● Recreational water route
Cayuga-Seneca Canal Trail, which is a component of the larger NYS Canalway Water Trail*	● Recreational water route
Chemung Basin River Trail*	● Recreational water route
Headwaters River Trail(s)*	● Recreational water route
Upper Delaware Scenic and Recreational River*	● Recreational water route
Proposed Triple Divide Water Trail*	● Proposed recreational water route

Sources: ESRI 2010; OPRHP 2007, 2010; NPS 2010a, 2010b.

* Trail traverses one or more counties

2.4.12.3 Natural Areas

This section discusses natural areas that are considered visual resources per NYSDEC Program Policy DEP-00-2, including state forest preserve areas; state nature and historic preserves; state or national wild, scenic and recreational rivers (designated and potential); national wildlife refuges, state game refuges, and state wildlife management areas; and national natural landmarks (NYSDEC 2000). These natural areas often contain scenic areas and/or are developed partly because of their associated visual or aesthetic qualities.

The State Forest Preserve (NYS Constitution Article XIV)



The State Forest Preserve consists of lands included in the Adirondack Forest Preserve (approximately 2.6 million acres) and the Catskill Forest Preserve (approximately 290,000 acres). These lands, which represent the majority of all state-owned property within the Adirondack and Catskill Parks, are protected as “forever wild” under Article XIV of the New York State Constitution. They are recognized as having exceptional scenic, recreational, and ecological value (NYSDEC 2011a, 2011b, 2011c).

The Adirondack Forest Preserve, located entirely within the Adirondack Park boundaries, is outside the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York. The Catskill Forest Preserve, located entirely within the Catskill Park boundaries, is located within the eastern part of this area in portions of Delaware, Greene, Ulster, and Sullivan Counties (Figure 2.12). Lands included in the Catskill Forest Preserve are likely to contain scenic or aesthetic areas that may be considered visual resources or visually sensitive.

State Nature and Historic Preserves (Section 4 of Article XIV of State Constitution)

State nature and historic preserves are parcels of land owned by the state that were acquired to protect the biological diversity of plants, animals, and natural communities, and which may provide a field laboratory for the observation of and education in these relationships. These areas may also provide for the protection of places of historical and natural interest, and may be used by the public for passive recreational pursuits that are compatible with protection of the ecological significance, historic features, and/or natural character of the areas designated as state nature and historic preserves (NYSDEC 2011d).

Eight state nature and historic preserves are located in the counties within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (Table 2.96). These state nature and historic preserves may contain scenic or aesthetic areas that may be considered visual resources or visually sensitive.



- | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Major Water Bodies | National Natural Landmark | National Wildlife Refuge |
| County Boundary | National Wild and Scenic River | State Forest Preserve |
| State Boundary | State Unique Area | State Wildlife Management Area |
| Boundary of Area of Interest for Visual Resources | | |

Figure 2.13: Natural Areas that May be Visually Sensitive

Source: ESRI, 2010; USGS, 2002; NYDEC, 2010; NPS, 2011; National Atlas US and USGS, 2010

Table 2.96 - State Nature and Historic Preserves in Counties Located within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011)

County Name*	Number of State Nature and Historic Preserves within County	Names of State Nature and Historic Preserves
Allegany	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Showy Lady Slipper Parcel (Town of New Hudson)
Cattaraugus	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zoar Valley Unique Area (Towns of Otto and Persia)
Cortland	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bog Brook (Towns of Southeast and Patterson) • Labrador Hollow (Town of Truxton)
Erie**	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinstein Woods (Town of Cheektowaga) • Zoar Valley Unique Area (Town of Collins)
Onondaga**	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Labrador Hollow (Town of Fabius)
Ontario**	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Squaw Island (Town of Canandaigua)
Yates	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parish Gully (Town of Italy) • Clark Gully (Towns of Middlesex and Italy)
Total	8***	

Sources: ESRI 2010; OPRHP 2008; NYSDEC 2011d.

* There are no State Nature and Historic Preserves within other counties located entirely or partially within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York.

** Only a portion of the county is located within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York.

*** Labrador Hollow is in two counties (Onondaga and Cortland); Zoar Valley Unique Area is in two counties (Cattaraugus and Erie).

Rivers designated as National or State Wild, Scenic or Recreational (16 U.S.C. Chapter 28, ECL 15-2701 et seq.)

National Wild, Scenic or Recreational Rivers are those rivers designated by Congress or the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968. The purpose of such designation is to preserve those rivers with outstanding natural, cultural, and recreational values in a free-flowing condition for the enjoyment of present and future generations. Wild rivers are those rivers or sections of rivers that are free of impoundments and generally inaccessible except by trail, with watershed or shorelines essentially primitive and waters unpolluted. These represent vestiges of primitive America. Scenic rivers are those rivers or sections of rivers that are free of impoundments, with shorelines or a watershed still largely primitive and shorelines largely undeveloped, but accessible in places by roads. Recreational rivers are those rivers or sections of rivers that are readily accessible by road or railroad, that may have some development along their shorelines, and that may have undergone some impoundment or diversion in the past (National Wild and Scenic Rivers System 2011a).

A portion of only one river, the Delaware River (also known as the Upper Delaware Scenic and Recreational River), has been designated a National Wild and Scenic River in New York State (National Wild and Scenic Rivers System 2011b, 2011c; NPS 2010c). This portion of the Delaware River, located in Delaware County along the New York-Pennsylvania border, is within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (see Table 2.97 and Figure 2.13). Designated in part for its scenic qualities, this portion of the Delaware River contains scenic areas that may be considered visual resources or visually sensitive.

A portion of one other water body in New York State, the East Branch of Fish Creek, located in Lewis County, was studied for its potential for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (National Wild and Scenic Rivers System 2011d). This portion of Fish Creek is located in Oneida County, which is partially located within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (Table 2.97).

Section 5(d) of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 requires federal agencies to consider the effects of planned use and development on potential national wild and scenic river areas. In partial fulfillment of this requirement, the NPS has compiled and maintains a Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI), which is a register of river segments that potentially qualify as National Wild, Scenic or Recreational River areas (NPS 2008a).

In order to be listed on the NRI, a river must be free-flowing and possess one or more Outstanding Remarkable Values (ORVs). In order to be assessed as outstandingly remarkable, a river-related value must be a unique, rare, or exemplary feature that is significant at a comparative regional or national scale. Such values must be directly river-related: located in the river or on its immediate shorelands (generally within 0.25 mile on either side of the river); contribute substantially to the function of the river ecosystem; and/or owe their location or existence to the presence of the river. ORVs may involve values associated with scenery, recreation, geology, fish, wildlife, prehistory, history, cultural, or other values (e.g., hydrology, paleontology, or botany resources) (NPS 2008a).

Portions of 17 NRI-listed rivers or water bodies are located partially or entirely within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (Table 2.97). Many of these rivers or water bodies have been designated in part for their scenic qualities, and all of these rivers or water bodies may contain scenic areas that may be considered visual resources or visually sensitive.

State-designated Wild, Scenic and Recreational Rivers are those rivers or portions of rivers of the state of New York protected by the state's Wild Scenic and Recreational Rivers Act. This act protects those rivers of the state that possess outstanding scenic, ecological, recreational, historic, and scientific values. Attributes of these rivers may include value derived from fish and wildlife and botanical resources, aesthetic quality, archaeological significance, and other cultural and historic features. State policy is to preserve designated rivers in a free-flowing condition, protecting them from improvident development and use, and to preserve the enjoyment and benefits derived from these rivers for present and future generations (NYSDEC 2011e).

Portions of two state-designated Wild, Scenic and Recreational Rivers - the Genesee River and the Upper Delaware River - flow within counties located partially or entirely within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (Table 2.97). These rivers have been designated, in part, for their scenic qualities, and both of these rivers may contain scenic areas that may be considered visual resources or visually sensitive.

Table 2.97 - National and State Wild, Scenic and Recreational Rivers (designated or potential) Located within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011)

County Name*	Name of River or Water Body	Designation Status
Albany**	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portion of Catskill Creek*** 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listed in NRI in 1982
Allegany	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portions of Genesee River*** 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listed in NRI in 1982; updated in 1995 • Designated a State Wild, Scenic and Recreational River
Cattaraugus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portions of Allegheny River • Portions of Cattaraugus Creek*** • Portion of Conewango Creek *** 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listed in NRI in 1982, updated in 1995 • Listed in NRI in 1982; updated in 1995 • Listed in NRI in 1982
Cayuga**	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portion of Fall Creek*** 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated a State Wild, Scenic and Recreational River
Chautauqua	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portion of Cattaraugus Creek*** • Portion of Chautauqua Creek • Portion of Conewango Creek*** 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listed in NRI in 1982; updated in 1995 • Listed in 1982 • Listed in NRI in 1982
Chemung	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portion of Chemung River 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listed in NRI in 1982
Delaware	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delaware River (Upper)*** • Portions of Delaware River, East Branch 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated a National Wild & Scenic River in 1978 • Listed in NRI in 1982 and 1995
Erie**	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portions of Cattaraugus Creek*** 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listed in NRI in 1982; updated in 1995
Greene**	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portion of Batavia Kill 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listed in NRI in 1982
Livingston**	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portions of Genesee River*** 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listed in NRI in 1982; updated in 1995 • Designated a State Wild, Scenic and Recreational River
Orange**	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portion of Basher Kill *** 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listed in NRI in 1995
Steuben	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portion of Canisteo River • Portion of Cohocton River 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listed in NRI in 1995 • Listed in NRI in 1995
Sullivan**	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delaware River (Upper)*** • Portion of Basher Kill*** • Portion of Beaver Kill*** • Portions of Neversink River, including East and West Branches • Portion of Mongaup Creek 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated a National Wild and Scenic River in 1978 • Listed in NRI in 1995 • Listed in NRI in 1992; updated in 1995 • Listed in 1982 and 1995 • Listed in NRI in 1995
Tompkins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portion of Fall Creek*** 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated a State Wild, Scenic and Recreational River
Ulster**	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portion of Beaver Kill*** • Portion of Esopus Creek • Portions of Neversink River, including East and West Branches 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listed in NRI in 1992; updated in 1995 • Listed in NRI in 1995 • Listed in 1982 and 1995
Wyoming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portions of Genesee River*** 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listed in NRI in 1982; updated in 1995 • Designated a State Wild, Scenic and Recreational River

Sources: ESRI 2010; NPS 2008a, 2009a, 2010c; OPRHP 2008; NYSDEC 2011f.

* There are no national or state Wild, Scenic and Recreational Rivers within other counties located entirely or partially within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York.

** Only a portion of the county is located within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York.

*** Portions of the Genesee River are in three counties (Allegany, Wyoming, and Livingston); portions of the Beaver Kill are in two counties (Ulster and Sullivan); portions of Cattaraugus Creek are in three counties (Erie, Cattaraugus, and Chautauqua); Conewango Creek is in two counties (Chautauqua and Cattaraugus); Basher Kill is in two counties (Orange and Sullivan); the Upper Delaware River is in two counties (Delaware and Sullivan); Fall Creek is in two counties (Cayuga and Tompkins).

National Wildlife Refuges (16 U.S.C. 668dd), State Game Refuges and State Wildlife Management Areas (ECL 11-2105)

National Wildlife Refuges (NWRs) are a network of lands and waters included in the National Wildlife Refuge system and managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. These lands and waters are set aside for the conservation, management and, where appropriate, restoration of fish, wildlife, and plant resources and their habitats. In addition to the task of conserving wildlife, NWRs may also be managed for six wildlife-dependent recreational uses: hunting, fishing, wildlife observation, photography, and environmental education and interpretation. There are three NWRs in counties that are partially within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales of New York: The Iroquois NWR in Genesee and Orleans Counties; the Montezuma NWR in Seneca and Wayne Counties; and the Shawangunk Grasslands NWR in Ulster County (USFWS 2011). However, none of the NWRs are located within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (Figure 2.13).

New York State's ECL (11-2105) defines state game refuges as lands set aside or established for the protection of wildlife and fish. Such lands remain game refuges until the state permits the taking of wildlife or fish within these lands. State Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs) are lands owned by New York State that have been acquired primarily for the production and use of wildlife, including research on wildlife species and habitat management. WMAs are under the control and management of the Department's DFWMR. While fishing, hunting and trapping are the most widely practiced recreational activities on many WMAs, most also provide opportunities for hiking, cross-country skiing, bird watching, or enjoying nature (NYSDEC 2011g).

There are 42 state game refuges or WMAs within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (Table 2.98 and Figure 2.13). Many of the lands included in state game refuges or WMAs contain scenic areas that may be considered visual resources or visually sensitive.

Table 2.98 - State Game Refuges and State Wildlife Management Areas Located within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011)

County Name*	Number of State Game Refuges and WMAs	Name of State Game Refuges or WMA
Albany**	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Louise E. Keir WMA • Partridge Run WMA
Allegany	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alma Pond • Genesee Valley WMA • Hanging Bog WMA • Keeney Swamp WMA
Cattaraugus	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conewango Swamp WMA • Harwood Lake MUA
Chautauqua	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alder Bottom WMA • Canadaway Creek WMA • Clay Pond WMA • Hartson Swamp WMA • Jacquins Pond WMA • Kabob WMA • Tom's Point WMA • Watts Flats WMA
Chenango	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pharsalia WMA
Delaware	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bear Spring Mountain WMA • Wolf Hollow WMA
Erie**	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hampton Brook Woods WMA
Greene**	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vinegar Hill WMA
Livingston**	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conesus Inlet WMA • Rattlesnake Hill WMA
Madison**	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tioughnioga WMA
Ontario**	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Honeoye Creek WMA • Stid Hill MUA
Orange**	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cherry Island WMA
Otsego**	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crumhorn Mountain WMA • Hooker Mountain WMA
Schoharie**	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Franklinton Vlaie WMA
Schuyler	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catharine Creek WMA • Waneta-Lamoka WMA
Seneca**	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Willard WMA
Steuben	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cold Brook WMA • Erwin WMA • Helmer Creek WMA • West Cameron WMA
Sullivan**	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bashakill WMA • Mongaup Valley WMA
Tompkins	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connecticut Hill WMA
Wyoming	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Silver Lake Outlet WMA
Yates	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High Tor WMA
Total	42	

Source: ESRI 2010; NYSDEC 2011g, 2011h; USFWS 2011.

* No other NWRs or state game refuges or wildlife management areas in New York State are located within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York.

** Only a portion of the county is located within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York State.

National Natural Landmarks [36 CFR Part 62]

National Natural Landmarks (NNLs) are sites that contain outstanding biological and/or geological resources, regardless of land ownership, and are selected for their outstanding condition, illustrative value, rarity, diversity, and value to science and education. NNL sites are designated by the Secretary of the Interior, with landowner concurrence (NPS 2008b, 2009b, 2011e). Five NNLs are located within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (Figure 2.13 and Table 2.99). These NNLs are a combination of unique ecological settings such as bogs or marshes and geological features (NPS 2011f). They are likely to contain aesthetic areas that may be considered visual resources or visually sensitive.

Table 2.99 - National Natural Landmarks Located within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011)

County Name*	Name of National Natural Landmark	Description
Albany	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Bear Swamp 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Designated in 1973 ● Low, swampy woodland with relict stands of great laurel
Allegany	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Moss Lake Bog 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Designated in 1973 ● Post-glacial sphagnum bog in a small kettle lake
Cattaraugus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Deer Lick Nature Sanctuary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Designated in 1967 ● Gorge and mature northern hardwood forest
Livingston	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Fall Brook Gorge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Designated in 1970 ● Gorge exposing Upper and Middle Devonian Age geological strata with fossil remains and a waterfall ● Series of ecological communities developed in response to sharply contrasting microclimates
Tompkins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● McLean Bogs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Designated in 1973 ● Two spring-fed bogs, one acidic and one alkaline ● Rare plant species and one of the best examples of a northern deciduous forest in New York

Sources: ESRI 2010; NPS 2011f.

* None of the other NNLs in New York State, including those in Genesee, Onondaga, Seneca, and Ulster Counties, are located within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York

2.4.12.4 Additional Designated Scenic or Other Areas



This section discusses additional designated scenic or other areas that are considered visual resources or visually sensitive per NYSDEC Program Policy DEP-00-2, including sites, areas, lakes, reservoirs, or highways designated or eligible for designation as scenic; scenic areas of statewide significance; Adirondack Park scenic vistas; Palisades Park system components; and national heritage areas (NYSDEC 2000). These areas often contain scenic areas and/or are developed partly because of their associated visual or aesthetic qualities.

A site, area, lake, reservoir, or highway designated or eligible for designation as scenic (ECL Article 49 or DOT equivalent and APA), Designated State Highway Roadside (Article 49 Scenic Road)

Resources designated or eligible for designation as scenic can include sites, areas, lakes, reservoirs, or highways. Many of these types of resources are discussed in other areas of the Visual Resources section. This subsection focuses on designated scenic roads.

New York State Scenic Byways are transportation corridors that are of particular statewide interest. They are representative of a region's scenic, recreational, cultural, natural, historic, or archaeological significance (NYSDOT 1999-2011). There are nine state-designated and three proposed scenic byways within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (see Table 2.100). The locations of many of these are shown on Figure 2.14. There are also a number of state-designated scenic roads in New York (NYSDOT 1999-2011). While there are 28 roads in portions of Orange and Greene Counties, these are all located outside the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York.

The Great Lakes Seaway Trail, one of the state-designated scenic byways, is also a designated National Scenic Byway (Table 2.100 and Figure 2.14). The National Scenic Byways Program is managed by the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration. National Scenic Byways are roads that are recognized based on one or more archaeological, cultural, historic, natural, recreational, and scenic qualities (USDOT 2011). State and national scenic byways and roads are resources designated specifically for scenic or aesthetic areas or qualities and which would be considered visual resources or visually sensitive.



- Major Water Bodies
- County Boundary
- State Boundary
- Boundary of Area of Interest for Visual Resources
- National Scenic Byway
- State Scenic Byway
- Scenic Areas of Statewide Significance

Figure 2.14: Additional Designated Scenic or other Areas that May be Visually Sensitive

Source: ESRI, 2010; USGS, 2002; NYDEC, 2010; NPS, 2011; National Atlas US and USGS, 2010

Table 2.100 - Designated and Proposed National and State Scenic Byways, Highways, and Roads Located within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011)

Name	Description
Great Lakes Seaway Trail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● National Scenic Byway ● State-designated scenic byway ● Great Lakes/Canadian border ● Scenic, recreational, historic, and natural themes
Western New York Southtowns Scenic Byway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● State-designated scenic byway ● Lake Erie ● Scenic, historical, natural, recreational themes
Cayuga Lake Scenic Byway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● State-designated scenic byway ● Finger Lakes region of New York State ● Scenic and recreational themes
Scenic Route 90	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● State-designated scenic byway ● Finger Lakes region of New York State ● Scenic, recreational, natural, and historic themes
Route 417/36 Scenic Byway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● State-designated scenic byway ● Finger Lakes region of New York State ● Scenic, recreational, natural, and historical themes
Seneca Lake, Hector and Lodi Scenic Byway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● State-designated scenic byway ● Finger Lakes region of New York State ● Scenic, historical, recreational, and natural themes
Route Twenty Scenic Byway (U.S. Route 20)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● State-designated scenic byway ● Central New York State ● Scenic, natural and historic themes
Shawangunk Mountains Scenic Byway*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● State-designated scenic byway ● Shawangunk Mountains ● Scenic and natural themes
Route 28 Central Catskills Scenic Byway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Proposed scenic byway ● Catskill Mountains
Mountain Cloves Scenic Byway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Proposed scenic byway ● Catskill Mountains
Durham Valley Scenic Byway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Proposed scenic byway ● Catskill Mountains
Upper Delaware Scenic Byway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● State-designated scenic byway ● Delaware River Valley ● Scenic, natural, historic, and recreational themes

Sources: NYSDOT 1999-2011; USDOT 2011; Catskill Center for Conservation and Development 2011; Durham Valley Scenic Byway Corridor Coordinating Committee (undated); Mountain Cloves Scenic Byway Steering Committee 2011.

* Shawangunk Mountains Scenic Byway is adjacent to and immediately outside of the western edge of the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York.

Scenic Areas of Statewide Significance (Article 42 of Executive Law)

Scenic Areas of Statewide Significance (SASS) are areas designated by the Department of State based on a scenic assessment program developed by the Division of Coastal Resources. This program identifies the scenic qualities of coastal landscapes, evaluates them against criteria for determining aesthetic significance, and recommends areas for designation. An SASS designation protects scenic landscapes through the review of projects requiring state or federal actions, including direct actions, permits, or funding (NYSDOS 2004).

Six areas within the Hudson River Valley coastal regions in Columbia, Greene, Dutchess, and Ulster Counties were designated as SASSs in 1993. All six of these areas are outside the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (Figure 2.14).

Adirondack Park Scenic Vistas (Adirondack Park Land Use and Development Map)

The Adirondack Park was created in 1892 by the State of New York and is the largest publicly protected area in the contiguous United States. The boundary of the Park encompasses approximately 6 million acres in northern New York State, including portions of Saint Lawrence, Franklin, Clinton, Lewis, Herkimer, Hamilton, Essex, Oneida, Fulton, Warren, Saratoga, and Washington Counties. Nearly half of the Adirondack Park is publicly-owned and belongs to the people of New York State; this public land is constitutionally protected to remain “forever wild” forest preserve (Adirondack Park Agency 2003). No Adirondack Park Scenic Vistas are located within the boundary of the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (State of New York 2001).

Palisades Park (Palisades Interstate Park Commission)

The Palisades are a unique geological feature consisting of cliffs extending from southeastern New York State to northwestern New Jersey. While there is no Palisades Park in New York State, there are a number of state, county, and town parks in Orange and Rockland Counties, New York, that are located along the Palisades, many of which are operated in conjunction with the Palisades Interstate Park Commission. These parks include: Bear Mountain Park, Blauvelt State Park, Bristol Beach Park, Buttermilk Falls County Park, Clausland Mountain County Park, Franny Reese State Park, Goosepond Mountain Park, Harriman Park, Haverstraw Park, High Tor State Park, Highland Lakes Park, Hook Mountain State Park, Lake Superior Park, Minnewaska

Preserve, Mountain View Nature County Park, Nyack Beach State Park, Rockland Lake State Park, Schunnemunk Ridge Park, Sean Hunter Ryan Memorial County Park, Sterling Forest Park, Storm King Mountain Park, Tackamack Town Park (North and South), and Tallman State Park (New York-New Jersey Trails Conference 1999-2011, Palisades Parks Conservancy 2003-2007). None of these parks are located within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York.

Bond Act Properties purchased under Exceptional Scenic Beauty or Open Space category
Bond Act Properties are properties purchased under the “Exceptional Scenic Beauty” or “Open Space” categories of the Environmental Bond Act of 1986. Properties included in the “Exceptional Scenic Beauty” category are defined as land forms, water bodies, geologic formations, and vegetation that possess significant scenic qualities or significantly contribute to scenic value. Properties included in the “Open Space” category are defined as open or natural land in or near urban or suburban areas necessary to serve the scenic or recreational needs thereof. Such properties are purchased by individual municipalities using grants from New York State; grants consist of moneys raised through the sale of environmental bonds. Municipalities can include cities; counties, towns, villages, and public benefit corporations; school districts or improvement districts within a city, county, town or village; or Indian tribes residing within New York state; or any combination thereof (FindLaw 2011).

The OPRHP’s Open Space Conservation Plan identifies 38 regional priority conservation projects within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (Table 2.101). These projects represent the unique and irreplaceable open-space resources that encompass exceptional ecological, wildlife, recreational, scenic, and historical values. They were identified as a result of extensive analysis of New York State’s open-space conservation needs by nine Regional Advisory Committees, in consultation with NYSDEC and OPRHP (OPRHP 2009). If acquired, these projects would be considered Bond Act properties purchased under the Open Space category. Additional previous Bond Act Properties may be located throughout the counties located entirely or partially within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York. Bond Act Properties purchased under the “Exceptional Scenic Beauty” or “Open Space” categories contain, or may contain, scenic or aesthetic qualities that may be considered visual resources or visually sensitive.

Table 2.101 - Recommended Open Space Conservation Projects Located in the Area Underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York (New August 2011)

County Name*	Number of Recommended Conservation Projects in County	Name of Recommended Conservation Project
Albany**	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Black Creek Marsh/Vly Swamp (Project 44) – expand protection of wetland complex ● Five Rivers Environmental Education Center (Project 46) – protect Phillipinkill stream corridor to north and east of education center ● Helderberg Escarpment (Project 48) – protect southern extent of this natural feature
Allegany	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Inland Lakes (Project 124)*** – protect undeveloped shoreline associated with wetlands and critical tributary habitat; protect water quality and important fish and wildlife habitat; and secure adequate public access for recreational opportunities
Cattaraugus	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Allegheny River Watershed (Project 117) – protect areas for conservation, recreational, educational, and public access purposes ● Cattaraugus Creek and Tributaries (Project 119)*** – protect fisheries, recreational access, and unique geological areas ● Significant wetlands (Project 127)*** – protect significant natural wetland communities and provide recreational, educational, and ecological enhancement opportunities (e.g., Keeney Swamp, Bird Swamp, and Hartland Swamp)
Cayuga**	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Carpenter Falls/Bear Swamp Corridor (Project 91)*** – protect water quality, preserve scenic resources, and expand the trail system in Bear Swamp State Forest ● Summerhill Fen and Forest Complex (Project 102) – secure upland forests, wetlands, and adjacent upland buffers along Fall Creek that are recognized for biological and recreational significance
Chautauqua	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cattaraugus Creek and Tributaries (Project 119)*** – protect fisheries, recreational access, and unique geological areas ● Chautauqua Lake Access, Vistas, Shore Lands and Tributaries (Project 120) – secure public access for recreational fishing and boating, preserve undeveloped shoreline, and protect water quality ● Lake Erie Tributary Gorges (Project 125)*** – acquire public access to various gorges along tributaries to Lake Erie ● Trails and Trailways (Project 126) – protect existing trail corridors and acquire new corridor for trails ● Inland Lakes (Project 124)*** – protect undeveloped shoreline associated with wetlands and critical tributary habitat; protect water quality and important fish and wildlife habitat; and secure adequate public access for recreational opportunities
Chemung	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Catharine Valley Complex (Project 108) – preserve unique geological and ecological areas and acquire land for recreational use of historic Chemung Canal towpath ● Chemung River Greenbelt (Project 109)*** – expand and enhance significant recreational resources in a unique scenic landscape and protect important wildlife habitat
Chenango	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Genny Green Trail/Link Trail (Project 94) – acquire land for major trail connections
Cortland	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Develop a State Park in Cortland County (Project 92) – develop a state park

County Name*	Number of Recommended Conservation Projects in County	Name of Recommended Conservation Project
Delaware	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Catskill River and Road Corridors (Project 36)*** – protect lands that serve as riparian buffers, preserve or restore floodplain areas, protect scenic areas and vistas along principal road corridors and on visible ridgelines, protect flood-prone areas, and enhance public access and recreational opportunities in the following areas: Beaverkill/Willowemoc/Route 17 (future Interstate 86) Corridor; Delaware River Branches and Main Stem Corridors; Mongaup Valley WMA; and Route 28 Corridor (Blue Stone Wild Forest, Ticetenevck Mt./Tonshi Mt./Kenozia Lake, Catskill Interpretive Center area, and Meade Hill/Fleischmann Mountain) ● Upper Delaware Highlands (Project 42)*** – provide contiguous natural resource protection for one of key remaining ecological regions in the continental U.S through easements for forestland and farmlands and along the Upper Delaware Scenic Byway. ● Susquehanna River Valley Corridor (Project 53)*** - protect areas within the Chesapeake Bay drainage basin for water quality, fisheries, public recreation, public access, birding, and agricultural conservation
Erie**	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Buffalo River Watershed (Project 118)*** – protect the Buffalo River corridor and three of its tributaries and improve access for recreational users ● Lake Erie Tributary Gorges (Project 125)*** – acquire public access to various gorges along tributaries to Lake Erie
Livingston**	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Genesee River Corridor (Project 107)*** – protect various habitats and landscapes along the Genesee River ● Western Finger Lakes: Conesus, Hemlock, Canadice and Honeoye (Project 113)*** - protect Finger Lakes shorelines that are wholly or largely undeveloped
Madison**	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Nelson Swamp (Project 95) – reduce ownership fragmentation of swamp, protect biologically significant swamp, further management objective of perpetual protection, and enhance compatible public use opportunities ● Central Leatherstocking – Mohawk Grasslands Area (Project 87)*** – multi-regional project for conservation of habitat for grassland birds (grasslands occur in portions of Schoharie, Otsego, Oneida, Madison, and Onondaga Counties)
Oneida**	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Central Leatherstocking – Mohawk Grasslands Area (Project 87)*** – multi-regional project for conservation of habitat for grassland birds (grasslands occur in portions of Schoharie, Otsego, Oneida, Madison and Onondaga Counties)
Onondaga**	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Camillus Valley/Nine Mile Creek (Project 90) – buffer important attributes of the Nine Mile Creek Valley from development and provide public waterway access ● Carpenter Falls/Bear Swamp Corridor (Project 91)*** – protect water quality, preserve scenic resources, and expand the trail system in Bear Swamp State Forest
Ontario**	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hi Tor/Bristol Hills (Project 110)*** – ensure that key tracts of land remain as open space in this area ● Western Finger Lakes: Conesus, Hemlock, Canadice and Honeoye (Project 113)*** - protect Finger Lakes shorelines that are wholly or largely undeveloped ● Wolf Gully (Project 114) – protect for its exceptional biological diversity
Orange**	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Catskill River and Road Corridors (Project 36)*** – protect lands that serve as riparian buffers, preserve or restore floodplain areas, protect scenic areas and vistas along principal road corridors and on visible ridgelines, protect flood-prone areas, and enhance public access and recreational opportunities in

County Name*	Number of Recommended Conservation Projects in County	Name of Recommended Conservation Project
		the following areas: Beaverkill/Willowemoc/Route 17 (future Interstate 86) Corridor; Delaware River Branches and Main-stem Corridors; Mongaup Valley WMA; and Route 28 Corridor (Blue Stone Wild Forest, Ticeteneyck Mt./Tonshi Mt./Kenozia Lake, Catskill Interpretive Center area and Meade Hill/Fleischmann Mountain)
Otsego**	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Susquehanna River Valley Corridor (Project 53)*** - protect areas within the Chesapeake Bay drainage basin for water quality, fisheries, public recreation, public access, birding and agricultural conservation ● Central Leatherstocking – Mohawk Grasslands Area (Project 87)*** – multi-regional project for conservation of habitat for grassland birds (grasslands occur in portions of Schoharie, Otsego, Oneida, Madison, and Onondaga Counties)
Schoharie**	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Central Leatherstocking – Mohawk Grasslands Area (Project 87)*** – multi-regional project for conservation of habitat for grassland birds (grasslands occur in portions of Schoharie, Otsego, Oneida, Madison, and Onondaga Counties)
Seneca**	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Seneca Army Depot Conservation Area (Project 111) – protect a unique population of white deer
Steuben	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Chemung River Greenbelt (Project 109)*** – expand and enhance significant recreation resources in a unique scenic landscape and protect important wildlife habitat
Sullivan**	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Neversink Highlands (Project 28) – protect significant natural attractions and resources, hunting and fishing opportunities, and wildlife habitat in the following areas: Tomsco Falls, Neversink Gorge vicinity, Basha Kill vicinity and Harlen Swamp Wetland Complex ● Catskill River and Road Corridors (Project 36)*** – protect lands that serve as riparian buffers, preserve or restore floodplain areas, protect scenic areas and vistas along principal road corridors and on visible ridgelines, protect flood-prone areas, and enhance public access and recreational opportunities in the following areas: Beaverkill/Willowemoc/Route 17 (future Interstate 86) Corridor; Delaware River Branches and Main-stem Corridors; Mongaup Valley WMA; and Route 28 Corridor (Blue Stone Wild Forest, Ticeteneyck Mt./Tonshi Mt./Kenozia Lake, Catskill Interpretive Center area and Meade Hill/Fleischmann Mountain) ● New York City Watershed Lands (Project 39) – identify and protect high-priority sites on land that have potential for development, for forestry, or for fisheries and relatively large and/or link area already protected by private or public entities and/or allow for improved long-term management of land and water resources ● Upper Delaware Highlands (Project 42)*** – provide contiguous natural resource projection for one of key remaining ecological regions in the continental U.S through easements for forestland and farmlands and along the Upper Delaware Scenic Byway
Tioga	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Two Rivers State Park (Project 103) – develop a state park ● Emerald Necklace (Project 104) – consolidate existing state holdings while ensuring linkage between public land in the vicinity of Ithaca, conserve lands, and enhance recreational opportunities
Tompkins	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● State Parks Greenbelt/Tompkins County (Project 101) – protect valuable open-space recreational resources between four state park facilities connected by the Black Diamond Trail Corridor ● Finger Lakes Shorelines (Project 105) – preserve portions of the shoreline of the Finger Lakes for public access or wildlife in the following areas or projects: Finger Lakes Water Trails, Owasco Flats, Camp Barton, On Cayuga

County Name*	Number of Recommended Conservation Projects in County	Name of Recommended Conservation Project
		Lake, B&H Railroad property at the south end of Keuka Lake in Hammondsport, extending the eastern terminus of the Outlet Trail to the Seneca Lake shoreline at Dresden, and undeveloped shoreline on Seneca Lake
Ulster**	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Great Rondout Wetlands (Project 24) – protect several large wetlands in the following areas: Great Pacama Vly, Cedar Swamp and Beer Kill Wetlands/Cape Pond ● Catskill River and Road Corridors (Project 36)*** – protect lands that serve as riparian buffers, preserve or restore floodplain areas, protect scenic areas and vistas along principal road corridors and on visible ridgelines, protect flood-prone areas, and enhance public access and recreational opportunities in the following areas: Beaverkill/Willowemoc/Route 17 (future Interstate 86) Corridor; Delaware River Branches and Main-stem Corridors; Mongaup Valley WMA; and Route 28 Corridor (Blue Stone Wild Forest, Ticeteneyck Mt./Tonshi Mt./Kenozia Lake, Catskill Interpretive Center area, and Meade Hill/Fleischmann Mountain) ● Catskills Unfragmented Forest (Project 37) – securing additional large unfragmented areas of forestlands in the Catskill High Peaks areas, including the following sites : Overlook Mountain; Guardian Mountain; Indian Head Wilderness Consolidation; Balsam, Graham and Doubletop Mountains/Dry Brook Valley; Peekamoose Gorge; Frost Valley; Fir Brook/Round Pond/Black Bear Road Vicinity; West Shokan/Sampsonville Area Lands; Bearpen/Vly/Roundtop Mountains; Catskill Escarpment North and Windham High Peak; Rusk Mountain Wild Forest; Hunter West Kill Wilderness; and Catskill Mountain Heritage Trail
Wyoming	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Buffalo River Watershed (Project 118)*** – protect the Buffalo River corridor and three of its tributaries and improve access for recreational users ● Inland Lakes (Project 124)*** – protect undeveloped shoreline associated with wetlands and critical tributary habitat; protect water quality and important fish and wildlife habitat; and secure adequate public access for recreational opportunities ● Inland Lakes (Project 124)*** – protect undeveloped shoreline associated with wetlands and critical tributary habitat; protect water quality and important fish and wildlife habitat; and secure adequate public access for recreational opportunities
Yates	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hi Tor/Bristol Hills (Project 110)*** – ensure that key tracts of land remain as open space in this area
Total	38***	

Source: OPRHP 2009.

* No other recommended conservation projects are located within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales in New York.

** Only a portion of the county is located within the area underlain by the Marcellus and Utica Shales.

*** Susquehanna River Valley Corridor (Project 53) is in two counties (Otsego and Delaware); Cattaraugus Creek and Tributaries (Project 119) is in two counties (Cattaraugus and Chautauqua); Carpenter Falls/Bear Swamp Corridor (Project 91) may be in two counties (Cayuga and Onondaga); Lake Erie Tributary Gorges (Project 125) may be in two counties (Chautauqua and Erie); Central Leatherstocking – Mohawk Grasslands Area (Project 87) may occur in multiple counties (Schoharie, Otsego, Oneida, Madison and Onondaga); Catskill River and Road Corridors (Project 36) may occur in multiple counties (Delaware, Sullivan, Orange and Ulster); Catskill River and Road Corridors (Project 36) may occur in two counties (Delaware and Sullivan); Buffalo River Watershed (Project 118) will occur in two counties (Erie and Wyoming); Genesee River Corridor (Project 107) may occur in multiple counties from the New York/Pennsylvania state line to Lake Ontario; Western Finger Lakes: Conesus, Hemlock, Canadice and Honeoye (Project 113) will occur in two counties (Livingston and Ontario); Chemung River Greenbelt (Project 109) will occur in two counties (Chemung and Steuben); Inland Lakes (Project 124) is in three counties (Allegany, Chautauqua, and Wyoming); Hi Tor/Bristol Hills (Project 110) is in two counties (Yates and Ontario); Significant wetlands (Project 127) may occur in numerous counties.

2.4.13 Noise⁵⁶

2.4.13.1 Noise Fundamentals

Noise is defined as any unwanted sound. Sound is defined as any pressure variation that the human ear can detect. Humans can detect a wide range of sound pressures, but only the pressure variations occurring within a particular set of frequencies are experienced as sound. However, the acuity of human hearing is not the same at all frequencies. Humans are less sensitive to low frequencies than to mid-frequencies, and so noise measurements are often adjusted (or weighted) to account for human perception and sensitivities. The unit of noise measurement is a decibel (dB). The most common weighting scale used is the A-weighted scale, which was developed to allow sound-level meters to simulate the frequency sensitivity of human hearing. Sound levels measured using this weighting are noted as dBA (A-weighted decibels). (“A” indicates that the sound has been filtered to reduce the strength of very low and very high frequency sounds, much as the human ear does.) The A-weighted scale is logarithmic, so an increase of 10 dB actually represents a sound that is 10 times louder. However, humans do not perceive a 10-dBA increase as 10 times louder but as only twice as loud.

The following is typical of human responses to changes in noise level:

- A 3-dBA change is the threshold of change detectable by the human ear;
- A 5-dBA change is readily noticeable; and
- A 10-dBA change is perceived as a doubling (or halving) of noise level.

The decrease in sound level from any single noise source normally follows the “inverse square law.” That is, sound pressure level (SPL) changes in inverse proportion to the square of the distance from the sound source. At distances greater than 50 feet from a sound source, every doubling of the distance produces a 6-dB reduction in the sound level. Therefore, a sound level of 70 dB at 50 feet would have a sound level of approximately 64 dB at 100 feet. At 200 feet, sound from the same source would be perceived at a level of approximately 58 dB.

⁵⁶ Subsection 2.4.13, in its entirety, was provided by Ecology and Environment Engineering, P.C., August 2011 and was adapted by the Department.

The total sound pressure created by multiple sound sources does not create a mathematical additive effect. For example, two proximal noise sources that are 70 dBA each do not have a combined noise level of 140 dBA. In this case the combined noise level is 73 dBA. As the difference between the two sound levels is 0 dB, 3 dB are added to the sound level to compensate for the additive effects of the sound.

To characterize the average ambient noise (“noise”) environment in a given area, noise level descriptors are commonly used. The Leq (sound level equivalent) is generally used to characterize the average sound energy that occurs during a relatively short period, such as an hour. The Ldn (day-night level) would be used for an entire 24-hour period. To account for peoples’ greater sensitivity to sound during nighttime hours, the Ldn noise metric descriptor places a stronger emphasis on noise that occurs during nighttime hours (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.) by applying a 10-dB “penalty” to those hours. The Lmax refers to the maximum A-weighted noise level recorded for a single noise event during a given period.

Although both the sound power and sound pressure characteristic of sound share the same unit of measure, the decibel (dB), and the term “sound level” is commonly substituted for each, they have different properties. Sound power is the acoustical energy emitted by the sound source, and is an absolute value; it is not affected by the environment. The SPL is the varying difference, at a fixed point, between the pressure caused by a sound wave and atmospheric pressure. Sound pressure is what our ears hear and what sound level meters measure. The sound power level is always considerably higher than the sound pressure level near a source because it takes into account the effective radiating surface area of the source.


2.4.13.2 Common Noise Effects

Common noise effects include speech interference, sleep disturbance, and annoyance.

Speech Interference

The interference with speech comprehension is a masking process in which environmental noise curtails or prevents speech perception. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) established the relationship between percent speech intelligibility and continuous noise level (USEPA 1974). This relationship is presented in Figure 2.15

Figure 2.15 - Level of Continuous Noise Causing Speech Interference (New August 2011)



Source: USEPA 1974.

Sleep Disturbance

Exposure to noise can produce disturbances of sleep in terms of difficulty to fall asleep, alterations of sleep pattern and depth, and awakening. It should be noted that the adverse effect of noise on sleep partly depends on the nature of the noise source, and there are considerable differences in individual reactions to the same noise. To avoid sleep disturbance, the World Health Organization (WHO) recommends an indoor level in bedrooms of 30 dBA for continuous noise and an Lmax of 45 dBA for single sound events (WHO 2000).

Annoyance

The capacity of noise to induce annoyance depends upon many of its physical characteristics, including its SPL and spectral characteristics, as well as the variations of these properties over time. Numerous studies have been conducted to assess community annoyance in response to transportation noise sources. A summary of community annoyance is presented in Table 2.102.

Table 2.102 - Effects of Noise on People (New August 2011)

Ldn (dBA)	Percent Annoyance	Average Community Reaction	General Community Attitude Towards Area
≥75	37	Very Severe	Noise is likely to be the most important of all adverse aspects of the community environment.
70	22	Severe	Noise is one of the most important adverse aspects of the community environment.
65	12	Significant	Noise is one of the important adverse aspects of the community environment.
60	7	Moderate	Noise may be considered an adverse aspect of the community environment.
≤55	3	Slight	Noise is considered no more important than various other environmental factors.

Source: Cowan 1994.

2.4.13.3 Noise Regulations and Guidance

Federal

In 1974 the USEPA published *Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety* (USEPA 1974). This publication evaluates the effects of environmental noise with respect to health and safety. The document provides information for state and local governments to use in developing their own ambient noise standards. The USEPA has determined that in order to protect the public from activity interference and annoyance outdoors in residential areas, noise levels should not exceed an Ldn of 55 dBA (Table 2.103). The USEPA considers an Ldn of 55 dBA to be the maximum sound level that will not adversely affect public health and welfare by interfering with speech or other activities in outdoor areas.

Table 2.103 - Summary of Noise Levels Identified as Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety (New August 2011)

Effect	Level	Area
Hearing Loss	Leq ₍₂₄₎ =< 70 dB	All areas
Outdoor activity interference and annoyance	Ldn =< 55 dB	Outdoors in residential areas and farms and other outdoor areas where people spend widely varying amounts of time and other places in which quiet is a basis for use
	Leq ₍₂₄₎ =< 55 dB	Outdoor areas where people spend limited amounts of time, such as school yards, playgrounds, etc.
Indoor activity interference and annoyance	Ldn =< 45 dB Leq ₍₂₄₎ =< 45 dB	Indoor residential areas Other indoor areas with human activities such as schools, etc.

Source: USEPA 1974.

New York State

The Department has issued Program Policy DEP-00-1, Assessing and Mitigating Noise Impacts, which is intended to provide direction to Department staff for the evaluation of sound levels and characteristics generated from proposed or existing facilities. Under this policy, in the review of an application for a permit, the Department is to evaluate the potential for adverse impacts of sound generated and emanating to receptors outside of the facility or property. When a sound level evaluation indicates that receptors may experience sound levels or characteristics that produce significant noise impacts or impairment of property use, the Department is to require the permittee or applicant to employ reasonable and necessary measures to either eliminate or mitigate adverse noise effects.

In the Department policy, noise is defined as any loud, discordant, or disagreeable sound or sounds. More commonly, in an environmental context, noise is defined simply as unwanted sound. The environmental effects of sound and human perceptions of sound can be described in terms of the following four characteristics:

1. SPL, or perceived loudness, as expressed in decibels (dB) or A-weighted decibel scale dBA, which is weighted towards those portions of the frequency spectrum, between 20 and 20,000 Hertz, to which the human ear is most sensitive. Both measure sound pressure in the atmosphere.
2. Frequency (perceived as pitch), the rate at which a sound source vibrates or makes the air vibrate.

3. Duration, i.e., recurring fluctuation in sound pressure or tone at an interval; sharp or startling noise at recurring interval; the temporal nature (continuous vs. intermittent) of sound.
4. Pure tone, which is comprised of a single frequency. Pure tones are relatively rare in nature but, if they do occur, they can be extremely annoying.

The initial evaluation for most facilities should determine the maximum amount of sound created at a single point in time by multiple activities for the proposed project. All facets of the construction and operation that produce noise should be included, such as land-clearing activities (chain saw and equipment operation), drilling, equipment operation for excavating, hauling or conveying materials, pile driving, steel work, material processing, and product storage and removal. Land clearing and construction may be only temporary noise at the site, whereas the ongoing operation of a facility would be considered permanent noise.

The Department Noise Guidelines state that increases ranging from 0 to 3 dB will have no appreciable effect on receptors, and that increases from 3 to 6 dB have potential for adverse noise impact only in cases where the most sensitive receptors are present. Sound pressure increases of more than 6 dB may require additional analysis of impact potential, depending on existing sound pressure levels and the character of surrounding land uses and receptors, and an increase of 6 dB(A) may cause complaints. Therefore, a cumulative increase in the total ambient sound level of 6 dBA or less is unlikely to constitute an adverse community impact.

To aid staff in its review of a potential noise impact, Program Policy DEP-00-1 identifies three major categories of noise sources:

- Fixed equipment or process operations,
- Mobile equipment or process operations, and
- Transport movements of products, raw material or waste.

2.4.13.4 Existing Noise Levels

The ambient sound level of a region is defined by the total noise generated, including sounds from natural and man-made sources. The magnitude and frequency of environmental noise may vary considerably over a day and throughout the week because of changing weather conditions and the

effects of seasonal vegetative cover. Table 2.104 presents SPLs that are characteristic for the land use described. Most of the high-volume hydraulic fracturing would occur in quiet rural areas where the noise levels are typically as low as 30 dBA, depending on weather conditions and natural noise sources.

Table 2.104 - Common Noise Levels (New August 2011)

Description	SPL (dBA)
Rural area at night	30
Quiet suburban area at night	40
Typical suburban area	50
Typical urban area	60

Source: Cowan 1994.
SPL = sound pressure level.

2.4.14 Transportation - Existing Environment⁵⁷

This section presents a general overview of the vehicle and road classification system, major roadways and roadway use in the regional areas, and the primary funding sources for the roadway improvements. Although roadways would be the primary transportation system used to access well sites, railroads and airports may also be used to transport equipment and supplies. These other transportation modes are also briefly discussed.

2.4.14.1 Terminology and Definitions

The following terms are defined at the federal level to describe roadway classifications and vehicle classes and are used by transportation planners and engineers at the state and local levels.

Federal Functional Classification Codes

The federal functional classification (FC) codes group streets, roads, and highways into several classes based on the construction type and the type of service the roads provide. This discussion focuses on the roads prevalent in rural areas, where most of the horizontal drilling and high-volume hydraulic fracturing is assumed to occur.

⁵⁷ Subsection 2.4.14, in its entirety, was provided by Ecology and Environment Engineering, P.C., August 2011 and was adapted by the Department.

Rural areas have five basic classifications of roads:

- FC01/FC02 - Principal Arterial (Interstate or Other);
- FC06 - Minor Arterial;
- FC07 – Major Collector;
- FC08 – Minor Collector; and
- FC09 – Local.

Typically, the higher the road classification, the higher the level of service a road can supply to vehicles, whether measured by vehicle class/weight or number of vehicle trips.

The arterial system of roadways provides the highest level of mobility at the highest speed, for long, uninterrupted travel. The construction of roads in the arterial system follows stringent guidelines, and high-grade materials are used. These roads can support more of the heavy vehicle truck traffic than smaller, local roads. The minor collectors (FC08) and, to a larger extent, the local roads (FC09) show signs of deterioration with an increase in heavy-truck traffic.

- Principal Arterial. The Principal Arterial categories are often divided into Principal Arterial - Interstate, and Principal Arterial - Other. Arterials generally are constructed according to higher design standards than other roads, often have multiple lanes traveling in the same direction, and have some degree of access control, such as on ramps.

The rural principal arterial highway network is an interstate and inter-county roadway that connects developed areas with an urban population typically greater than 50,000 people.

- Minor Arterial. A rural minor arterial highway is a roadway that is considered serving an urban area if it comes within 2 miles of the urban boundary.

Collector roadways provide a lower degree of mobility than arterials and are not designed for long-distance or high-speed travel. They typically consist of two-lane roads that collect and distribute traffic from the arterial system. They are divided into two categories in the rural setting - Major Collectors and Minor Collectors.

- Major Collector. Major Collectors provide service to any county seat not on an arterial route and can also connect or serve larger towns that are not provided services by their arterial roads.

- Minor Collector. Minor Collectors are roadways that are spaced consistently and proportional to population densities present in the rural community. They collect traffic from local roads and provide access to higher-level roads.

Local roads are the largest category of roads in terms of mileage in the road network. In rural areas, they include all public roads below the collector system, including basic residential and commercial roads.

There is an inverse relationship between the speeds and distances traveled on roads versus the actual existing mileage of the various road systems. The arterial systems account for higher average vehicle miles per trip (VMT), while local road systems account for the vast majority of actual roads (Table 2.105).

Table 2.105 - Guidelines on Extent of Rural Functional Systems (New August 2011)

System	Range (Average Vehicle Miles per Trip [VMT])	Miles of Road (percent)
Principal Arterial System	30-55	2-4
Principal Arterial plus Minor Arterial Road System	45-75	6-12 ¹
Collector Road System	20-35	20-25
Local Road System	5-20	65-75

Source: FHWA 2011.

















¹ Most states fall in the 7-10% range.

The FC codes have recently been updated; however, the codes presented in this section correspond to the codes used in data compilations that are currently available.

FHWA Vehicle Classes with Definitions

Figure 2.16 presents the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) vehicle class definitions (FHWA 2011). Table 2.106 provides descriptions of the 13 vehicle classes designated by the FHWA.

Figure 2.16 - FHWA Vehicle Classifications (New August 2011)

(1) Motorcycle 	(2) Passenger Car 	(3) Two Axle, 4-Tire Unit 	(4) Buses 	
(5) Two Axle, 6-Tire Unit 	(6) Three Axle Single Unit 	(7) Four or More Axles Unit 	(8) Three or four Axles Trailer 	
(9) Five Axle Single Trailer 		(10) Six or More Axles, Single Trailer 		 
(11) Five or Less Axles, Multi-Trailer 		(12) Six Axles, Multi-Trailer 		
(13) Seven or More Axles, Multi-Trailer 				

Source: Diamond Traffic Products 2011.

Table 2.106 - Descriptions of the Thirteen FHWA Vehicle Classification Categories (New August 2011)

Vehicle Class	Description
1	Motorcycles. All two- or three-wheeled motorized vehicles. Typical vehicles in this category have saddle-type seats and are steered by handlebars rather than steering wheels. This category includes motorcycles, motor scooters, mopeds, motor-powered bicycles, and three-wheel motorcycles. This vehicle type may be reported at the option of the state.
2	Passenger Cars. All sedans, coupes, and station wagons manufactured primarily for the purpose of carrying passengers and including those passenger cars pulling recreational or other light trailers.
3	Other Two-Axle, Four-Tire Single Unit Vehicles. All two-axle, four-tire vehicles other than passenger cars. Included in this classification are pickup and panel trucks, vans, and other vehicles such as campers, motor homes, ambulances, hearses, carryalls, and minibuses. Other two-axle, four-tire single-unit vehicles pulling recreational or other light trailers are included in this classification. (Note: Because automatic vehicle classifiers have difficulty distinguishing class 3 from class 2, these two classes may be combined into class 2).
4	Buses. All vehicles manufactured as traditional passenger-carrying buses with two axles and six tires or three or more axles. This category includes only traditional buses (including school buses) functioning as passenger-carrying vehicles. Modified buses should be considered to be a truck and should be appropriately classified.
5	Two-Axle, Six-Tire, Single-Unit Trucks. All vehicles on a single frame, including trucks, camping and recreational vehicles, motor homes, etc., with two axles and dual rear wheels.
6	Three-Axle, Single-Unit Trucks. All vehicles on a single frame, including trucks, camping and recreational vehicles, motor homes, etc., with three axles.
7	Four or More Axle, Single-Unit Trucks. All trucks on a single frame with four or more axles.
8	Four or Fewer Axle, Single-Trailer Trucks. All vehicles with four or fewer axles, consisting of two units, one of which is a tractor or straight truck power unit.
9	Five-Axle, Single-Trailer Trucks. All five-axle vehicles consisting of two units, one of which is a tractor or straight truck power unit.
10	Six or More Axle, Single-Trailer Trucks. All vehicles with six or more axles, consisting of two units, one of which is a tractor or straight truck power unit.
11	Five or Fewer Axle, Multi-Trailer Trucks. All vehicles with five or fewer axles, consisting of three or more units, one of which is a tractor or straight truck power unit.
12	Six-Axle, Multi-Trailer Trucks. All six-axle vehicles consisting of three or more units, one of which is a tractor or straight truck power unit.
13	Seven or More Axle, Multi-Trailer Trucks. All vehicles with seven or more axles, consisting of three or more units, one of which is a tractor or straight truck power unit.

Source: FHWA 2001.

Notes: In reporting information on trucks, the following criteria should be used:

- Truck tractor units traveling without a trailer will be considered single-unit trucks.
- A truck tractor unit pulling other such units in a "saddle mount" configuration will be considered one single-unit truck and will be defined only by the axles on the pulling unit.
- Vehicles are defined by the number of axles in contact with the road. Therefore, "floating" axles are counted only when in the down position.
- The term "trailer" includes both semi- and full trailers.

Not included in the FHWA Vehicle Classification Categories are farm and agricultural equipment, which are common in the rural areas. Many of the rural roads are shared by passenger traffic, truck traffic, and farm and agricultural equipment.

2.4.14.2 Regional Road Systems

New York State

The NYSDOT, acting through the Commissioner of Transportation, has general supervision of roads, highways, and bridges in the State of New York. The functions, powers and duties of the Commissioner of Transportation and the NYSDOT, respectively, are more fully described in Article II of the Highway Law and Article 2 of the Transportation Law. It is the mission of the NYSDOT to ensure that those who live, work, and travel in New York State have a safe, efficient, balanced, and environmentally sound transportation system.

The NYSDOT is divided into 11 regions to better manage the roadways, duties, and users (Figure 2.17).

Figure 2.17 - New York State Department of Transportation Regions (New August 2011)



Source: NYSDOT 2011a

The network of roads within New York State consists of federal, state, county, local, and private roads. Overall, there are an estimated 114,546 miles of highway roads in the state. This includes 32 interstate highways (principal arterials) totaling 1,705 miles, which are primarily maintained by the NYSDOT.

Figure 2.18 depicts the main interstate highways in New York State. The New York State Thruway, also known as the Governor Thomas E. Dewey Thruway (Interstate (I-) 90) is the main east-west route that crosses the midsection of the state, linking Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, and Albany. The New York State Thruway is a system of limited-access highways in New York State operated by the New York State Thruway Authority (NYSTA). It includes a total of approximately 570 miles (that is comprised of portions of I-87, I-90, I-95, I-190, and I-287). The Southern Tier Expressway, I-86, also is a major east-west route that services that southern portion of the state, connecting Jamestown, Olean, Elmira, and Binghamton. From Binghamton, I-86 runs southeast, providing access to New York City, and I-88 runs northeast providing access to Albany. Major north-south routes include I-81, which extends from Pennsylvania north through Binghamton and Syracuse to the border crossing with Canada, and I-87, which extends from New York City north to Montreal.

The state's transportation and road network also includes over 15,000 miles of state routes and 97,000 miles of county and local roads (NYSDOT 2009a). Each region examined as part of this analysis is discussed individually below.

The NYSDOT has specific, statutory authority to regulate work within the state highway rights-of-way (ROWs) (see Highway Law Section 52). This authority extends to granting, conditioning, or denying permits for, among many other things, curb cuts or breaks in access to state highways, utility work within the state ROWs that would be necessary for the operation of hydraulic fracturing facilities, and design approval for any new culverts, bridges, access roads, etc., on state ROWs that may become necessary for the construction or operation of hydraulic fracturing facilities.

Region A

Region A comprises Chemung, Tioga, and Broome Counties, which are within NYSDOT Regions 6 (Chemung) and 9 (Tioga and Broome). Table 2.107 presents a summary of the mileage of highways within each county. The Highway Mileage Report developed by NYSDOT provides current information on the public highway mileage in New York State by county (NYSDOT 2009a).

Table 2.107 - Region A: Highway Mileage by County, 2009 (New August 2011)

	Town or Village	County	NYSDOT Owned	Other	Total
Chemung	766.7	243.7	118.4	3.6	1,132.4
Tioga	823.7	141.7	155.2	0.0	1,120.6
Broome	1,340.1	339.1	297.3	19.6	1,996.1
Total Region A	2,930.5	724.5	570.9	23.2	4,249.1

Source: NYSDOT 2009a.

The principal arterial in Region A is the Southern Tier Expressway (I-86/NY-17), which runs east-west through the three counties that constitute Region A. This highway connects Elmira and areas west of the region with Binghamton and areas east of the region. Another major highway, I-81, intersects I-86 in Binghamton and runs north to Syracuse and south to Scranton, Pennsylvania. In addition, I-88 originates in Binghamton and runs northeast to Albany (Figure 2.18)

Numerous other arterials, collectors, and local roadways cover this region and connect smaller towns and villages. Heavy vehicles (i.e., Vehicle Classifications 04 through 13) primarily use major roadways. NYSDOT conducted a study of the road use by heavy vehicle traffic, based on 2004 to 2009 data (NYSDOT 2010a). The data for rural areas in NYSDOT Regions 6 and 9 are presented in Table 2.108.

Table 2.108 - Heavy Vehicles as a Percentage of Total Vehicles in Rural Areas in NYSDOT Regions 6 and 9, 2004-2009 (New August 2011)

Functional Classification (FC) Code	NYSDOT Region 6	NYSDOT Region 9	Statewide
01	36.0%	25.1%	25.2%
02	15.5%	13.6%	12.5%
06	10.2%	10.2%	9.5%
07	10.9%	8.7%	8.9%
08	5.7%*	6.8%	6.8%
09	-*	6.4%	7.1%

Source: NYSDOT 2010a.

* No data or insufficient data (i.e., data from <10 highway segments).

Heavy-vehicle traffic is concentrated on major roadways, with FC road classifications 01 and 02 handling 51.5% and 38.7%, respectively, of heavy-vehicle traffic in NYSDOT Regions 6 and 9. Compared to the statewide percentage (37.7%), in both Regions 6 and 9, heavy-vehicle traffic is concentrated more on principal arterial roadways and less on other roads. Since FC01 and FC02 are arterials used primarily for long-distance, high-speed travel, the majority of this traffic is assumed to pass through the counties.

Region B

Region B comprises Otsego, Delaware, and Sullivan Counties, all of which are in NYSDOT Region 9. Table 2.109 presents a summary of the mileage of highways within each county. The Highway Mileage Report developed by NYSDOT provides current information on the public highway mileage in New York State by county (NYSDOT 2009a).

Table 2.109 - Region B: Highway Mileage by County, 2009 (New August 2011)

	Town or Village	County	NYSDOT Owned	Other	Total
Otsego	1,326.2	476.6	290.4	4.2	2,097.4
Delaware	1,608.4	262.0	341.1	37.5	2,248.9
Sullivan	1,462.1	385.3	201.9	10.6	2,059.9
Total Region B	4,396.7	1,123.9	833.4	52.3	6,406.2

Source: NYSDOT 2009a.

The road network in Region B has two main roadway corridors running through different sections of the three counties. One is I-88, which runs in a southwest-northeast direction along the border of Otsego and Delaware Counties. In addition, NY-17 runs from the western portion of Delaware County to the east and southeast, along the Catskill Forest Preserve, into Sullivan County and towards New York City (Figure 2.18).

Numerous other arterials, collectors, and local roadways cover this region and connect smaller towns and villages. Heavy vehicles primarily use major roadways. A NYSDOT study used vehicle classification data from 2004 to 2009 to estimate the percentage of heavy vehicles on various road classifications in rural and urban settings (NYSDOT 2010a). The data for rural areas in NYSDOT Region 9 are presented in Table 2.110.

Table 2,110 - Heavy Vehicles as a Percentage of Total Vehicles in Rural Areas in NYSDOT Region 9, 2004-2009 (New August 2011)

Functional Classification (FC) Code	NYSDOT Region 9	Statewide
01	25.1%	25.2%
02	13.6%	12.5%
06	10.2%	9.5%
07	8.7%	8.9%
08	6.8%	6.8%
09	6.4%	7.1%

Source: NYSDOT 2010a.

Heavy-vehicle traffic is concentrated on major roadways, with FC road classifications 01 and 02 handling 38.7% of heavy-vehicle traffic in NYSDOT Region 9. Compared to the statewide percentage (37.7%), in Region 9, heavy-truck traffic is concentrated more on principal arterials and a less on other roads.

Region C

Region C comprises Chautauqua and Cattaraugus Counties, both of which are in NYSDOT Region 5. Table 2,111 presents a summary of the mileage of highways in each county. The *Highway Mileage Report* developed by NYSDOT provides current information on the public highway mileage in New York State, by county (NYSDOT 2009a).

Table 2,111 - Region C: Highway Mileage by County, 2009 (New August 2011)

	Town or Village	County	NYSDOT Owned	Other	Total
Cattaraugus	1,379.8	397.7	315.2	54.1	2,146.8
Chautauqua	1,531.5	551.5	353.1	47.1	2,483.2
Total Region C	2,911.3	949.2	668.3	101.2	4,630.0

Source: NYSDOT 2009a.

The two main roadway corridors in Region C run through different sections of the two counties. One is I-90, which runs northeast from the Pennsylvania border in Chautauqua County and along Lake Erie towards Buffalo, New York. The other corridor, I-86/NY-17, runs east-west through both Chautauqua and Cattaraugus Counties, crossing into Pennsylvania in western Chautauqua County. I-86/NY-17 crosses over Chautauqua Lake and runs north of the major population center

of Jamestown. It also connects other cities such as Randolph, Salamanca, and Olean (Figure 2.18).

Numerous other arterials, collectors, and local roadways cover this region and connect smaller towns and villages; these include Route 16, Route 19, Route 60, and Route 219. Heavy vehicles primarily use major roadways. A NYSDOT study used vehicle classification data from 2004 to 2009 to estimate the percentage of heavy vehicles on various road classifications in rural and urban settings (NYSDOT 2010a). The data for rural areas in NYSDOT Region 5 are presented in Table 2.112.

Table 2.112 - Heavy Vehicles as a Percentage of Total Vehicles in Rural Areas in NYSDOT Region 5, 2009 (New August 2011)

Functional Classification (FC) Code	NYSDOT Region 5	Statewide
01	23.5%	25.2%
02	10.9%	12.5%
06	11.3%	9.5%
07	8.8%	8.9%
08	6.3%	6.8%
09	7.1%	7.1%

Source: NYSDOT 2010a.

Heavy-vehicle traffic is concentrated on major roadways, with FC classifications 01 and 02 handling 34.4% of heavy-vehicle traffic in NYSDOT Region 5. However, the percentages are less than the corresponding statewide percentage. This may be a result of the city of Buffalo being located in NYSDOT Region 5, where heavy-vehicle traffic may use smaller roads in industrial/manufacturing areas for pickups and deliveries.

2.4.14.3 Condition of New York State Roads

New York State reports annually on the condition of bridges and pavements. Based on data submitted to the FHWA in April 2010, about 12% of the highway bridges in New York State are classified, under the broad federal standards, as structurally deficient, and about 25% are classified as functionally obsolete. Those classifications do not mean the bridges are unsafe, rather that they would require repairs or modifications to restore their condition or improve their functionality (NYSDOT 2011b).

The condition of pavements is scored on a 10-point scale, as shown in Table 2.113. New York State road conditions are ranked 42nd in the nation (NYSDOT 2009b). This makes any impacts on road conditions an important consideration.

Table 2.113 - Ranking System of Pavement Condition in New York State (New August 2011)

9-10	Excellent	No significant surface distress
7-8	Good Surface	Distress beginning to show
6	Fair	Surface distress is clearly visible
1-5	Poor	Distress is frequent and severe
U	Under Construction	Not rated due to ongoing work

Source: NYSDOT 2010b.

2.4.14.4 NYSDOT Funding Mechanisms

The construction, reconstruction, or maintenance (including repair, rehabilitation, and replacement) of transportation infrastructure under the State’s jurisdiction are performed by the NYSDOT. The state has statutorily established a number of funds that collect dedicated taxes and fees to fund NYSDOT’s capital and operating activities. Most of the tax and fee sources for these funds are related to transportation and collected from transportation users. They include:

- Petroleum business tax;
- Highway use tax;
- Motor fuel tax;
- Motor vehicle fees;
- Auto rental tax; and
- Miscellaneous special revenues.

The Petroleum Business Tax (PBT) is a tax imposed on petroleum businesses operating in New York State. The tax is paid by registered distributors and is imposed at a cents-per-gallon rate on petroleum products sold or used in the State. The tax imposition occurs at different points in the distribution chain, depending on the type of petroleum product: For motor fuel, the PBT is imposed upon importation into the State; for diesel motor fuel, the PBT is imposed on the first sale or use in the State; for non-automotive diesel fuel and residual oil, the PBT is imposed on

final sale or use; for kero-jet fuel, the PBT is imposed on fuel consumed on take-off from points in the State. The tax is jointly administered and collected with the State's motor fuel tax (NYSDTF 2011a).

The Highway Use Tax (HUT) is a tax on motor carriers operating certain motor vehicles on New York State public highways (excluding toll-paid portions of the New York State Thruway). The tax is based on mileage traveled on NYS public highways and is computed at a rate determined by the weight of the motor vehicle and the reporting method. A HUT certificate of registration is required for any truck, tractor, or other self-propelled vehicle with a gross weight over 18,000 pounds or for any truck with an unloaded weight over 8,000 pounds and any tractor with an unloaded weight over 4,000 pounds. An automotive fuel carrier (AFC) certificate of registration is required for any truck, trailer, or semi-trailer transporting automotive fuel (NYSDTF 2011b).

New York State has a motor fuel tax on motor fuel and diesel motor fuel sold in the State. The tax is imposed when motor fuel is produced in or imported into New York State and when diesel motor fuel is first sold or used in the State. It is jointly administered and collected with the petroleum business tax. The tax is paid by registered motor fuel and diesel motor fuel distributors (NYSDTF Finance 2011c).

Motor vehicle fees, which are collected by the New York State Department of Motor Vehicles, are another large source of income for the NYSDOT. Other taxes collected for the NYSDOT include the auto rental tax, corporation and utility tax, and other miscellaneous receipts, although the PBT, HUT, motor fuel tax, and motor vehicle fees are the main sources of revenue.

Table 2.114 shows the actual total receipts for years 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 for the NYSDOT, as well as the estimated receipts for year 2011-2012. Total receipts allotted to the NYSDOT increased from 2009 to 2011 and are expected to continue to increase through 2012.

Table 2.114 - NYSDOT Total Receipts, 2009-2012 (\$ thousands) (New August 2011)

	2009-2010 Actual	2010-2011 Actual	2011-2012 Estimated
Petroleum Business Tax	612,502	605,945	614,000
Highway Use Tax	137,247	129,162	144,000
Motor Fuel Tax	401,099	407,725	404,000
Motor Vehicle Fees	626,589	813,264	827,000
Auto Rental Tax	51,726	60,032	65,000
Corporation and Utility Tax	19,641	16,400	15,000
Other Miscellaneous Receipts	635,045	467,876	578,902
Total Tax Receipts	1,848,804	2,032,528	2,069,000
Total Receipts	2,483,849	2,500,404	2,647,902

Source: Zerrillo 2011.

The actual amount of total receipts in the year 2010-2011 was \$2.5 billion. Approximately \$1.4 billion, or 45.7%, came from business taxes, including the motor fuel, petroleum, and highway use taxes. Approximately \$813 million, or 32.5%, came from motor vehicle fees, and \$544 million, or 21.8% came from auto rental and corporation and utility uses taxes and other miscellaneous receipts. In the estimated receipts for next year (2011-2012), all income related to taxes is estimated to remain relatively constant, whereas there is expected to be a \$200 million increase in motor vehicle fees due to increases in fees (Table 2.114).

Collectively, revenues from these taxes flow into the state's Dedicated Highway and Bridge Trust Fund (DHBTF), which is the primary funding source for the NYSDOT highway and bridge capital program, engineering and program administration, DMV administration, as well as capital programs for transit, rail and aviation. In addition to these tax revenues, state general fund support is required to sustain the DHBTF and provide for new project commitments.

NYSDOT is implementing the final year of a two-year capital program for which approximately \$1.8 billion is annually dedicated to capital rehabilitation and replacement of the state and local road and bridge system. Despite past investment, the condition of the state's highway pavements and bridges is declining. Given the age of the state's highway system, the capital program, by necessity, invests largely in safety and asset preservation projects to meet the urgent needs of the transportation system.

In addition to state investment in roads and bridges, local governments invest in local roads and bridge infrastructure maintenance and improvement, largely through local property and other local taxes.

2.4.14.5 Rail and Air Services

New York State is served by an extensive system of rail lines for passengers and freight. Amtrak, operating primarily over rail lines owned by freight railroads, is the solitary provider of intercity rail passenger service in New York State. Over approximately 782 route miles, Amtrak links downstate with upstate cities that include Albany, Utica, Syracuse, Rochester, Buffalo, and many other intermediate points. CSX Transportation, Canadian Pacific Railway, and Norfolk Southern Railway are the primary owners and operators of freight corridors in New York State. CSX Transportation is the largest among these railroads, operating 1,292 of the total 4,208 miles of freight rail in the state. Fifty-nine of New York State's 62 counties are served by one of New York's freight railroads, which connect to all adjacent states and Canadian provinces (NYSDOT 2009). The principal rail lines in New York State are shown on Figure 2.18.

Freight carried by railroad is off-loaded at rail yards and transported to specific locations from the railroads by truck. The rail network in New York State is capable of carrying much of the drill equipment that might be required, although it would still have to be moved by truck from the rail yards to the well heads.

Many of the communities in and near the gas development areas are serviced by commercial airliners, including those associated with airports in smaller cities such as Jamestown, Binghamton, and Elmira, and in larger cities such as Buffalo, Rochester, and Syracuse. Figure 2.18 shows the location of Commercial - Primary airports, which are publicly-owned airports that receive scheduled passenger service and have more than 10,000 enplaned passengers per year. A list of Commercial - Primary airports in New York State is provided below. Some airports that are not categorized as Primary airports, because they fall below the 10,000 passenger per year passenger count, also are serviced by scheduled air carriers. The Jamestown airport is one such facility that lies within the area of potential shale gas development.

- Albany International Airport;
- Greater Binghamton Airport;
- Buffalo Niagara International Airport;
- Elmira/Corning Regional Airport;
- Long Island MacArthur Airport;
- Ithaca Tompkins Regional Airport;
- John F. Kennedy International Airport;
- LaGuardia Airport;
- Stewart International Airport;
- Plattsburgh International Airport;
- Greater Rochester International Airport;
- Syracuse Hancock International Airport; and
- Westchester County Airport.

In addition to Commercial - Primary airports, there are many other public use airports that can be utilized by charter operations. None of these airports are at or near capacity and can be available to service an influx of temporary workers.

2.4.15 Community Character⁵⁸

A community's character is defined by a combination of natural physical features, history, demographics and socioeconomics, and culture (Robinson 2005). Key attributes or features used to define community character generally include local natural features and land uses; local history and oral traditions; social practices and festivals; unique local restaurants and cuisine; and local arts. In addition, New York State's Environmental Quality Review Act acknowledges community character as a component of the environment, including existing patterns of

⁵⁸ Subsection 2.4.15, in its entirety, was provided by Ecology and Environment Engineering, P.C., August 2011 and was adapted by the Department.

population concentration, distribution or growth, and existing community or neighborhood character.

Local and regional planning are important in defining a community's character and long-term goals. In New York State, planning, zoning, and local law are implemented and enforced at the local level, through county and municipal boards or councils. The local entities set forth the community's goals and objectives through planning or zoning documents, which provide the most tangible and formal expression of a community's character. Notably, a 2007 New York State Court of Appeals decision (Village of Chestnut Ridge vs. Town of Ramapo) observed that "[t]he power to define the community character is a unique prerogative of a municipality acting in its governmental capacity" and, that, generally, through the exercise of their zoning and planning powers, municipalities are given the job of defining their own character (NYSDEC 2007).

A sense of place also is central to community character or identity. "Sense of place" can be described as those tangible and intangible characteristics which, over a period of time, have given a place its distinctiveness, identity, and authenticity (Robinson 2005). Distinctiveness can be globally, nationally, or regionally important, as well as locally or personally important. The various elements that comprise sense of place include, but are not limited to, regional and local planning, population density, transportation and access, and services and amenities.

To be a defined "place" a bounded area must be recognized by those within and without it as being a distinctive community and having a distinctive character. A sense of place and community character cannot be described for New York State as a whole due to the vast area it covers and the range of differences in communities across the state. Residents of a single place share their history, resources, and common concerns and have a similar way of life. Regions A, B, and C (Figure 2.3) were developed for the purposes of the SGEIS to generally describe representative areas of impact within the area underlain by the Marcellus Shale in New York State. Because they encompass numerous counties and municipalities with diverse land uses, planning goals, and identities, it is difficult to fully describe community character at the regional level. Each community within these regions has its own set of distinctiveness, authenticity, and identity. For the purposes of this analysis, the sense of place for a county or region was described utilizing regional, county, and local comprehensive plans, economic development plans, and Web

sites. These resources were used to piece together the sense of place for the representative regions.

Region A

Region A comprises Broome, Tioga, and Chemung Counties (Figure 2.4a). It is located in the eastern portion of the Southern Tier of New York, along the New York/Pennsylvania border. The Southern Tier Expressway (Interstate 86) crosses the southern portion of Region A, providing east/west access, and connecting the cities of Elmira in Chemung County, Waverly and Oswego in Tioga County, and Binghamton, Endicott and Johnson City in Broome County. Most of the urban development occurs along this corridor. The remainder of the region is rural; the rural landscape is dominated by the hills and valleys along the Susquehanna and Chemung Rivers. Collectively, the counties within Region A comprise 38 towns/cities, 18 villages, and many unincorporated areas. There are 21 combined school districts in the Region.

Generally, Region A can be described as having relatively small urban centers and quaint villages surrounded by small, scattered, and picturesque rural communities, largely set within the hills and valleys along the Susquehanna and Chemung Rivers. The Susquehanna and Chemung River valleys are a large part of the natural landscape and create vistas important to local communities. The natural landscape is home to a variety of wildlife, which is enjoyed by residents and visitors both passively (e.g., hiking and bird watching) and actively (e.g., fishing and hunting). Rural elements include scenic drives/routes, farmland, woodlands, forests, waterways, and natural areas. Villages and towns in Region A are quaint and historic and are also home to many musicians and artisans. In Region A, officials and residents describe their communities as being friendly and having a small-town feel and their residents as hard-working and ethical. Many note their country fairs, unique shops, and overall rural characteristics as contributing to their community's character.


Within the counties that comprise Region A, agriculture is an important part of community character. There are over 1,500 farms within Region A, and approximately 279,000 acres of land within the Region are located within 11 state-designated agricultural districts (NYSDAM 2011). Figure 2.19 provides an overview of the agricultural districts within Region A.

Region A is rich in history and historic preservation opportunities. Chemung County and the city of Elmira are considered to be “Mark Twain Country,” because it is the area where Mark Twain lived a large portion of his life and where he died. The character of Region A is influenced by numerous sites and events associated with Native American history, the Revolutionary War and Civil War, and the Underground Railroad, as well as historic villages, towns, and farms (Chemung County Chamber of Commerce 2011). The town of Owego, in Tioga County, has 151 homes that are located in historic districts (Visit Tioga 2011), and numerous Victorian homes throughout the region contribute to the historical aspect of its region’s character.


The region aims to maintain a “Main Street” and small local business attitude by promoting economic growth and maintaining a rural character.

Agri-tourism in the form of petting zoos, U-pick farms, and farmers markets is a large part of the community character of the region. An abundance of outdoor recreational activities, including hiking, biking, fishing, boating, hunting, cross-country skiing, and bird-watching, contributes to the high quality of life these communities all strive for. These activities are counterbalanced by many opportunities to enjoy art, music, and other cultural amenities provided by the region’s cities and towns.

Drilling for natural gas has been performed to a limited extent in Region A; in 2009 there were only 46 gas wells in the region (NYSDEC 2009). Of these, 45 active gas wells are located in Chemung County and one is in Tioga County. In addition, there are 13 underground gas storage wells in operation in Tioga County (NYSDEC 2011).



Pennsylvania



- | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Representative Region A | USGS NLCD Developed | Forest |
| County Boundary | USGS NLCD Open Space | Herbaceous/Shrub/Scrub |
| Agricultural Districts | USGS NLCD Agriculture | Open Water |
| | | Wetlands |

NOTE: Agricultural district boundaries are overlaid on the land cover data. The land cover within agricultural district boundaries includes land cover other than agriculture; however, land cover within the agricultural district boundaries is predominately agriculture.

Figure 2.19:
Land Cover and Agricultural Districts
Representative Region A

Source: ESRI, 2010; NYS/DAM, 2011

Broome County. Broome County is the furthest east in the region. The county has a total area of 715 square miles, including 707 square miles of land and 8 square miles of surface water (lakes, ponds, rivers, and streams). Broome County is more densely populated than the other counties in Region A, with a population density of 284 persons per square mile.

Within Broome County are 17 towns/cities and seven villages, and 12 school districts (Broome County 2011; New York Schools 2011a). The Binghamton-Johnson City-Endicott Tri-City Area is the predominant urban area of the county, which is surrounded by suburban development (Greater Binghamton Chamber of Commerce 2011). Major manufacturers located in Binghamton include Lockheed Martin (systems integration), BAE Systems (mission systems) and IBM Corporation (technology). Large healthcare facilities are also located in Binghamton, including United Health Services and Lourdes Hospital. The State University of New York at Binghamton is also a large employer within the region.

The Southern Tier Expressway (Interstate 86/NYS Route 17) crosses the southern portion of Broome County in an east-west direction, and Interstate 81 provides northern access to the cities of Cortland and Syracuse and the New York State Thruway.

The remaining land area in Broome County is largely rural. As reported by the Census of Agriculture, in 2007 there were 580 farms in Broome County, covering approximately 98,000 acres of land (22% of the total land area of the county). The average size of a farm in Broome County in 2007 was 150 acres. Principal sources of farm income include milk, cattle/calves, other crops/hay and nursery, greenhouse, floriculture, and sod. Dairy products account for approximately 70% of agricultural sales in the county (USDA 2007). As of 2011, there were approximately 153,000 acres of land within three state-designated agricultural districts in Broome County (NYSDAM 2011). Agri-tourism in Broome County focuses on farmers markets, U-pick farms, alpaca farms, apples, botanical gardens, and maple syrup (Visit Binghamton 2011).

Broome County and Tioga County are a part of the Susquehanna Heritage Area, which seeks to use the historic, cultural, and natural resources of the counties to strengthen the region's identity, enhance the local quality of life, support the local economy, and promote stewardship (Susquehanna Heritage Area 2009).

Broome County's Department of Planning and Economic Development "serves to promote the sound and orderly economic and physical growth of Broome County and its constituent municipalities...it implements projects and programs designed to improve the economy, environment and physical infrastructure of the county" (Broome County 2009). Development of comprehensive plans is generally left to the discretion of city and town zoning and planning boards, which originally adopted traditional forms of regulation in an effort to protect land use and natural resources. Local and regional development is guided by a number of open space plans, local comprehensive plans, and strategic plans. These documents broadly reflect a community's history, values, future goals, and character.

Broome County does not have a comprehensive or master plan, but many of its larger municipalities have a comprehensive/master plan, land use regulations/laws, and zoning maps. A brief review of representative local planning documents indicated that several communities in the county are concerned with protecting and maintain agricultural activities in order to preserve open space, promote historic preservation, and preserve and enhance the sense of community identities. As an example, the Town of Union's Unified Comprehensive Plan outlines the following goals and objectives: "protect and maintain agricultural activities as a land use option in order to preserve open space . . . promote a balance between the need to use and the need to preserve resources . . . [and] . . . promote historic preservation" (Town of Union 2009).

Tioga County. Tioga County is located in the Southern Tier of New York State, west of Broome County. This county has a total area of 523 square miles, including 519 square miles of land and 4 square miles of surface waters (lakes, ponds, rivers, and streams). Tioga County has the lowest population density in Region A, with 98.6 persons per square mile.

Within Tioga County are nine towns and six villages, as well as six school districts (Tioga County 2011a; New York Schools 2011b). The largest urban developments are Owego (19,883 persons in the town and 3,896 persons in the village) and Waverly (4,444 persons). The Binghamton-Johnson City-Endicott Tri-City Area also extends from Broome County into the eastern edge of Tioga County. The existing land use pattern in Tioga County has been influenced by the historic pattern of highway-oriented transportation and employment provided by IBM Corporation and later Lockheed Martin (Tioga County 2005). The presence of technologically advanced industries

in the southern portion of the county, along the Southern Tier Expressway and near Owego, led to that portion of the county being more densely populated than the northern portion. There are no major roadways running east-west in the northern portion of the county.

The remaining land area in Tioga County is largely rural. As reported by the Census of Agriculture, in 2007 there were 565 farms in this county, covering approximately 106,800 acres of land (32% of the land area of the county). The average size of a farm in Tioga County in 2007 was 189 acres (USDA 2007). The principal source of farm income is dairy products, which accounted for approximately 75% of agricultural products sold in 2007. Other farming in the county includes beef cows, horses, sheep, and poultry. Hay is the largest crop grown in Tioga County, followed by oats and vegetables. Farming operations in Tioga County also produce over 800 gallons of maple syrup (Tioga County 2011a). In recent years, Tioga County has seen decreases in the number of farms, the productivity of farms, and farmed acreage (Tioga County 2005). As of 2011, there were approximately 84,000 acres of land within three state-designated agricultural districts in the county (NYSDAM 2011). Tioga County continues to encourage farm owners to enroll in and work with the NYSDAM to establish agricultural districts to preserve the agricultural character of the county (Tioga County 2005).

Tioga County's physical environment ranges from farming communities to historic town centers with charming "Main Streets" (Visit Tioga County 2011; Tioga County 2005). The county is defined as rural and suburban, but not urban (Tioga County 2011b). The portion of the Susquehanna River basin in Tioga County provides recreational and visual benefits to the county. Tioga County prides itself in its unspoiled beauty, human resources, and central geographic location (Tioga County 2011c).

Tioga County encourages local municipalities to develop their own planning documents (Tioga County 2005). Development of comprehensive plans is generally left to the discretion of village and town zoning and planning boards, which originally adopted traditional forms of regulation in an effort to protect land use and natural resources. Local and regional development is guided by a number of open space plans, local comprehensive plans, and strategic plans. These documents broadly reflect a community's history, values, future goals, and character.

Tioga County does not have a comprehensive or master plan, but many of its municipalities have a comprehensive/master plan, land use regulations/laws, and/or zoning maps. A brief review of representative local planning documents indicated that several communities in the county are concerned with promoting economic development while preserving and maintaining their small town/hometown atmosphere and rural character. The towns also emphasize the importance of conservation and preservation of natural areas and open space, including both agriculture land use and future expansion of recreational community areas. For example, the first goal of the Town of Candor Comprehensive Plan is to “attract and recruit desirable small business and light industry in order to help create a stable tax base and maintain the small town/hometown atmosphere” (Town of Candor 1999).

Chemung County. Chemung County is located west of Tioga County. The county has a total area of 411 square miles, including 408 square miles of land and 3 square miles of surface water. Chemung County has a population density of 218 persons per square mile.

Within Chemung County are 12 towns/cities and five villages, as well as three school districts (Chemung County 2011a; New York Schools 2011c). The existing land use pattern in Chemung County has been significantly influenced by the topography of the region, including the Chemung River Valley. The region’s climate, topography, and soils support productive agricultural, forestry, and wood product industries (Susquehanna – Chemung 2011). The region is rural, with rolling hills, scenic farmlands, rural vistas, and outdoor recreation opportunities, which are all major contributors to the region’s appeal.

The city of Elmira is the largest population center in Chemung County. Located along the Southern Tier Expressway (Interstate 86/17), the city is the historical and cultural center of the county and has numerous historical markers, museums, and tours. The city has the “largest concentration of Victorian-era homes in the State of New York” (Chemung County Chamber of Commerce 2011). Chemung County has many manufacturing industries, which make products such as subway cars, electronic equipment, structural steel products, helicopters, automotive-related products, and paper products (Chemung County 2008).

As reported by the Census of Agriculture, in 2007 there were 373 farms in the county, covering approximately 65,000 acres of land (approximately 25% of the land area of the county). The average size of a farm in Chemung County in 2007 was 175 acres (USDA 2007). Agricultural activities include the production of corn, wheat, hay silage, vegetables, poultry, eggs, beef, milk, milk products, and pork (Chemung County 2008). Approximately 42,000 acres of farmland in Chemung County are located in five agricultural districts (NYSDAM 2011). Farming operations in Chemung County have also decreased over the years, but agriculture is still a major industry in this county.

Chemung County's topography consists of hills and valleys, with the principal valley being the Chemung River valley (Chemung County 2008). The majority of the county is naturally forested and classified as woodland, but up to 18% of the land area is active agricultural land (Chemung County 2008). Described as the "Gateway to the Finger Lakes," Chemung County itself has sufficient waterways, rolling hills, scenic farmlands, and outdoor recreational resources to provide a high quality of life for residents and tourists (Susquehanna-Chemung 2011).

Chemung County's Planning Department assists local communities with comprehensive planning, land use and zoning, floodplains and watersheds, and grant proposals (Chemung County 2011b). Chemung County empowers the local municipalities to develop their own planning documents and periodically presents specialized training workshops for local planning and zoning officials (Chemung County 2011b, 2011c). Development of comprehensive plans is generally left to the discretion of village and town zoning and planning boards, which originally adopted traditional forms of regulation in an effort to protect land use and natural resources. Local and regional development is guided by a number of open-space plans, comprehensive plans, and strategic plans. These documents broadly reflect a community's history, values, future goals, and character. The Chemung County Planning Department participates actively in the Rural Leadership program of the Southern Tier Regional Planning and Development Board (Chemung County 2011b).

Chemung County does not have a comprehensive or master plan, but many of its municipalities have a comprehensive/master plan, land use regulations/laws, and/or zoning maps. A brief review of representative local planning documents indicated that several communities in the

county are concerned with protecting their small town feel, maintaining a similar population size, enhancing recreational amenities, and protecting environmentally significant and/or sensitive areas while minimizing anthropogenic adverse impacts on the land and, consequently, the quality of life of the residents. For example, the Village of Horseheads Comprehensive Plan states their village "... is an inviting place where diverse residents choose to live, work, and play; it is a blend of residential neighborhoods, commercial and manufacturing businesses, parks, and open spaces. Residents and Village officials take pride in the surroundings by assuring the maintenance and beauty of homes, land, and property" (Village of Horseheads 2010).

Region B

Region B comprises Delaware, Sullivan, and Otsego Counties (Figure 2.4b). Region B is located in the Catskill Mountains and the Leatherstocking region of New York and has a rich natural and human history. The National Baseball Hall of Fame is located in Cooperstown, in Otsego County, and is a destination for thousands of people annually. Glass museums, history museums, and other tourist attractions exist throughout the region. The Catskills are an attraction for outdoor enthusiasts. Various manufacturing companies are located across the region, mainly occurring in the larger towns. The region is known for manufacturing communications equipment, integrated circuits, pharmaceuticals, transportation equipment, plastic and rubber products, and food and beverages. Other large employers include insurance companies, colleges, health care facilities, and retailers. NYSEG, Verizon, and other electronics companies are located in the city of Oneonta (City of Oneonta 2011). Having manufacturing and cultural hubs surrounded by natural areas contributes to the community character of the region.


Within the region there are 60 towns, 26 villages, and over 75 hamlets; 42 combined school districts. Gas drilling is relatively new to these counties and is not an integral part of the industrial or rural landscape of the region. In 2009 there were no natural gas wells in production in Region B (NYSDEC 2009). Several exploratory wells were developed in 2007 and 2009, but no production has been reported.

Generally, Region B can be described as having relatively small urban centers and villages surrounded by numerous small, scattered, and picturesque rural hamlets within a setting of sparsely populated hills, mountains, and valleys. Some communities boast about their clean

water, land, and air and panoramic views of natural beauty, while others are particularly proud of their proximity to larger metropolitan areas. Local Web sites and planning documents describe the less densely populated segments of each community as having a rural character, with few buildings, structures, or development (Catskills Region 2011). Rural elements include meandering, tree-lined streets, farmland, woodlands and forests, and natural areas. With the exception of communities immediately along state or county transportation corridors, the hamlets, villages, and towns in Region B generally are pedestrian-friendly or are in the process of revitalizing their neighborhoods to be more walkable (Sullivan County Chamber of Commerce 2011a). Within Region B, views and vistas are dominated by undeveloped open space (Town of Otsego 2005). In Delaware County, this was reinforced by the 1997 Watershed Memorandum of Agreement with NYC.

There are over 1,900 farms within the three counties that comprise Region B; consequently, agriculture is an important part of community character within the Region. Approximately 588,000 acres of land within Region B are located within 15 state-designated agricultural districts (NYSDAM 2011). Figure 2.20 provides an overview of the agricultural districts within Region B.

In Region B, many of the inhabited places are small and the pace of life is slow. Some local officials and residents describe their communities as being friendly and having a small-town feel. Many note their country fairs, specialty shops, and team sports as contributing to their community's character. Delaware and Sullivan Counties are described as rural retreats for urban tourists from NYC. The City of Oneonta, in Otsego County, describes itself as a religious community, known for its many places and worship. All of the counties in Region B describe active and passive recreational activities as being essential to their community character. Available outdoor recreational activities include hiking, fishing, boating, biking, bird-watching, hunting, skiing, and snowmobiling.



- Representative Region B USGS NLCD
- County Boundary
- Agricultural Districts
- Agriculture
- Forest
- Open Space
- Open Water
- Developed
- Herbaceous/Shrub/Scrub
- Wetlands

NOTE: Agricultural district boundaries are overlaid on the land cover data. The land cover within agricultural district boundaries includes land cover other than agriculture; however, land cover within the agricultural district boundaries is predominately agriculture.

Figure 2.20:
Land Cover and Agricultural Districts
Representative Region B

Source: ESRI, 2010; NYS/DAM, 2010, 2011

Region B, while rural and slow-paced in some areas, also has several centers of commerce, high-quality health care facilities, institutions of higher education, and noteworthy cultural activities, including art galleries, theatre groups, and music events. These assets significantly contribute to their “sense of place.” For centuries the Catskills Mountains in Delaware County have been a place where art colonies flourished. In Cooperstown, in Otsego County, the Baseball Hall of Fame, Glimmerglass Opera, art galleries, and specialty shops draw throngs of visitors each year. Sullivan County describes itself as offering value and convenience for visitors seeking an escape closer to home, with museums, antiques, boutiques and theater, as well as outdoor recreational activities. It is best known as the home of the Woodstock music festival and the Monticello Raceway. Agri-tourism also is important to Sullivan County.

Delaware County. Geographically, Delaware County is the largest county in Region B and is one of the larger counties in New York State (Delaware County Chamber of Commerce 2011a). Delaware County is located in the southeastern part of the state and is bordered to the south by the Delaware River. The Catskill Mountains are partially located in Delaware County. The county has a total area of 1,468 square miles, including 1,446 square miles of land and 22 square miles of surface water (lakes, ponds, rivers, and streams). Delaware County is one of the least populated counties in New York State, with 33 persons per square mile. The county has 19 cities/towns, 10 villages, two hamlets, and 13 school districts (Delaware County 2011; Delaware County Chamber of Commerce 2011b; New York Schools 2011d). The largest population centers are the villages of Sidney (3,900 persons), Walton (3,088 persons), and Delhi (3,087 persons). Interstate 86/Route 17 crosses the southern boundary of Delaware County.

The remaining areas in Delaware County are rural. As reported by the Census of Agriculture, in 2007, there were 747 farms in the county, covering approximately 200,000 acres (22% of the land area in the county). The average size of a farm in Delaware County in 2007 was 222 acres. The principal sources of farm income include milk, vegetables, other crops/hay and nursery, greenhouse, floriculture, and sod (USDA 2007). According to more recent data from the Delaware County Chamber of Commerce, dairy products account for approximately 80% of agricultural sales in the county, and Delaware County represents 80% of the dairy farms in the NYC watershed area (Delaware County Chamber of Commerce 2011b). As of 2011, there were

approximately 237,000 acres of land within eight state-designated agricultural districts in Delaware County (NYSDAM 2011).

The existing land use pattern in Delaware County has been influenced by the historic pattern of hamlet development, highway-oriented transportation, and state land ownership. In addition, a major land-acquisition program is underway in Delaware County and other Catskills/Delaware Watershed communities that help to provide an unfiltered drinking water supply to NYC. The acquisition of this land will preclude future development in designated areas (NYC Watershed 2009).

Delaware County does not have a comprehensive plan, but it empowers its municipalities to develop their own planning documents. Development is generally left to the discretion of village and town zoning and planning boards, which originally adopted traditional forms of regulation in an effort to protect land use and natural resources. Local and regional development is guided by a number of open-space plans, comprehensive plans, and strategic plans. These documents broadly reflect a community's history, values, future goals, and character.

Delaware County does not have a comprehensive or master plan, but many of its municipalities have a comprehensive/master plan, land use regulations/laws, and zoning maps. A brief review of representative local planning documents indicated that several communities in the county are concerned with protecting and preserving agricultural land, including niche farming, forestry, and other sensitive areas; maintaining a rural character and the historical context of the communities; preserving existing development patterns and the appearance of residential development; maintaining the natural environment; and minimizing impacts on scenic transportation routes and vistas. For example, the Town of Stamford states in its Final Draft Comprehensive Plan that the town "will be a place that continues to maintain and celebrate its small town, rural character and natural beauty . . . maintain our open spaces and the pristine nature of the environment . . . [and] . . . our quality of life will be enhanced because of the Towns' strong sense of community through its caring, friendly people and the dedicated organizations and volunteers that serve us well" (Town of Stamford 2011).

Sullivan County. Sullivan County is located south of Delaware County. The county has a total area of 1,038 square miles, including 1,011 square miles of land and 27 square miles of surface water (lakes, ponds, rivers, and streams). The county's physical environment ranges from historic urban centers to farming communities nestled within an open-space network that includes the Upper Delaware Scenic and Recreation River (to the west), Catskill Park (to the north) Basherkill Watershed, and Shawangunk Ridge (Sullivan County Catskills 2011a).

Sullivan County has a population density of 76 persons per square mile. Within the county are 15 cities/towns, six villages, and over 30 hamlets; and eight school districts (Sullivan County Catskills 2011b; Sullivan County Chamber of Commerce 2011b). The largest population centers are the Village of Monticello (6,726 persons), and the Village of Liberty (4,392 persons). Interstate 86/Route 17 crosses through the middle of Sullivan County, providing access to New York City, which is approximately 60 miles southeast of Sullivan County.

The remaining portions of Sullivan County are rural and open space. According to the Census of Agriculture, in 2007 there were 323 farms in Sullivan County, covering approximately 63,600 acres (approximately 10% of the land area of the county). The average size of a farm in 2007 was 156 acres (USDA 2007). In 2007, the principal sources of farm income included poultry and eggs, milk and other dairy products from cows (USDA 2007). Poultry and eggs accounted for approximately 65% of agricultural sales in the county in 2007. In recent years, however, Sullivan County has seen a decrease in traditional dairy and livestock farms (it now has only two major egg producers and 28 dairy farms) and an increase in smaller niche and diversified vegetable and livestock farms. As of 2011, there were approximately 162,000 acres of land within two state-designated agricultural districts in Sullivan County (NYSDAM 2011).

In its Comprehensive Plan, the county describes itself as being on the verge of becoming urban, with rapid growth and development that will change its character and have an impact on its resources (Sullivan County Catskills 2005). The county's vision and community land use goals include avoiding heavy traffic, strip malls, and loss of open space and ensuring the availability of affordable housing. While development decisions are made at the local level, the county encourages collective support of a unified vision in its Comprehensive Plan (Sullivan County Catskills 2005). As stated in the Comprehensive Plan, current development patterns often

mandate a separation of land uses; however, revitalization efforts are focused on mixed-used in-fill development (i.e., development within vacant or under-utilized spaces within the built environment), walkable communities, and streetscape improvements (Sullivan County Catskills 2005). The county also is committed to preserving viewsheds, natural resources, and environmentally sensitive areas through zoning. Lastly, the county encourages coordinated zoning among its municipalities and intends to provide resources to municipalities to upgrade local zoning and land use regulations every 10 years.

Otsego County. Otsego County is located in central New York State, north of Delaware County. It is situated in the foothills of the Catskill Mountains, at the headwaters of the Susquehanna River (Otsego County 2011). The County has a total area of 1,015 square miles, including 1,003 square miles of land and 12 square miles of surface water (lakes, ponds, rivers, and streams). The county has a population density of 62 persons per square mile.

Within the county are 25 cities/towns, nine villages, and 47 hamlets; and 21 school districts. The city of Oneonta, the county seat, has a population of 13,901 persons, and is surrounded by suburbs, and villages, hamlets, and farm communities that stretch across the remainder of the county. Interstate 88 crosses the southern portion of Otsego County, connecting the City of Oneonta to Binghamton to the south, and the Albany area to the north.

Farming operations in Otsego County have decreased over the years, but agriculture is still a major industry in the county. Active farmland is concentrated in the mid- to northern portions of the county (Otsego County 1999). According to the Census of Agriculture, in 2007 there were 908 farms in Otsego County, covering approximately 206,000 acres (approximately 30% of the land area of the county). The average size of a farm in Otsego County in 2007 was 201 acres (USDA 2007). The principal sources of farm income include milk, cattle/calves, other crops and hay and nursery, greenhouse, floriculture, and sod. Dairy products account for approximately 70% of agricultural sales in the county (USDA 2007). As of 2011, there were approximately 189,000 acres of land within five state-designated agricultural districts in Otsego County (NYS DAM 2011).

Otsego County does not have a comprehensive or master plan, but most of its 34 municipalities have a comprehensive/master plan, land use regulations/laws, and zoning maps. A brief review of representative comprehensive plans indicated that several communities in the county are concerned with protecting sensitive areas, maintaining a low residential density, preserving existing patterns of land use in hamlets and rural areas, maintaining the natural environment, and minimizing visual blight. For example, the Town of Otsego Comprehensive Plan's vision statement states the following: "We foresee the future Town of Otsego as continuing to have a clean environment, beautiful landscape, and rural character. We foresee carefully managed growth and development, maintaining access to our natural areas. We foresee a place of safety for us and our families." (Town of Otsego 2008). According to the Otsego County Department of Planning, affordable housing and real estate is also important to the county (Otsego County 2009).

Region C

Region C comprises Chautauqua and Cattaraugus Counties (Figure 2.4c). Generally, Region C can be described as largely rural in character, with commercial/industrial hubs located along the Southern Tier Expressway and agri-tourism spread across the region. Some communities boast about their access to water bodies and the recreational opportunities they provide, while others are particularly proud of their proximity to lively cities. Local Web sites and planning documents describe the less densely populated portions of each community as having a rural character and charm. Rural elements include scenic drives/routes, farmlands, woodlands and forests, waterways, and natural areas. Hamlets, villages, and towns in the region are quaint and historic and many are home to museums and historical sites. The unique geological history of the region has endowed it with numerous natural attractions, including the deeply incised valleys of Allegany State Park, the deep gorges of Zoar Valley, and numerous lakes and rivers, all of which contribute to the region's character.

Distinct features in each county contribute to the type of agriculture they support, which in turn influences the character of each county. The floodplains of large streams such as Cattaraugus Creek support dairy farms in Cattaraugus County, whereas the climatic influences of nearby Lake Erie support grape production in Chautauqua County.

The city of Salamanca in Cattaraugus County is the only U.S. city east of the Mississippi River that is located within a Native American tribal land (Seneca Nation of Indians). The proximity to Native American tribal lands and the Native American history of the area are important to this community's character. The residents of Region C are proud of their history and work diligently to preserve and promote it. The promotion of this history is evidenced by historical sites and museums found throughout the region, including the Chautauqua Institution in Chautauqua, New York. This renowned institution opened in the late 1800s and serves as a community center and resource "where the human spirit is renewed, minds are stimulated, faith is restored, and art is valued" (Chautauqua County Chamber of Commerce 2011a). This is another example of heritage forming an important part of community character in Region C.

Region C has a vibrant and diverse agricultural industry, which can be found throughout the rolling hills, rural countryside, and woodlands. The agricultural heritage of the region includes Amish communities in both Cattaraugus and Chautauqua Counties. There are over 2,700 farms in Region C. Approximately 632,000 acres of land within Region C are located within 17 state-designated agricultural districts (NYSDAM 2011). Figure 2.21 provides an overview of the agricultural districts within Region C.

Although agriculture is an important aspect of Region C, there is a balance between rural preservation and urban development. There are numerous small villages and communities within Region C, many of which are rich in historic sites and museums. For example, Jamestown in Chautauqua County is home to the Roger Tory Peterson Institute of Natural History, the Fenton History Center, the Lucy-Desi Museum, and the Desilu Playhouse and Theater. Jamestown's unique character and Victorian heritage are echoed throughout the region.


Tourism is also a large part of the community character of the region. Recreational activities that draw tourists to the region include bicycling, boating, fishing, gaming (on Native American tribal land), geo-caching (a treasure-hunting game using GPS technology), golfing, hiking, horseback riding, motor sports, scenic driving, hunting, mountain biking, downhill skiing, cross-country skiing, snowmobiling, snowshoeing, and white water rafting. This abundance of the recreational activities is a significant aspect of the community character in Region C. Within the region are 63 cities/towns, 28 villages, and other unincorporated areas, as well as 30 combined school districts.

Gas drilling is not new to Region C; in 2009 approximately 3,917 gas wells were in production in this region (NYSDEC 2009).

Chautauqua County. Located in the southwestern corner of the state, Chautauqua County is considered the western gateway to New York State (Chautauqua County 2011a). The county is bordered by Lake Erie to the northwest, Pennsylvania to the south and west, the Seneca Nation of Indians and Erie County to the northeast, and Cattaraugus County to the east (Chautauqua County 2011b). The center of the county is Chautauqua Lake; five smaller lakes are located throughout the county. The Southern Tier Expressway crosses the mid-section of the county, and the New York State Thruway crosses the county along its northern border near Lake Erie. Chautauqua County has a total area of 1,500 square miles, including 1,062 square miles of land and 438 square miles of surface water (lakes, ponds, rivers, and streams).

There are two cities within the county, Jamestown to the south and Dunkirk along Lake Erie, which are surrounded by rural areas and lakes. Due to the presence of the two cities, Chautauqua County has an average population density of 127 persons per square mile. Within the county are 29 cities/towns and 15 villages, as well as 18 school districts (Chautauqua County 2011a; New York Schools 2011e).

According to the Census of Agriculture, in 2007 there were 1,658 farms in Chautauqua County, which cover approximately 235,858 acres (35% of the land area of the county) (USDA 2007). In 2007 the average size of a farm in this county was 142 acres (USDA 2007). In Chautauqua County, the principal sources of farm income are grape and dairy products (USDA 2007). Grapes and grape products account for approximately 30% of agricultural sales in the county, and dairy products account for approximately 50.5% of agricultural sales (USDA 2007). Grape growers in Chautauqua County produce approximately 65% of New York State's total annual grape harvest (Tour Chautauqua 2011a). As of 2011, there were approximately 392,000 acres of land within 11 state-designated agricultural districts in Chautauqua County (NYSDAM 2011).



- | | |
|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Representative Region C | USGS NLCD Forest |
| County Boundary | Developed |
| Agricultural Districts | Open Space |
| | Agriculture |
| | Herbaceous/Shrub/Scrub |
| | Open Water |
| | Wetlands |

NOTE: Agricultural district boundaries are overlaid on the land cover data. The land cover within agricultural district boundaries includes land cover other than agriculture; however, land cover within the agricultural district boundaries is predominately agriculture.

Figure 2.21:
Land Cover and Agricultural Districts
Representative Region C

Source: ESRI, 2010; NYS/DAM, 2010, 2011

Agri-tourism in Chautauqua County focuses on wineries in the northern portion of the county and scenic drives and farmers markets in the southern and eastern portions of the county. Another large part of agri-tourism here centers on the county's Amish Country (Tour Chautauqua 2011b).

Other industries also play important roles in the community character of Region C. In Chautauqua County, tourism based on recreational opportunities and historical and cultural sites and events is important throughout the county. Dunkirk, which is strategically located along Lake Erie, is described by the Chautauqua County Chamber of Commerce as having financial and technological support networks that provide businesses with competitive opportunities for growth (Chautauqua County Chamber of Commerce 2011b). The village of Fredonia is home to the State University of New York (SUNY) Fredonia campus, and the educational industry forms a large part of the community's character (Chautauqua County Chamber of Commerce 2011c).

Jamestown serves as an industrial, commercial, financial, and recreational hub for southwestern New York, and the city is home to several museums and historical resources (Chautauqua County Chamber of Commerce 2011d). The city of Salamanca is located along the Allegheny River and describes itself as filled with country charm. It is the only city in the U.S. that lies almost completely within the borders of an Indian Reservation (Seneca Nation) (City of Salamanca 2011). The city is located on the northern border of Allegany State Park and serves as a year-round access point to the park. Salamanca is a center for the forestry and wood products industry and has plentiful supplies of maple, oak, and cherry (City of Salamanca 2011).

Chautauqua County has a comprehensive plan called *Chautauqua County 20/20 Comprehensive Plan* (Chautauqua County 2011b), which is designed to assist the county government in making decisions that affect the county's future (Chautauqua County 2011b). The plan identifies strategic issues and goals and is intended to ensure that there is cooperation between municipalities to achieve these goals (Chautauqua County 2011b). The plan states that Chautauqua County has an unusually high number of natural resource assets and unique attractions, including but not limited to farms (dairy and grape), lakes, historic towns, and the Chautauqua Institution (Chautauqua County 2011b). The county considers its traditional agricultural base to have preserved its open space and rural charm, which is a significant aspect of the county's community character (Chautauqua County 2011b).

Cattaraugus County. Cattaraugus County is located directly east of Chautauqua County and is also located within the Southern Tier of New York. The county has a total area of 1,322 square miles, including 1,310 square miles of land and 12 square miles of surface water (lakes, ponds, rivers, and streams). Cattaraugus County has a much lower population density than Chautauqua County, at 61 persons per square mile. Within the county are 34 cities/towns and 13 villages, as well as 12 school districts (Cattaraugus County 2011; New York Schools 2011f).

Cattaraugus County is much more rural than Chautauqua County, with small towns and rural characteristics. There are three Native American reservations wholly or partially within Cattaraugus County. The county's geology was sculpted by glaciers during the last glacial period, and the county is drained by two significant waterways, the Allegheny River in the south and Cattaraugus Creek in the north (Enchanted Mountains 2011a).

The existing land use pattern in Cattaraugus County has been significantly influenced by the topography of the region. Glaciers and rivers have sculpted the county into a mountainous region ideal for a wide variety of outdoor recreational activities, including skiing, hiking, hunting, and camping, and the fertile valleys support productive agricultural communities.

According to the Census of Agriculture, in 2007 there were 1,122 farms in Cattaraugus County, which cover approximately 183,000 acres (USDA 2007). In 2007 the average size of a farm in the county was 163 acres (USDA 2007). The principal sources of farm income are dairy products; nursery, greenhouse, floriculture, and sod; and cattle/calves (USDA 2007). Dairy products account for approximately 68% of agricultural sales in the county (USDA 2007). However, in recent years, dairy farming has declined in Cattaraugus County, especially in areas around towns/cities where the majority of commerce is not based on agriculture, such as around Ellicottville, where tourism is the main source livelihood (Cattaraugus County 2007). As of 2011, there were approximately 240,000 acres of land within six state-designated agricultural districts in Chautauqua County (NYSDAM 2011).

Agri-tourism is an important industry in Cattaraugus County. Agri-tourism in this county centers on maple syrup production and the Amish Trail, which is located in the western portion of Cattaraugus County (Enchanted Mountains 2011b; GOACC 2011).

The city of Olean is the commercial and industrial hub of Cattaraugus County (GOACC 2011). The city has a rich commercial and industrial history and is currently home to several large corporations, including manufacturers such as Dresser-Rand and Cutco-Alcas. This regional industrial and commercial center is necessary to maintain the rural character of the rest of Cattaraugus County.

The role of the Cattaraugus County Planning Department is to assist local communities with comprehensive planning, land use and zoning, floodplains and watersheds, census data and demographics, planning for agriculture, and any downtown revitalization projects (Cattaraugus County 2011). Cattaraugus County empowers the local municipalities to develop their own planning documents (Cattaraugus County 2011). Development of comprehensive plans is generally left to the discretion of county and town zoning and planning boards, which originally adopted traditional forms of regulation in an effort to protect land use and natural resources. Local and regional development is guided by a number of open-space plans, comprehensive plans, and strategic plans. These documents broadly reflect a community's history, values, future goals, and character.

Cattaraugus County does not have a comprehensive or master plan, but many of its municipalities have a comprehensive/master plan, land use regulations/laws, and zoning maps. A brief review of representative local planning documents indicated that several communities in the county are concerned with protecting sensitive areas, promoting tourism through recreation activities, maintaining a small town/rural feel, maintaining the natural environment, and creating a balance of the rural character and protection of the environment with appropriate economic development. Affordable housing and real estate also is important to the communities. For example, the Town of Portville Comprehensive Plan outlines the following goals: "... maintain the rural character of the Town, and at the same time provide for anticipated growth and development ... [and] ... maintain the predominantly rural character by preserving natural woodlands and floodplains, conserving the productive farms as much as possible, encouraging open space areas as a integral part to any new residential development, and concentrating intensive residential and commercial uses into selected centers of activity" (Town of Portville 2003).

In Cattaraugus County, Allegany State Park and the Enchanted Mountains provide recreational opportunities and associated jobs. The village of Ellicottville flourishes on the tourism industry, which centers on two major ski resorts. In the city of Olean, commerce is centered on industry (GOACC 2011).

This page intentionally left blank.



DEC

Chapter 3

Proposed SEQRA Review Process

This page intentionally left blank.

Chapter 3 - Proposed SEQRA Review Process

CHAPTER 3 PROPOSED SEQRA REVIEW PROCESS	3-1
3.1 INTRODUCTION – USE OF A GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT	3-1
3.1.1 1992 GEIS and Findings	3-2
3.1.2 Need for a Supplemental GEIS.....	3-2
3.2 FUTURE SEQRA COMPLIANCE	3-3
3.2.1 Scenarios for Future SEQRA Compliance under the SGEIS	3-4
3.2.2 Review Parameters.....	3-5
3.2.2.1 SGEIS Applicability - Definition of High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing	3-6
3.2.2.2 Project Scope.....	3-6
3.2.2.3 Size of Project	3-7
3.2.2.4 Lead Agency.....	3-8
3.2.3 EAF Addendum and Additional Informational Requirements	3-8
3.2.3.1 Hydraulic Fracturing Information	3-9
3.2.3.2 Water Source Information.....	3-9
3.2.3.3 Distances	3-10
3.2.3.4 Water Well Information	3-11
3.2.3.5 Fluid Disposal Plan.....	3-11
3.2.3.6 Operational Information	3-12
3.2.3.7 Invasive Species Survey and Map.....	3-13
3.2.3.8 Required Affirmations	3-13
3.2.3.9 Local Planning Documents	3-14
3.2.3.10 Habitat Fragmentation	3-14
3.2.4 Prohibited Locations.....	3-14
3.2.5 Projects Requiring Site-Specific SEQRA Determinations of Significance	3-15
3.3 REGULATIONS	3-17

This page intentionally left blank.

Chapter 3 PROPOSED SEQRA REVIEW PROCESS

3.1 Introduction – Use of a Generic Environmental Impact Statement

The Department's regulations to implement SEQRA¹ authorize the use of a generic environmental impact statement (EIS) to assess the environmental impacts of separate actions having similar types of impacts.² Additionally, a generic EIS and its findings "should set forth specific conditions or criteria under which future actions will be undertaken or approved, including requirements for any subsequent SEQRA compliance"³ such as the need for a supplemental environmental impact statement (SEIS). The course of action following a final generic EIS depends on the level of detail within the generic EIS, as well as the specific follow-up actions being considered. In considering a subsequent action such as permitting horizontal drilling and high-volume hydraulic fracturing in the Marcellus Shale and other low-permeability reservoirs, the Department must evaluate the generic EIS to determine whether the impacts from the subsequently proposed action (i.e., approval of the permit application) are not addressed, or are inadequately addressed, in the generic EIS, and, in either case, whether the subsequent action is likely to have one or more significant adverse environmental impacts. If significant adverse impacts of the subsequent action are identified, and they are not adequately addressed in the generic EIS, then a site- or project-specific SEIS must be prepared. Under the regulations, generic EISs and their findings should identify the environmental issues or thresholds that would trigger the need for a SEIS. However, if the Department determines that the final generic EIS adequately addresses all potential significant adverse impacts of the subsequently proposed action, then no SEIS is necessary. The SEQRA regulations pertaining to generic EISs (6 NYCRR §617.10[d][1]) provide that when a final generic EIS has been filed, "no further SEQRA compliance is required if a subsequent proposed action will be carried out in conformance with the conditions and thresholds established for such actions" in the generic EIS.⁴

¹ SEQRA regulations are available at <http://www.dec.ny.gov/regs/4490.html>.

² 6 NYCRR §617.10(a). The regulations define the uses and functions of generic EISs. Frequently asked questions on the use of generic environmental impact statements are posted on the Department's website at <http://www.dec.ny.gov/permits/56701.html>.

³ 6 NYCRR §617.10(c).

⁴ 6 NYCRR §617.10(d)(1).

3.1.1 1992 GEIS and Findings

Drilling and production of separate oil and gas wells, and other wells regulated under ECL 23 have common types of impacts. Therefore, the Department issued the 1992 GEIS and Findings Statement to cover oil, gas and solution mining activities regulated under ECL 23. The 1992 GEIS is incorporated by reference into this document.⁵ Based on the 1992 GEIS, the Department found that issuance of a standard, individual oil or gas well drilling permit anywhere in the state, when no other permits are involved, would not have a significant environmental impact.⁶ See Appendix 2.

Also, in the 1992 Findings Statement, the Department found that issuance of a drilling permit for a location in a State Parkland, in an Agricultural District, or within 2,000 feet of a municipal water supply well, or for a location which requires other Department permits, may be significant and required a site-specific SEQRA determination. Under the 1992 GEIS, the only instance where issuance of an individual permit to drill an oil or gas well is always deemed significant and therefore always requires an SEIS is when the proposed location is within 1,000 feet of a municipal water supply well.

As part of the 1992 GEIS, the Department also evaluated the action of leasing of state land for oil and gas development and found no significant environmental impacts associated with that action.⁷ Specifically, the Department concluded that lease clauses and the permitting process with its attendant environmental review would result in mitigation of any potential impacts that could result from a proposal to drill. See Appendix 3.

3.1.2 Need for a Supplemental GEIS

As mentioned above, the SEQRA regulations require preparation of a supplement to a final generic EIS if a subsequent proposed action may have one or more significant adverse environmental impacts that were not addressed in the 1992 GEIS.⁸ In 2008, the Department determined that some aspects of the current and anticipated application of horizontal drilling and

⁵ <http://www.dec.ny.gov/energy/45912.html>.

⁶ http://www.dec.ny.gov/docs/materials_minerals_pdf/geisfindorig.pdf.

⁷ Sovas GH, April 19, 2003 (http://www.dec.ny.gov/docs/materials_minerals_pdf/geisfindsup.pdf).

⁸ 6 NYCRR §617.10(d)(4).

high-volume hydraulic fracturing warranted further review in the context of a SGEIS, or Supplement. This determination was based primarily upon three concerns, as follows: (1) high-volume hydraulic fracturing would require water volumes far in excess of generic EIS descriptions (in the 1992 GEIS), (2) the possibility of drilling taking place in the NYC Watershed, in or near the Catskill Park, and near the federally-designated Upper Delaware Scenic and Recreational River, and (3) the longer duration of disturbance likely to take place at multi-well drilling sites.

- 1) *Water Volumes*: Multi-stage hydraulic fracturing of horizontal shale wells may require the use and management of millions of gallons of water for each well. This raised concerns about the volume of chemical additives present on a site, withdrawal of large amounts of water from surface water bodies, and the management and disposal of flowback water;
- 2) *Anticipated Drilling Locations*: While the 1992 GEIS does address drilling in watersheds that are major sources of drinking water supply, areas of rugged topography, unique habitats and other sensitive areas, oil and gas activity in the eastern third of the State was rare to non-existent at the time of publication. Although the 1992 Findings have statewide applicability, the revised draft SGEIS examines whether additional regulatory controls are needed in any of the new geographic areas of interest given the attributes and characteristics of those areas. For example, the 1992 GEIS did not address the possibility of drilling in the vicinity of the NYC watershed area which lies in the prospective area for Marcellus Shale drilling; and
- 3) *Multi-well pads*: Well operators previously suggested that as many as 16 horizontal wells could be drilled at a single well site, or pad. As stated in the following chapters, current information suggests that 6 to 10 wells per pad is the likely distribution. While this method will result in fewer well pads and thus fewer disturbed surface locations, it will also result in a longer duration of disturbance at each drilling pad than if only one well were to be drilled there, and a greater intensity of activity at those sites. ECL §23-0501(1)(b)(1)(vi) requires that all horizontal infill wells in a multi-well shale unit be drilled within three years of the date the first well in the unit commences drilling. The potential impacts of this type of multi-well project were not analyzed in the 1992 GEIS.

3.2 Future SEQRA Compliance

The 1992 Findings Statement describes the well permit and attendant environmental review processes for individual oil and gas wells. Under the 1992 Findings Statement, each application to drill a well is deemed by the Department an individual project, meaning each application

requires individual review. In terms of SEQRA compliance, the Department considers itself the appropriate lead agency for purposes of SEQRA review involving such applications inasmuch as the Department is the agency principally responsible under ECL §23-0303(2) for regulating oil and gas development activities with local government jurisdiction being limited to local roads and the rights of local governments under the Real Property Tax Law. The Department does not propose to change these aspects of its review.

3.2.1 Scenarios for Future SEQRA Compliance under the SGEIS

- **FIRST SCENARIO:** Applications that conform with the 1992 GEIS and the SGEIS.

Generally, when application documents⁹ demonstrate conformance with the thresholds and conditions for such actions to proceed under the 1992 GEIS and the SGEIS, SEQRA would be deemed satisfied, and no further SEQRA process would be required. Upon receipt of an application for a well permit, which will be accompanied by the detailed project-specific information described in Appendix 6, Department staff will determine based on detailed project-specific information whether the application conforms to the conditions and thresholds described in the 1992 GEIS and the SGEIS that entitle the application to be covered by the 1992 GEIS and the SGEIS. If the application conforms to the 1992 GEIS and the SGEIS, Department staff will file a record of consistency statement and no further review under SEQRA will occur in connection with the processing of the well permit application. Permit conditions will be added on a site-specific basis to ensure compliance with the requirements of the 1992 GEIS, the SGEIS, and ECL 23.

- **SECOND SCENARIO:** Proposed action is adequately addressed in the 1992 GEIS or the SGEIS but not in respective Findings Statement.

A supplemental findings statement must be prepared if the proposed action and impacts are adequately addressed in the 1992 GEIS and the SGEIS but are not addressed in the previously adopted 1992 GEIS Findings Statement or the SGEIS Findings Statement.

⁹ See Appendix 4 for a copy of the Application for Permit to Drill, Deepen, Plug Back or Convert a Well Subject to the Oil, Gas and Solution Mining Regulatory Program.

- **THIRD SCENARIO:** Permit applications that are not addressed, or not adequately addressed, in the 1992 GEIS or the SGEIS.

If the proposed action and its impacts are not addressed in the 1992 GEIS or SGEIS, then additional information would be required to determine whether the project may result in one or more additional significant adverse environmental impacts not assessed in the 1992 GEIS or the SGEIS. The projects that categorically fall into this category are listed in Section 3.2.3.

Depending on the nature of the action, the additional information would include an environmental assessment form or EAF; topographic, geologic or hydrogeologic information; air impact analysis; chemical information or other information deemed necessary by the Department to determine the potential for a significant adverse environmental impact. A project-specific SEQRA determination will either result in 1) a negative declaration (determination of no potentially significant impact), or 2) a positive declaration (requiring the preparation of a site-specific SEIS for the drilling application).

Examples since 1992 where such site-specific determinations have been made include the following actions: i) underground gas storage projects, ii) well sites where special noise mitigation measures are required, iii) well sites that disturb more than two and a half acres in designated Agricultural Districts, and iv) geothermal wells drilled in proximity to NYC water tunnels. As stated above, under the 1992 GEIS wells closer than 2,000 feet to a municipal water supply well would also require further site-specific review. None have been permitted since 1992.

The following sections explain how this Supplement will be used, together with the previous 1992 GEIS, to satisfy SEQRA in certain instances when high-volume hydraulic fracturing is proposed.

3.2.2 Review Parameters

In conducting SEQRA reviews, the Department will handle the topics of i) SGEIS applicability, ii) individual project scope, iii) project size and iv) lead agency as follows.

3.2.2.1 SGEIS Applicability - Definition of High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing

High-volume hydraulic fracturing is done in multiple stages, typically using 300,000-600,000 gallons of water per stage (Chapter 5). High-volume hydraulic fracturing in a vertical well would be comparable to a single stage. Wells hydraulically fractured with less water are generally associated with smaller well pads and many fewer truck trips, and do not trigger the same potential water sourcing and disposal impacts as high-volume hydraulically fractured wells. Therefore, for purposes of the SGEIS and application of the mitigation requirements described herein, high-volume hydraulic fracturing is defined as hydraulic fracturing that uses 300,000 or more gallons of water, regardless of whether the well is vertical, directional or horizontal. Wells requiring 299,999 or fewer gallons of water to fracture low-permeability reservoirs are not considered high-volume, and will be reviewed and permitted pursuant to the 1992 GEIS and Findings Statement.

Potential impacts directly related to water volume are associated with i) water withdrawals, ii) the volume of materials present on the well pad for fracturing, iii) the handling and disposition of flowback water, and iv) road use by trucks to haul both fresh water and flowback water. The Department proposes the following methodology, applicable to both vertical and horizontal wells that will be subjected to hydraulic fracturing:

≤ 299,999 gallons of water: Not considered high-volume; 1992 GEIS mitigation is sufficient; and

≥ 300,000 gallons of water: Always considered high-volume. The applicant must complete the EAF Addendum. All relevant procedures and mitigation measures set forth in this Supplement are required to satisfy SEQRA without a site-specific determination.

3.2.2.2 Project Scope

As was the case under the 1992 GEIS, each application to drill a well will continue to be considered as an individual project with respect to well drilling, construction, hydraulic fracturing (including additive use), and any aspects of water and materials management (source, containment and disposal) that vary between wells on a pad. Well permits will be individually

issued and conditioned based on review of well-specific application materials. However, location screening for well pad setbacks and other required permits, review of access road location and construction, and the required stormwater permit coverage will be for the well pad based on submission of the first well permit application for the pad.

The only case where the project scope extends beyond the well pad and its access road is when the application documents propose surface water withdrawals that have not been previously approved by the Department. Such proposed withdrawals will be considered part of the project scope for the first well permit application that indicates their use, and all well permit applications that propose their use will be considered incomplete until the Department has approved the withdrawal.

Gathering lines and pipelines are not within the scope of project review as the PSC has exclusive jurisdiction to review these activities under Public Service Law Article VII. Compressor stations associated with gathering lines and pipelines are also under the PSC's Public Service Law Article VII review authority except that the Department has jurisdiction under ECL Article 19 (Air Pollution Control) to review air emissions and ECL Article 17 for the SPDES program. The foregoing is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3 of the GEIS and Section 1.5 of the Final Scope. Chapter 5 of this Supplement describes the facilities likely to be associated with a multi-well shale gas production site, and Chapter 8 provides details on the PSC's environmental review process for these facilities.

3.2.2.3 Size of Project

The size of the project will continue to be defined as the surface acreage affected by development, including the well pad, the access roads, and any other physical alteration necessary. The Department's well drilling and construction requirements, including the supplementary permit conditions proposed herein, preclude any subsurface impacts other than the permitted action to recover hydrocarbons. Most wells will be drilled on multi-well pads, described in Chapter 5 as likely an average of 3.5 acres in size, with larger pads possible, during the drilling and hydraulic fracturing stages of operations. Average production pad size, after reclamation, is likely to be 1.5 acres for a multi-well pad. Pads for vertical wells would be smaller. Access road acreage depends on the location, the length of the road and other factors.

In general, each 150 feet of access road adds 1/10th of an acre to the total surface acreage disturbance.

Surface water withdrawal sites will generally consist of hydrants, meters, power facilities, a gravel pad for water truck access, and possibly one or more storage tanks. These sites would generally be expected to be rather small, less than an acre or two in size.

3.2.2.4 Lead Agency

For the reasons set out in section 3.2 above, the Department would in most, if not all, instances continue to assert the lead agency role under SEQRA. If the proposed action falls under the jurisdiction of more than one agency, based, for example, on the need for a local floodplain development permit, the lead agency must in the first instance be determined by agreement among the involved agencies. Disputes are decided by the Department's Commissioner pursuant to 6 NYCRR §617.6(b)(5). Where there is an involved agency or agencies other than the Department (meaning another agency with jurisdiction to fund, approve, or undertake the action), to the extent practicable, the Department will seek lead agency designation, which is consistent with the criteria for such designation under SEQRA.

3.2.3 EAF Addendum and Additional Informational Requirements

The 1992 Findings authorized use of a shortened, program-specific environmental assessment form (EAF), which is required with every well drilling permit application.¹⁰ (See Appendices 2 and 5). The EAF and well drilling application form¹¹ do not stand alone, but are supported by the four-volume 1992 GEIS, the applicant's well location plat, proposed site-specific drilling and well construction plans, Department staff's site visit, and geographic information system (GIS) - based location screening, using the most current data available. Oil and gas staff within the Department consults and coordinates with staff in other Department programs administered by the Department when site review and the application documents indicate an environmental concern or potential need for another Department permit.

¹⁰ http://www.dec.ny.gov/docs/materials_minerals_pdf/eaf_dril.pdf. Under 6 NYCRR §617.2(m) of the SEQRA regulations, the model full and short EAFs may be modified by an agency to better serve it in implementing SEQR, provided the scope of the modified form is as comprehensive as the model.

¹¹ http://www.dec.ny.gov/docs/materials_minerals_pdf/dril_req.pdf.

The Department has developed an EAF Addendum for gathering and compiling the information needed to evaluate high-volume hydraulic fracturing projects (≥300,000 gallons) in the context of this SGEIS and its Findings Statement, and to identify the required site-specific mitigation measures. The EAF Addendum will be required as follows:

- 1) With the application to drill the first well on a pad constructed for high-volume hydraulic fracturing, regardless of whether the well is vertical or horizontal;
- 2) With the applications to drill subsequent wells for high-volume hydraulic fracturing on the pad if any of the information changes; and
- 3) Prior to high-volume re-fracturing of an existing well.

Categories of information required with the EAF addendum are summarized below, and Appendix 6 provides a full listing of the proposed EAF Addendum requirements.

3.2.3.1 Hydraulic Fracturing Information

Required information will include the minimum depth and elevation of the top of the fracture zone, estimated maximum depth and elevation of the bottom of potential fresh water, identification of the proposed fracturing service company and additive products, the proposed volume of fracturing fluid and percent by weight of water, proppants and each additive.

Documentation of the operator's evaluation of alternatives to the proposed additive products will also be required.

3.2.3.2 Water Source Information

The operator will be required to identify the source of water to be used for hydraulic fracturing, and provide information about any newly proposed surface water source that has not been previously approved by the Department as part of a well permit application. The proposed withdrawal location and type of source (e.g., stream, lake, pond, groundwater, etc.) and other detailed information will be required to allow the Department to analyze potential impacts and, in the case of stream withdrawals, to ensure the operator's compliance relative to passby flow and the narrative flow standard in 6 NYCRR §703.2.

3.2.3.3 Distances

Distances to the following resources or cultural features will be required, along with a topographic map of the area showing the well pad, well location, and scaled distances from the proposed surface location of the well and the closest edge of the well pad to the relevant resources and features.

- Any known public water supply reservoir, river or stream intake, public or private water well or domestic supply spring within 2,640 feet;
- Any primary or principal aquifer boundary, perennial or intermittent stream, wetland, storm drain, lake or pond within 660 feet;
- Any residences, occupied structures or places of assembly within 1,320 feet.
- Capacity of rig fueling tank(s) and distance to:
 - Any public or private water well, domestic-supply spring, reservoir, river or stream intake, perennial or intermittent stream, storm drain, wetland, lake or pond within 500 feet of the planned location(s) of the fueling tank(s); and
- Distance from the surface location of the proposed well to the surface location of any existing well that is listed in the Department's Oil & Gas Database¹² or any other abandoned well identified by property owners or tenants within a) the spacing unit of the proposed well and/or b) within 1 mile (5,280 feet) of the proposed well location, whichever results in the greatest number of wells. For each well identified, the following information would be required, if available:
 - Well name and API Number;
 - Well type;
 - Well status;
 - Well orientation; and
 - Quantity and type of any freshwater, brine, oil or gas encountered during drilling, as recorded on the Department's Well Drilling and Completion Report.

¹² The Department's Oil & Gas Database contains information on more than 35,000 oil, gas, storage, solution salt, stratigraphic, and geothermal wells categorized under Article 23 of the ECL as Regulated Wells. The Oil & Gas database can be accessed on the Department's website at <http://www.dec.ny.gov/cfm/xtapps/GasOil/>.

3.2.3.4 Water Well Information

The EAF addendum for high-volume hydraulic fracturing will require evidence of diligent efforts by the well operator to determine the existence of public or private water wells and domestic-supply springs within half a mile (2,640 feet) of any proposed drilling location. The operator will be required to identify the wells and provide available information about their depth, and completed interval, along with a description of their use. Use information will include whether the well is public or private, community or non-community and the type of facility or establishment if it is not a private residence. Information sources available to the operator include:

- direct contact with municipal officials;
- direct communication with property owners and tenants;
- communication with adjacent lessees;
- EPA's Safe Drinking Water Act Information System database, available at http://oaspub.epa.gov/enviro/sdw_form_v2.create_page?state_abbr=NY; and
- The Department's Water Well Information search wizard, available at <http://www.dec.ny.gov/cfm/xtapps/WaterWell/index.cfm?view=searchByCounty>.

Additionally, geodata on water wells in New York State is available from the Department in KML (Keyhole Markup Language) and shape file formats. To access and download water well information, go to: <http://www.dec.ny.gov/geodata/ptk>.

Upon receipt of a well permit application, Department staff will compare the operator's well list to internally available information and notify the operator of any discrepancies or additional wells that are indicated within half a mile of the proposed well pad. The operator will be required to amend its EAF Addendum accordingly.

3.2.3.5 Fluid Disposal Plan

The Department's oil and gas regulations, specifically 6 NYCRR §554.1(c)(1), require a fluid disposal plan to be approved by the Department prior to well permit issuance for "any operation in which the probability exists that brine, salt water or other polluting fluids will be produced or

obtained during drilling operations in sufficient quantities to be deleterious to the surrounding environment . . .” To fulfill this obligation, the EAF Addendum will require information about flowback water and production brine disposition, including:

- Planned transport off of well pad (truck or piping), and information about any proposed piping;
- Planned disposition (e.g., treatment facility, disposal well, reuse, or centralized tank facility); and
- Identification and permit numbers for any proposed treatment facility or disposal well located in New York.

3.2.3.6 *Operational Information*

Other required information about well pad operations will include:

1. Information about the planned construction and capacity of the reserve pit;
2. Information about the number and individual and total capacity of receiving tanks on the well pad for flowback water;
3. Indication of the timing of the use of a closed-loop tank system (e.g., surface, intermediate and/or production hole);
4. Information about any off-site cuttings disposal plan;
5. If proposed flowback vent/flare stack height is less than 30 feet, then documentation that previous drilling at the pad did not encounter H₂S is required;
6. Description of planned public access restrictions, including physical barriers and distance to edge of well pad;
7. Identification of the EPA Tiers of the drilling and hydraulic fracturing engines used, if these use gasoline or diesel fuel. If particulate traps or SCR are not used, a description of other control measures planned to reduce particulate matter and nitrogen oxide emissions during the drilling and hydraulic fracturing processes;
8. If condensate tanks are to be used, their capacity and the vapor recovery system to be used;

9. If a wellhead compressor is used, its size in horsepower and description the control equipment used for nitrogen oxides (NO_x); and

10. If a glycol dehydrator is to be used at the well pad, its stack height and the capacity of glycol to be used on an annual basis.

3.2.3.7 Invasive Species Survey and Map

The Department will require that well operators submit, with the EAF Addendum, a comprehensive survey of the entire project site, documenting the presence and identity of any invasive plant species. As described in Chapter 7, this survey will establish a baseline measure of percent aerial coverage and, at a minimum, must include the plant species identified on the Interim List of Invasive Plant Species in New York State. A map (1:24,000) showing all occurrences of invasive species within the project site must be produced and included with the survey as part of the EAF Addendum.

3.2.3.8 Required Affirmations

The EAF Addendum will require operator affirmations to address the following:

- passby flow for surface water withdrawals;
- review of local floodplain maps;
- residential water well sampling and monitoring;
- access road location;
- stormwater permit coverage;
- use of ultra-low sulfur fuel;
- preparation of site plans to address visual and noise impacts, invasive species mitigation and greenhouse gas emissions;
- adherence to all well permit conditions; and
- adherence to best management practices for reducing direct impacts to terrestrial habitats and wildlife.

3.2.3.9 Local Planning Documents

The EAF Addendum will require the applicant to identify whether the location of the well pad, or any other activity under the jurisdiction of the Department, conflicts with local land use laws, regulations, plans or policies. The applicant will also be required to identify whether the well pad is located in an area where the affected community has adopted a comprehensive plan or other local land use plan and whether the proposed action is inconsistent with such plan(s).

3.2.3.10 Habitat Fragmentation

Applicants proposing well pads in Forest or Grassland Focus Areas that involve a disturbance in a contiguous forest patch of 150 acres or more in size or a contiguous grassland patch of 30 acres or more in size should not submit the EAF or a well permit application prior to conducting a site-specific ecological assessment in accordance with a detailed study plan that has been approved by the Department. The need and plan for an ecological assessment should be determined in consultation with the Department and will consider information such as existing site conditions, existing vegetative cover and ongoing and historical land management activities. The completed ecological assessment must be attached to the EAF and must include, at a minimum:

- A compilation of historical information about use of the area by forest interior birds or grassland birds;
- Results of pre-disturbance biological studies, including a minimum of one year of field surveys at the site to determine the current extent, if any, of use of the site by forest interior birds or grassland birds;
- An evaluation of potential impacts on forest interior or grassland birds from the project;
- Additional mitigation measures proposed by applicant; and
- Protocols for monitoring of forest interior or grassland birds during the construction phase of the project and for a minimum of two years following well completion.

3.2.4 Prohibited Locations

The Department will not issue well permits for high-volume hydraulic fracturing at the following locations:

- 1) Any proposed well pad within the NYC and Syracuse watersheds;

- 2) Any proposed well pad within a 4,000-foot buffer around the NYC and Syracuse watersheds;
- 3) Any proposed well pad within a primary aquifer (subject to reconsideration 2 years after issuance of the first permit for high-volume hydraulic fracturing);
- 4) Any proposed well pad within a 500-foot buffer around primary aquifers (subject to reconsideration 2 years after issuance of the first permit for high-volume hydraulic fracturing);
- 5) Any proposed well pad within 2,000 feet of public water supply wells, river or stream intakes and reservoirs (subject to reconsideration 3 years after issuance of the first permit for high-volume hydraulic fracturing);
- 6) Any proposed well pad within 500 feet of private drinking water wells or domestic use springs, unless waived by the owner; and
- 7) Any proposed well pad within a 100-year floodplain.

3.2.5 *Projects Requiring Site-Specific SEQRA Determinations of Significance*

The Department proposes that site-specific environmental assessments and SEQRA determinations of significance be required for the high-volume hydraulic fracturing projects listed below, regardless of the target formation, the number of wells drilled on the pad and whether the wells are vertical, directional or horizontal.

- 1) Any proposed high-volume hydraulic fracturing where the top of the target fracture zone is shallower than 2,000 feet along any part of the proposed length of the wellbore;
- 2) Any proposed high-volume hydraulic fracturing where the top of the target fracture zone at any point along any part of the proposed length of the wellbore is less than 1,000 feet below the base of a known fresh water supply;
- 3) Any proposed well pad within 500 feet of a principal aquifer;
- 4) Any proposed well pad within 150 feet of a perennial or intermittent stream, storm drain, lake or pond;
- 5) A proposed surface water withdrawal that is found not to be consistent with the Department's preferred passby flow methodology as described in Chapter 7;

- 6) Any proposed water withdrawal from a pond or lake;
- 7) Any proposed ground water withdrawal within 500 feet of a private well;
- 8) Any proposed ground water withdrawal within 500 feet of a wetland that pump test data shows would have an influence on the wetland;
- 9) Any proposed well location determined by NYCDEP to be within 1,000 feet of its subsurface water supply infrastructure; and
- 10) Any proposed centralized flowback water surface impoundment.

The Department will re-evaluate the need for site-specific SEQRA determinations within 500 feet of principal aquifers two years after issuance of the first permit for high-volume hydraulic fracturing.

The Department is not proposing to alter its 1992 Findings that proposed disposal wells require individual site-specific review or that proposed disturbances larger than 2.5 acres in designated Agricultural Districts require a site-specific SEQRA determination. According to the information received to date, the drilling of all high-volume hydraulically fractured wells will create surface disturbances in excess of 2.5 acres. The Department will consult with the Department of Agriculture and Markets to develop permit conditions, best management practices (BMP) requirements and reclamation guidelines to be followed when the proposed disturbance is larger than 2.5 acres on a farm in an Agricultural District. Staff will perform the SEQRA review and publish the results in the Environmental Notice Bulletin (ENB). A large number of agricultural districts are currently located in areas where high-volume hydraulic fracturing drilling is expected to occur but many of these districts have reverted to forestlands and are no longer in agricultural production. Mineral Resources will provide guidance to gas well operators to achieve the goal of reducing or minimizing the surface disturbance to agricultural farmlands. Examples of the proposed Agricultural District requirements include but are not limited to:

- decompaction and deep ripping of disturbed areas prior to topsoil replacement;
- removal of construction debris from the site;
- no mixing of cuttings with topsoil;

- removal of spent drilling muds from active agricultural fields;
- location of well pads/access roads along field edges and in nonagricultural areas (where possible);
- removal of excess subsoil and rock from the site; and
- fencing of the site when drilling is located in active pasture areas to prevent livestock access.

Proposed projects that require other Department permits will continue to require site-specific SEQRA determinations regarding the activities covered by those permits, with one exception. Required coverage under a general stormwater permit does not result in the need for a site-specific SEQRA determination, as the Department issues its general permits pursuant to a separate process.

3.3 Regulations

The Department's oil and gas well regulations, located at 6 NYCRR Parts 550 - 559, contain permitting, recordkeeping, and operating requirements for oil and gas wells. More detailed requirements applicable to drilling operations are routinely attached as conditions to well drilling permits issued pursuant to the ECL. Additionally, the Department's regulations concerning water withdrawals, stormwater control, and the use of state lands, among others, would apply to various aspects of high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations considered in this revised draft SGEIS. Appendix 10 of this revised draft SGEIS contains proposed supplementary permit conditions for high-volume hydraulic fracturing that will be attached to well drilling permits. Although conditions incorporated into well drilling are enforceable pursuant to ECL Article 71, a number of the application requirements specific to high-volume hydraulic fracturing as well as many of the mitigation measures discussed in this revised draft SGEIS will be set forth in regulations. Accordingly, draft revisions and additions to the Department's regulations will be considered as part of the SGEIS process, pursuant to the State Administrative Procedures Act (SAPA) for agency rulemaking.

The enactment of revisions or additions to the Department's regulations relating to high-volume hydraulic fracturing would have a positive effect on the environment by mitigating or otherwise

addressing potential environmental impacts from this activity. However, because these regulations would be enacted as part of an action that would authorize high-volume hydraulic fracturing the enactment of such regulatory revisions or additions will be considered in conjunction with the Department's consideration of the significant environmental impacts under SEQRA.

SAPA contains other potential impact areas for state agencies to consider, such as the impact of proposed rules on jobs, rural areas and the regulated community. Some of these types of impacts are discussed in this revised draft SGEIS, but a complete examination of those types of impacts will be evaluated within the rulemaking process. The Department will consider all information generated by the SGEIS and SAPA processes to make determinations on how high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations would be regulated.



Chapter 4

Geology

This page intentionally left blank.

Chapter 4 - Geology

CHAPTER 4 - GEOLOGY	4-1
4.1 INTRODUCTION	4-1
4.2 BLACK SHALES	4-2
4.3 UTICA SHALE	4-5
4.3.1 Total Organic Carbon.....	4-10
4.3.2 Thermal Maturity and Fairways	4-13
4.3.3 Potential for Gas Production	4-13
4.4 MARCELLUS FORMATION	4-14
4.4.1 Total Organic Carbon.....	4-16
4.4.2 Thermal Maturity and Fairways	4-16
4.4.3 Potential for Gas Production	4-17
4.5 SEISMICITY IN NEW YORK STATE	4-23
4.5.1 Background.....	4-23
4.5.2 Seismic Risk Zones.....	4-24
4.5.4 Seismic Events	4-27
4.5.5 Monitoring Systems in New York	4-35
4.6 NATURALLY OCCURRING RADIOACTIVE MATERIALS (NORM) IN MARCELLUS SHALE	4-35
4.7 NATURALLY-OCCURRING METHANE IN NEW YORK STATE	4-36

FIGURES

Figure 4.1 - Gas Shale Distribution in the Appalachian Basin	4-4
Figure 4.2 - Stratigraphic Column of Southwestern New York	4-7
Figure 4.3 - East West Cross-Section of New York State.	4-8
Figure 4.4 - Extent of Utica Shale in New York State	4-9
Figure 4.5 - Depth to Base of Utica Shale in New York State.....	4-11
Figure 4.6 - Thickness of High-Organic Utica Shale in New York State	4-12
Figure 4.7 - Utica Shale Fairway in New York State	4-15
Figure 4.8 - Depth and Extent of Marcellus Shale in New York State	4-18
Figure 4.9 - Marcellus Shale Thickness in New York State.....	4-19
Figure 4.10 - Total Organic Carbon of Marcellus Shale in New York State	4-20
Figure 4.11 - Marcellus Shale Thermal Maturity	4-21
Figure 4.12 - Marcellus Shale Fairway in New York State.....	4-22
Figure 4.13 - Mapped Geologic Faults in New York State	4-25
Figure 4.14 - New York State Seismic Hazard Map.....	4-26
Figure 4.15 - Seismic Events in New York State (1970 to 2009)	4-34

TABLES

Table 4.1 - Modified Mercalli Scale	4-29
Table 4.2 - Summary of Seismic Events in New York State.....	4-30

This page intentionally left blank.

Chapter 4 - GEOLOGY

This Chapter supplements and expands upon Chapter 5 of the 1992 GEIS. Sections 4.1 through 4.5 and the accompanying figures and tables were provided in essentially the form presented here by Alpha Environmental, Inc., under contract to NYSERDA to assist the Department with research related to this SGEIS.¹ Alpha's citations are retained for informational purposes, and are listed in the "consultants' references" section of the Bibliography. Section 4.6 discusses how NORM in the Marcellus Shale is addressed in the SGEIS.

The influence of natural geologic factors with respect to hydraulic fracture design and subsurface fluid mobility is discussed Chapter 5, specifically in Sections 5.8 (hydraulic fracture design) and 5.11.1.1 (subsurface fluid mobility).

4.1 Introduction

The natural gas industry in the US began in 1821 with a well completed by William Aaron Hart in the upper Devonian Dunkirk Shale in Chautauqua County. The "Hart" well supplied businesses and residents in Fredonia, New York with natural gas for 37 years. Hundreds of shallow wells were drilled in the following years into the shale along Lake Erie and then southeastward into western New York. Shale gas fields development spread into Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Kentucky. Gas has been produced from the Marcellus since 1880 when the first well was completed in the Naples field in Ontario County. Eventually, as other formations were explored, the more productive conventional oil and natural gas fields were developed and shale gas (unconventional natural gas) exploration diminished.

The terms "conventional" and "unconventional" are related more to prevailing technology and economics surrounding the development of a given play than to the reservoir rock type from which the oil or natural gas resources are derived. Gas shales (also called "gas-containing shales") are one of a number of reservoir types that are explored for unconventional natural gas, and this group includes such terms as: deep gas; tight gas; coal-bed methane; geopressurized zones; and Arctic and sub-sea hydrates.

The US Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA) began to evaluate gas resources in the US in the late 1960s. The Eastern Gas Shales Project was initiated in 1976 by

¹ Alpha, 2009.

the ERDA (later the US Department of Energy) to assess Devonian and Mississippian black shales. The studies concluded that significant natural gas resources were present in these tight formations.

The interest in development of shale gas resources increased in the late 20th and early 21st century as the result of an increase in energy demand and technological advances in drilling and well stimulation. The total unconventional natural gas production in the US increased by 65% and the proportion of unconventional gas production to total gas production increased from 28% in 1998 to 46% in 2007.²

A description of New York State geology and its relationship to oil, gas, and salt production is included in the 1992 GEIS. The geologic discussion provided herein supplements the information as it pertains to gas potential from unconventional gas resources. Emphasis is placed on the Utica and Marcellus Shales because of the widespread distribution of these units in New York.

4.2 Black Shales

Black shales, such as the Marcellus Shale, are fine-grained sedimentary rocks that contain high levels of organic carbon. The fine-grained material and organic matter accumulate in deep, warm, quiescent marine basins. The warm climate favors the proliferation of plant and animal life. The deep basins allow for an upper aerobic (oxygenated) zone that supports life and a deeper anaerobic (oxygen-depleted) zone that inhibits decay of accumulated organic matter. The organic matter is incorporated into the accumulating sediments and is buried. Pressure and temperature increase and the organic matter are transformed by slow chemical reactions into liquid and gaseous petroleum compounds as the sediments are buried deeper. The degree to which the organic matter is converted is dependent on the maximum temperature, pressure, and burial depth. The extent that these processes have transformed the carbon in the shale is represented by the thermal maturity and transformation ratio of the carbon. The more favorable gas producing shales occur where the total organic carbon (TOC) content is at least 2% and

² Alpha, 2009, p. 121.

where there is evidence that a significant amount of gas has formed and been preserved from the TOC during thermal maturation.³

Oil and gas are stored in isolated pore spaces or fractures and adsorbed on the mineral grains.⁴ Porosity (a measure of the void spaces in a material) is low in shales and is typically in the range of 0 to 10 percent.⁵ Porosity values of 1 to 3 percent are reported for Devonian shales in the Appalachian Basin.⁶ Permeability (a measure of a material's ability to transmit fluids) is also low in shales and is typically between 0.1 to 0.00001 millidarcy (md).⁷ Hill et al. (2002) summarized the findings of studies sponsored by NYSERDA that evaluated the properties of the Marcellus Shale. The porosity of core samples from the Marcellus in one well in New York ranged from 0 to 18%. The permeability of Marcellus Shale ranged from 0.0041 md to 0.216 md in three wells in New York State.

Black shale typically contains trace levels of uranium that is associated with organic matter in the shale.⁸ The presence of naturally occurring radioactive materials (NORM) induces a response on gamma-ray geophysical logs and is used to identify, map, and determine thickness of gas shales.

The Appalachian Basin was a tropical inland sea that extended from New York to Alabama (Figure 4.1). The tropical climate of the ancient Appalachian Basin provided favorable conditions for generating the organic matter, and the erosion of the mountains and highlands bordering the basin provided clastic material (i.e., fragments of rock) for deposition. The sedimentary rocks that fill the basin include shales, siltstones, sandstones, evaporites, and limestones that were deposited as distinct layers that represent several sequences of sea level rise and fall. Several black shale formations, which may produce natural gas, are included in these layers.⁹

³ Alpha, 2009, p. 122.

⁴ Alpha, 2009, p. 122.


⁵ Alpha, 2009, p.122.

⁶ Alpha, 2009, p.122.

⁷ Alpha, 2009, p.122.

⁸ Alpha, 2009, p. 122.

⁹ Alpha, 2009, p. 123.



The stratigraphic column for southwestern New York State is shown in Figure 4.2 and includes oil and gas producing horizons. This figure was initially developed by Van Tyne and Copley,¹⁰ from the analysis of drilling data in southwestern New York State, and it has been modified several times since then as various authors have cited it in different studies. The version presented as Figure 4.2 can also be found on the Department's website at <http://www.dec.ny.gov/energy/33893.html>. Figure 4.3 is a generalized cross-section from west to east across the southern tier of New York State and shows the variation in thickness and depth of the different stratigraphic units. This figure was initially developed by the Reservoir Characterization Group of the New York State Museum. It is important to note that the geographic areas represented in Figure 4.2 and Figure 4.3 are not precisely the same, and the figures were originally developed by different authors. For example, the Marcellus Shale is shown in Figure 4.2 as the basal unit of the Hamilton Group, but it appears as a discrete unit below the Hamilton Group in Figure 4.3 to highlight its gas-bearing potential. Similarly, the "Devonian Sandstone and Shale" of Figure 4.3 correlates to the Conewango, Conneaut, Canadaway, West Falls, Sonyea, and Genesee Groups of Upper Devonian age shown in Figure 4.2.

The Ordovician-aged Utica Shale and the Devonian-aged Marcellus Shale are of particular interest because of recent estimates of natural gas resources and because these units extend throughout the Appalachian Basin from New York to Tennessee. There are other black shale formations (Figures 4.2 and 4.3) in New York that may produce natural gas on a localized basis.¹¹ The following sections describe the Utica and Marcellus Shales in greater detail.

4.3 Utica Shale

The Utica Shale is an upper Ordovician-aged black shale that extends across the Appalachian Plateau from New York and Quebec, Canada, south to Tennessee. It covers approximately 28,500 square miles in New York and extends from the Adirondack Mountains to the southern tier and east to the Catskill front (Figure 4.4). The Utica Shale is exposed in outcrops along the southern and western Adirondack Mountains, and it dips gently south to depths of more than 9,000 feet in the southern tier of New York.

¹⁰ Van Tyne and Copley, 1983.

¹¹ Alpha, 2009, p. 123.

The Utica Shale is a massive, fossiliferous, organic-rich, thermally-mature, black to gray shale. The sediment comprising the Utica Shale was derived from the erosion of the Taconic Mountains at the end of the Ordovician, approximately 440 to 460 million years ago. The shale is bounded below by Trenton Group strata and above by the Lorraine Formation and consists of three members in New York State that include: Flat Creek Member (oldest), Dolgeville Member, and the Indian Castle Member (youngest).¹² The Canajoharie Shale and Snake Hill Shale are found in the eastern part of the state and are lithologically equivalent, but older than the western portions of the Utica.¹³

There is some disagreement over the division of the Utica Shale members. Smith & Leone (2009) divide the Indian Castle Member into an upper low-organic carbon regional shale and a high-organic carbon lower Indian Castle. Nyahay et al. (2007) combines the lower Indian Castle Member with the Dolgeville Member. Fisher (1977) includes the Dolgeville as a member of the Trenton Group. The stratigraphic convention of Smith and Leone is used in this document.

Units of the Utica Shale have abundant pyrite, which indicates deposition under anoxic conditions. Geophysical logs and cutting analyses indicate that the Utica Shale has a low bulk density and high total organic carbon content.¹⁴

The Flat Creek and Dolgeville Members are found south and east of a line extending approximately from Steuben County to Oneida County (Figure 4.4). The Dolgeville is an interbedded limestone and shale. The Flat Creek is a dark, calcareous shale in its western extent and grades to an argillaceous calcareous mudstone to the east. These two members are time-equivalent and grade laterally toward the west into Trenton limestones.¹⁵ The lower Indian Castle Member is a fissile, black shale and is exposed in road cuts, particularly at the New York State Thruway (I-90) exit 29A in Little Falls. Figure 4.5 shows the depth to the base of the Utica Shale.¹⁶ This depth corresponds approximately with the base of the organic-rich section of the Utica Shale.

¹² Alpha, 2009, p. 124.

¹³ Alpha, 2009, p. 124.

¹⁴ Alpha, 2009, p. 124.

¹⁵ Alpha, 2009, p. 124.

¹⁶ Alpha, 2009, p. 124.

Figure 4.2 - Stratigraphic Section of Southwestern New York State

Period	Group	Unit	Lithology			
Penn.	Pottsville	Olean	Quartz pebble conglomerate & sandstone, quartz pebble, conglomerate, sandstone & minor shale			
Miss.	Pocono	Knapp				
Dev.	Upper	Conewango		Shale & sandstone, scattered conglomerates		
		Conneaut	Chadakoin	Shale & siltstone, scattered conglomerates		
		Canadaway	Undifferentiated ¹	O G O G	Shale & siltstone Minor sandstone	
			Perrysburg ²	O G O G	Shale & siltstone Minor sandstone	
		West Falls	Java Nunda Rhinestreet	G	Shale & siltstone Argillaceous limestone	
		Sonyea	Middlesex	G	Shale & siltstone	
		Genesee			Shale with minor siltstone & limestone	
	Middle		Tully	G	Limestone with minor siltstone & sandstone	
		Hamilton	Moscow Ludlowville Skaneateles Marcellus	G	Shale with minor sandstone & conglomerate	
			Onondaga	O G	Limestone	
	Lower	Tristates	Oriskany	G	Sandstone	
		Helderberg	Manlius Rondout		Limestone & dolostone	
	Sil.	Upper		Akron	O G	Dolostone
			Salina	Camillus Syracuse Vernon	S S	Shale, siltstone, anhydrite & halite
Lockport			Lockport	G	Limestone & dolostone	
Lower			Rochester Irondequoit		Shale & sandstone	
		Clinton	Sodus Reynales Thorold		Limestone & dolostone	
		Medina	Grimsby Whirlpool	G G	Sandstone & shale Quartz sandstone	
Ord.	Upper	Queenston Oswego Lorraine Utica	G G	Shale & siltstone with minor sandstone		
	Middle	Trenton - Black River	Trenton Black River	G	Limestone and minor dolostone	
	Lower	Beekmantown	Tribes Hill Chuctanunda		Limestone & dolostone	
Camb.	Upper	Little Falls Galway (Theresa) Potsdam	G G	Quartz sandstone & dolostone; sandstone & sandy dolomite; conglomerate base		
PreCamb.		Gneiss, Marble, Quartzite, etc...		Metamorphic & igneous rocks		

1 - Includes: Glade, Bradford 1st, Chipmunk, Bradford 2nd, Harrisburg Run, Scio, Penny and Richburg.

2 - Includes: Bradford 3rd, Humphrey, Clarksville, Waugh & Porter, and Fulmer Valley.

O: Oil producing

G: Gas producing

S: Salt producing






FIGURE 4.3

EAST WEST CROSS-SECTION
OF NEW YORK STATE

Technical Support Document to the
Draft Supplemental Generic
Environmental Impact Statement



Legend

-  Utica Shale Outcrop*
-  Extent of the Utica Shale in New York

Source:
- New York State Museum - Reservoir Characterization Group (2009).
- Nyahay et al. (2007).
- U. S. Geological Survey, Central Energy Resources Team (2002).
- Fisher et al. (1970).





FIGURE 4.4

EXTENT OF UTICA SHALE
IN NEW YORK STATE

Technical Support Document to the
Draft Supplemental Generic
Environmental Impact Statement

4.3.1 Total Organic Carbon

Measurements of TOC in the Utica Shale are sparse. Where reported, TOC has been measured at over 3% by weight.¹⁷ Nyahay et al. (2007) compiled measurements of TOC for core and outcrop samples. TOC in the lower Indian Castle, Flat Creek, and Dolgeville Members generally ranges from 0.5 to 3%. TOC in the upper Indian Castle Member is generally below 0.5%. TOC values as high as 3.0% in eastern New York and 15% in Ontario and Quebec were also reported.¹⁸

The New York State Museum Reservoir Characterization Group evaluated cuttings from the Utica Shale wells in New York State and reported up to 3% TOC.¹⁹ Jarvie et al. (2007) showed that analyses from cutting samples may underestimate TOC by approximately half; therefore, it may be as high as 6%. Figure 4.6 shows the combined total thickness of the organic-rich (greater than 1%, based on cuttings analysis) members of the Utica Shale. As shown on Figure 4.6, the organic-rich Utica Shale ranges from less than 50 feet thick in north-central New York and increases eastward to more than 700 feet thick.

¹⁷ Alpha, 2009, p. 124.

¹⁸ Alpha, 2009, p. 125.

¹⁹ Alpha, 2009, p. 125.

Legend

- Depth to Base of Utica Shale*
- ▨ Utica Shale Outcrop
- Extent of the Utica Shale in New York





FIGURE 4.5

DEPTH TO BASE OF UTICA SHALE
IN NEW YORK STATE



Technical Support Document to the
Draft Supplemental Generic
Environmental Impact Statement

Notes:

- Top of the Trenton limestone approximates the base of the Utica shale (New York State Museum - Reservoir Characterization Group, 2009).
- U. S. Geological Survey, Central Energy Resources Team (2002).

Legend

- Utica Shale Thickness Contour (in feet)
- ▨ Utica Shale Outcrop
- Extent of the Utica Shale in New York





FIGURE 4.6

**THICKNESS OF HIGH-ORGANIC
UTICA SHALE
IN NEW YORK STATE**

Technical Support Document to the
Draft Supplemental Generic
Environmental Impact Statement



Note:
- Contours show the combined thickness of the high organic carbon interval (>1% TOC) lower Indian Castle, Dolgeville, Flat Creek members (New York State Museum - Reservoir Characterization Group, 2009).

4.3.2 *Thermal Maturity and Fairways*

Nyahay, et. al. (2007) presented an assessment of gas potential in the Marcellus and Utica Shales. The assessment was based on an evaluation of geochemical data from core and outcrop samples using methods applied to other shale gas plays, such as the Barnett Shale in Texas. A gas production “fairway”, which is a portion of the shale most likely to produce gas based on the evaluation, was presented. Based on the available, limited data, Nyahay et al. (2007) concluded that most of the Utica Shale is supermature and that the Utica Shale fairway is best outlined by the Flat Creek Member where the TOC and thickness are greatest. This area extends eastward from a northeast-southwest line connecting Montgomery to Steuben Counties (Figure 4.7). The fairway shown on Figure 4.7 correlates approximately with the area where the organic-rich portion of the Utica Shale is greater than 100 feet thick shown on Figure 4.6.²⁰ The fairway is that portion of the formation that has the potential to produce gas based on specific geologic and geochemical criteria; however, other factors, such as formation depth, make only portions of the fairway favorable for drilling. Operators consider a variety of these factors, besides the extent of the fairway, when making a decision on where to drill for natural gas.

The results of the 2007 evaluation are consistent with an earlier report by Weary et al. (2000) that presented an evaluation of thermal maturity based on patterns of thermal alteration of conodont microfossils across New York State. The data presented show that the thermal maturity of much of the Utica Shale in New York is within the dry natural gas generation and preservation range and generally increases from northwest to southeast.

4.3.3 *Potential for Gas Production*

The Utica Shale historically has been considered the source rock for the more permeable conventional gas resources. Fresh samples containing residual kerogen and other petroleum residuals reportedly have been ignited and can produce an oily sheen when placed in water.²¹ Significant gas shows have been reported while drilling through the Utica Shale in eastern and central New York.²²

²⁰ Alpha, 2009, p. 125.

²¹ Alpha, 2009, p. 126.

²² Alpha, 2009, p. 126.

No Utica Shale gas production was reported to the Department in 2009. Vertical test wells completed in the Utica in the St. Lawrence Lowlands of Quebec have produced up to one million cubic feet per day (MMcf/d) of natural gas.

4.4 Marcellus Formation

The Marcellus Formation is a Middle Devonian-aged member of the Hamilton Group that extends across most of the Appalachian Plateau from New York south to Tennessee. The Marcellus Formation consists of black and dark gray shales, siltstones, and limestones. The Marcellus Formation lies between the Onondaga limestone and the overlying Stafford-Mottville limestones of the Skaneateles Formation²³ and ranges in thickness from less than 25 feet in Cattaraugus County to over 1,800 feet along the Catskill front.²⁴ The informal name “Marcellus Shale” is used interchangeably with the formal name “Marcellus Formation.” The discussion contained herein uses the name Marcellus Shale to refer to the black shale in the lower part of the Hamilton Group.

The Marcellus Shale underlies an area of approximately 18,700 square miles in New York (Figure 4.8). The Marcellus is exposed in outcrops to the north and east and reaches depths of more than 5,000 feet in the southern tier (Figure 4.8).

The Marcellus Shale in New York State consists of three primary members.²⁵ The oldest (lower-most) member of the Marcellus is the Union Springs Shale which is laterally continuous with the Bakoven Shale in the eastern part of the state. The Union Springs and Bakoven Shales are bounded below by the Onondaga and above by the Cherry Valley Limestone in the west and the correlative Stony Hollow Member in the East. The upper-most member of the Marcellus Shale is the Oatka Creek Shale (west) and the correlative Cardiff-Chittenango Shales (east). The members of primary interest with respect to gas production are the Union Springs and lower-most portions

²³ Alpha, 2009, p. 126.

²⁴ Alpha, 2009, p. 126.

²⁵ Alpha, 2009, p. 127.

of the Oatka Creek Shale.²⁶ The cumulative thickness of the organic-rich layers ranges from less than 25 feet in western New York to over 300 feet in the east (Figure 4.9). Gamma ray logs indicate that the Marcellus Shale has a slightly radioactive signature on gamma ray geophysical logs, consistent with typical black shales. Concentrations of uranium ranging from 5 to 100 parts per million have been reported in Devonian gas shales.²⁷

4.4.1 *Total Organic Carbon*

Figure 4.10 shows the aerial distribution of TOC in the Marcellus Shale based on the analysis of drill cuttings sample data.²⁸ TOC generally ranges between 2.5 and 5.5 percent and is greatest in the central portion of the state. Ranges of TOC values in the Marcellus were reported between 3 to 12%²⁹ and 1 to 10.1%.³⁰

4.4.2 *Thermal Maturity and Fairways*

Vitrinite reflectance is a measure of the maturity of organic matter in rock with respect to whether it has produced hydrocarbons and is reported in percent reflection (% Ro). Values of 1.5 to 3.0 % Ro are considered to correspond to the “gas window,” though the upper value of the window can vary depending on formation and kerogen type characteristics.

VanTyne (1993) presented vitrinite reflection data from nine wells in the Marcellus Shale in Western New York. The values ranged from 1.18 % Ro to 1.65 % Ro, with an average of 1.39 % Ro. The vitrinite reflectance values generally increase eastward. Nyahay et al (2007) and Smith & Leone (2009) presented vitrinite reflectance data for the Marcellus Shale in New York (Figure 4.11) based on samples compiled by the New York State Museum Reservoir Characterization Group. The values ranged from less than 1.5 % Ro in western New York to over 3 % Ro in eastern New York.

Nyahay et al. (2007) presented an assessment of gas potential in the Marcellus Shale that was based on an evaluation of geochemical data from rock core and outcrop samples using methods

²⁶ Alpha, 2009, p. 127.

²⁷ Alpha, 2009, p. 127.

²⁸ Alpha, 2009, p. 127.

²⁹ Alpha, 2009, p. 127.

³⁰ Alpha, 2009, p. 127.

applied to other shale gas plays, such as the Barnett Shale in Texas. The gas productive fairway was identified based on the evaluation and represents the portion of the Marcellus Shale most likely to produce gas. The Marcellus fairway is similar to the Utica Shale fairway and is shown on Figure 4.12. The fairway is that portion of the formation that has the potential to produce gas based on specific geologic and geochemical criteria; however, other factors, such as formation depth, make only portions of the fairway favorable for drilling. Operators consider a variety of these factors, besides the extent of the fairway, when making a decision on where to drill for natural gas. Variation in the actual production is evidenced by Marcellus Shale wells outside the fairway that have produced gas and wells within the fairway that have been reported dry.

4.4.3 *Potential for Gas Production*

Gas has been produced from the Marcellus since 1880 when the first well was completed in the Naples field in Ontario County. The Naples field produced 32 MMcf during its productive life and nearly all shale gas discoveries in New York since then have been in the Marcellus Shale.³¹

All gas wells completed in New York's Marcellus Shale as of the publication date of this document are vertical wells.³²

The Department's summary production database includes reported natural gas production for the years 1967 through 1999. Approximately 544 MMcf of gas was produced from wells completed in the Marcellus Shale during this period.³³ In 2010, the most recent reporting year available, a total of 34 MMcf of gas was produced from 15 Marcellus Shale wells in Livingston, Steuben, Schuyler, Chemung, Chautauqua, Wyoming and Allegany Counties.

Volumes of in-place natural gas resources have been estimated for the entire Appalachian Basin. Charpentier et al. (1982) estimated a total in-place resource of 844.2 Tcf in all Devonian shales within the basin, including the Marcellus Shale. Approximately 164.1 Tcf, or 19%, of that estimated total, was attributed to the Devonian shales in New York State. NYSERDA estimates that approximately 15% of the total Devonian shale gas resource of the Appalachian Basin lies beneath New York State.

³¹ Alpha, 2009, p. 129.

³² Alpha, 2009, p. 129.

³³ Alpha, 2009, p. 129.

Legend

- Depth to the Top of the Marcellus Shale
- ▨ Marcellus Shale and Hamilton Group Outcrop
- Extent of the Marcellus Shale in New York





FIGURE 4.8

DEPTH AND EXTENT OF MARCELLUS SHALE IN NEW YORK STATE

Technical Support Document to the
Draft Supplemental Generic
Environmental Impact Statement



Source:
- New York State Museum - Reservoir Characterization Group (Leone, 2009).

Legend

- Thickness Organic-Rich Marcellus Shale (in feet)
- ▨ Marcellus Shale and Hamilton Group Outcrop
- Extent of the Marcellus Shale in New York





FIGURE 4.9

MARCELLUS SHALE THICKNESS
IN NEW YORK STATE



Technical Support Document to the
Draft Supplemental Generic
Environmental Impact Statement

Notes:

- Source: New York State Museum - Reservoir Characterization Group (Leone, 2009)
- Organic-rich Marcellus includes Union Springs and Oatka Creek Members and lateral equivalents.

Legend

- Total Organic Carbon (weight percent) in Organic-Rich Marcellus Shale
- ▨ Marcellus Shale and Hamilton Group Outcrop
- Extent of the Marcellus Shale in New York




FIGURE 4.10

TOTAL ORGANIC CARBON
OF MARCELLUS SHALE
IN NEW YORK STATE

Technical Support Document to the
Draft Supplemental Generic
Environmental Impact Statement

Source:
- Modified from New York State Museum - Reservoir Characterization
Group (Leone, 2009).



Legend

Extent of the Marcellus Shale in New York

Vitrinite Reflection (%Ro)

- Less than 0.6
- 0.6 to 1.5
- 1.5 to 3.0
- Greater than 3.0








FIGURE 4.11

MARCELLUS SHALE
THERMAL MATURITY

Technical Support Document to the
Draft Supplemental Generic
Environmental Impact Statement

Source:
- Modified from Smith & Leone (2009).

Legend

-  Marcellus Shale and Hamilton Group Outcrop
-  Marcellus Shale Fairway
-  Extent of the Marcellus Shale in New York





FIGURE 4.12

**MARCELLUS SHALE FAIRWAY
IN NEW YORK STATE**

Technical Support Document to the
Draft Supplemental Generic
Environmental Impact Statement

Source:

- US Geological Survey, Central Energy Resources Team (2002)
- New York State Museum - Reservoir Characterization Group
- Nyahay et al. (2007)

In 2011, the USGS estimated a mean of 84.2 Tcf of technically recoverable undiscovered natural gas reserves in the Marcellus Shale in the Appalachian Basin, more than a 40-fold increase from its 2002 estimate of 1.9 Tcf. Engelder had previously estimated a 50% probability that 489 Tcf of gas would be produced basin-wide from the Marcellus after a 50-year decline, and assigned 71.9 Tcf of that total to 17 counties in New York.³⁴ Engelder's basin-wide estimate appears to include both proven and undiscovered reserves. While Engelder's methodology is based on both geology and published information about initial production rates and production decline from actual wells in Pennsylvania, the USGS describes its approach as based on recognized geologic characteristics of the formation. There is insufficient information available to determine the validity of comparing these projections, but it is common for projections of these types to vary, as a function of the prevailing technologies and knowledge base associated with a given resource.

4.5 Seismicity in New York State

4.5.1 Background

The term “earthquake” is used to describe any event that is the result of a sudden release of energy in the earth's crust that generates seismic waves. Many earthquakes are too minor to be detected without sensitive equipment. Large earthquakes result in ground shaking and sometimes displacing the ground surface. Earthquakes are caused mainly by movement along geological faults, but also may result from volcanic activity and landslides. An earthquake's point of origin is called its focus or hypocenter. The term epicenter refers to the point at the ground surface directly above the hypocenter.

Geologic faults are fractures along which rocks on opposing sides have been displaced relative to each other. The amount of displacement may be small (centimeters) or large (kilometers).

Geologic faults are prevalent and typically are active along tectonic plate boundaries. One of the most well known plate boundary faults is the San Andreas fault zone in California. Faults also occur across the rest of the U.S., including mid-continent and non-plate boundary areas, such as

³⁴ Engelder, 2009.

the New Madrid fault zone in the Mississippi Valley, or the Ramapo fault system in southeastern New York and eastern Pennsylvania.

Figure 4.13 shows the locations of faults and other structures that may indicate the presence of buried faults in New York State.³⁵ There is a high concentration of structures in eastern New York along the Taconic Mountains and the Champlain Valley that resulted from the intense thrusting and continental collisions during the Taconic and Allegheny orogenies that occurred 350 to 500 million years ago.³⁶ There is also a high concentration of faults along the Hudson River Valley. More recent faults in northern New York were formed as a result of the uplift of the Adirondack Mountains approximately 5 to 50 million years ago.

4.5.2 *Seismic Risk Zones*

The USGS Earthquake Hazard Program has produced the National Hazard Maps showing the distribution of earthquake shaking levels that have a certain probability of occurring in the United States. The maps were created by incorporating geologic, geodetic and historic seismic data, and information on earthquake rates and associated ground shaking. These maps are used by others to develop and update building codes and to establish construction requirements for public safety.

New York State is not associated with a major fault along a tectonic boundary like the San Andreas, but seismic events are common in New York. Figure 4.14 shows the seismic hazard map for New York State.³⁷ The map shows levels of horizontal shaking, in terms of percent of the gravitational acceleration constant (%g) that is associated with a 2 in 100 (2%) probability of occurring during a 50-year period.³⁸ Much of the Marcellus and Utica Shales underlie portions of the state with the lowest seismic hazard class rating in New York (2% probability of exceeding 4 to 8 %g in a 50-year period). The areas around New York City, Buffalo, and northern-most New York have a moderate to high seismic hazard class ratings (2% probability of exceeding 12 to 40 %g in a 50-year period).

³⁵ Alpha, 2009, p. 138.

³⁶ Alpha, 2009, p. 138.

³⁷ Alpha, 2009, p. 139.

³⁸ Alpha, 2009, p. 139.

Legend

- Geologic Fault
- Combined Utica and Marcellus Shales in New York State




FIGURE 4.13

MAPPED GEOLOGIC FAULTS
IN NEW YORK STATE

Technical Support Document to the
Draft Supplemental Generic
Environmental Impact Statement



Note:
- Geologic fault features shown were compiled by Isachsen
and McKendree (1977) and exclude brittle structures identified
as drillholes, topographic, and tonal linear features.




FIGURE 4.14

NEW YORK STATE
SEISMIC HAZARD MAP

Technical Support Document to the
Draft Supplemental Generic
Environmental Impact Statement



- Notes:
- Map shows peak acceleration (%g) with 2% probability of exceedence in 50 years.
 - Source - USGS National Seismic Hazard Maps (2008).

4.5.3 Seismic Damage – Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale

There are several scales by which the magnitude and the intensity of a seismic event are reported. The Richter magnitude scale was developed in 1935 to measure of the amount of energy released during an earthquake. The moment magnitude scale (MMS) was developed in the 1970s to address shortcomings of the Richter scale, which does not accurately calculate the magnitude of earthquakes that are large (greater than 7) or distant (measured at a distance greater than 250 miles away). Both scales report approximately the same magnitude for earthquakes with a magnitude less than 7 and both scales are logarithmic; an increase of two units of magnitude on the Richter scale corresponds to a 1,000-fold increase in the amount of energy released.

The MMS measures the size of a seismic event based on the amount of energy released. Moment is a representative measure of seismic strength for all sizes of events and is independent of recording instrumentation or location. Unlike the Richter scale, the MMS has no limits to the possible measurable magnitudes, and the MMS relates the moments to the Richter scale for continuity. The MMS also can represent microseisms (very small seismicity) with negative numbers.

The Modified Mercalli (MM) Intensity Scale was developed in 1931 to report the intensity of an earthquake. The Mercalli scale is an arbitrary ranking based on observed effects and not on a mathematical formula. This scale uses a series of 12 increasing levels of intensity that range from imperceptible shaking to catastrophic destruction, as summarized in Table 4.1. Table 4.1 compares the MM intensity scale to magnitudes of the MMS, based on typical events as measured near the epicenter of a seismic event. There is no direct conversion between the intensity and magnitude scales because earthquakes of similar magnitudes can cause varying levels of observed intensities depending on factors such location, rock type, and depth.

4.5.4 Seismic Events

Table 4.2 summarizes the recorded seismic events in New York State by county between December 1970 and July 2009.³⁹ There were a total of 813 seismic events recorded in New York

³⁹ Alpha, 2009, p. 140.

State during that period. The magnitudes of 24 of the 813 events were equal to or greater than 3.0. Magnitude 3 or lower earthquakes are mostly imperceptible and are usually detectable only with sensitive equipment. The largest seismic event during the period 1970 through 2009 is a 5.3 magnitude earthquake that occurred on April 20, 2002, near Plattsburgh, Clinton County.⁴⁰ Damaging earthquakes have been recorded since Europeans settled New York in the 1600s. The largest earthquake ever measured and recorded in New York State was a magnitude 5.8 event that occurred on September 5, 1944, near Massena, New York.⁴¹

⁴⁰ Alpha, 2009, p. 140.

⁴¹ Alpha, 2009, p. 140.

**Table 4.1
Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale**

Modified Mercalli Intensity	Description	Effects	Typical Maximum Moment Magnitude
I	Instrumental	Not felt except by a very few under especially favorable conditions.	1.0 to 3.0
II	Feeble	Felt only by a few persons at rest, especially on upper floors of buildings.	3.0 to 3.9
III	Slight	Felt quite noticeably by persons indoors, especially on upper floors of buildings. Many people do not recognize it as an earthquake. Standing motor cars may rock slightly. Vibrations similar to the passing of a truck. Duration estimated.	
IV	Moderate	Felt indoors by many, outdoors by few during the day. At night, some awakened. Dishes, windows, doors disturbed; walls make cracking sound. Sensation like heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.	4.0 to 4.9
V	Rather Strong	Felt by nearly everyone; many awakened. Some dishes, windows broken. Unstable objects overturned. Pendulum clocks may stop.	
VI	Strong	Felt by all, many frightened. Some heavy furniture moved; a few instances of fallen plaster. Damage slight.	5.0 to 5.9
VII	Very Strong	Damage negligible in buildings of good design and construction; slight to moderate in well-built ordinary structures; considerable damage in poorly built or badly designed structures; some chimneys broken.	
VIII	Destructive	Damage slight in specially designed structures; considerable damage in ordinary substantial buildings with partial collapse. Damage great in poorly built structures. Fall of chimneys, factory stacks, columns, monuments, walls. Heavy furniture overturned.	6.0 to 6.9
IX	Ruinous	Damage considerable in specially designed structures; well-designed frame structures thrown out of plumb. Damage great in substantial buildings, with partial collapse. Buildings shifted off foundations.	
X	Disastrous	Some well-built wooden structures destroyed; most masonry and frame structures destroyed with foundations. Rails bent.	7.0 and higher
XI	Very Disastrous	Few, if any (masonry) structures remain standing. Bridges destroyed. Rails bent greatly.	
XII	Catastrophic	Damage total. Lines of sight and level are distorted. Objects thrown into the air.	

The above table compares the Modified Mercalli intensity scale and moment magnitude scales that typically observed near the epicenter of a seismic event.

Source: USGS Earthquake Hazard Program (http://earthquake.usgs.gov/learning/topics/mag_vs_int.php)

Table 4.2
Summary of Seismic Events in New York State
December 1970 through July 2009

County	Magnitude					Total
	< 2.0	2.0 to 2.9	3.0 to 3.9	4.0 to 4.9	5.0 to 5.3	
<i>Counties Overlying Utica and Marcellus Shales</i>						
Albany	27	20	3	0	0	50
Allegany	0	0	0	0	0	0
Broome	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cattaraugus	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cayuga	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chautauqua	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chemung	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chenango	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cortland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delaware	1	2	0	0	0	3
Erie	7	5	0	0	0	12
Genesee	3	5	0	0	0	8
Greene	2	1	0	0	0	3
Livingston	1	5	1	0	0	7
Madison	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	1	2	0	0	0	3
Niagara	7	3	0	0	0	10
Onondaga	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ontario	1	1	0	0	0	2
Otsego	0	0	0	0	0	0
Schoharie	2	4	0	1	0	7
Schuyler	0	0	0	0	0	0
Seneca	0	0	0	0	0	0
Steuben	2	0	1	0	0	3
Sullivan	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tioga	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tompkins	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wyoming	8	5	0	0	0	13
Yates	1	0	0	0	0	1
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>53</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>122</i>
<i>Counties Overlying Utica Shale</i>						
Fulton	1	2	1	0	0	4
Herkimer	4	3	0	0	0	7
Jefferson	5	3	0	0	0	8
Lewis	3	0	2	0	0	5
Monroe	1	0	0	0	0	1
Oneida	3	4	0	0	0	7
Orange	14	5	0	0	0	19
Orleans	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oswego	2	0	0	0	0	2
Saratoga	1	2	0	0	0	3
Schenectady	1	1	0	0	0	2
Wayne	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>58</i>

Table 4.2
Summary of Seismic Events in New York State
December 1970 through July 2009

County	Magnitude					Total
	< 2.0	2.0 to 2.9	3.0 to 3.9	4.0 to 4.9	5.0 to 5.3	
<i>Counties Not Overlying Utica or Marcellus Shales</i>						
Bronx	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clinton	60	30	5	0	1	96
Columbia	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dutchess	6	4	2	0	0	12
Essex	88	64	4	1	1	158
Franklin	40	19	3	0	0	62
Hamilton	53	10	0	0	0	63
Kings	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nassau	1	0	0	0	0	1
New York	3	2	0	0	0	5
Putnam	4	2	0	0	0	6
Queens	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rensselaer	1	0	0	0	0	1
Richmond	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rockland	15	3	0	0	0	18
St. Lawrence	84	29	0	0	0	113
Suffolk	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ulster	3	0	0	0	0	3
Warren	11	5	1	0	0	17
Washington	1	3	0	0	0	4
Westchester	61	11	1	1	0	74
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>431</i>	<i>182</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>633</i>
<i>New York State Total</i>	<i>529</i>	<i>255</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>813</i>

Notes:

- Seismic events recorded December 13, 1970 through July 28, 2009.
- Lamont-Doherty Cooperative Seismographic Network, 2009

Figure 4.15 shows the distribution of recorded seismic events in New York State. The majority of the events occur in the Adirondack Mountains and along the New York-Quebec border. A total of 180 of the 813 seismic events shown on Table 4.2 and Figure 4.15 during a period of 39 years (1970–2009) occurred in the area of New York that is underlain by the Marcellus and/or the Utica Shales. The magnitude of 171 of the 180 events was less than 3.0. The distribution of seismic events on Figure 4.15 is consistent with the distribution of fault structures (Figure 4.13) and the seismic hazard risk map (Figure 4.14).

Induced seismicity refers to seismic events triggered by human activity such as mine blasts, nuclear experiments, and fluid injection, including hydraulic fracturing.⁴² Induced seismic waves (seismic refraction and seismic reflection) also are a common tool used in geophysical surveys for geologic exploration. The surveys are used to investigate the subsurface for a wide range of purposes including landfill siting; foundations for roads, bridges, dams and buildings; oil and gas exploration; mineral prospecting; and building foundations. Methods of inducing seismic waves range from manually striking the ground with weight to setting off controlled blasts.

Hydraulic fracturing releases energy during the fracturing process at a level substantially below that of small, naturally occurring, earthquakes. However, some of the seismic events shown on Figure 4.15 are known or suspected to be triggered by other types of human activity. The 3.5 magnitude event recorded on March 12, 1994, in Livingston County is suspected to be the result of the collapse associated with the Retsof salt mine failure in Cuylerville, New York.⁴³ The 3.2 magnitude event recorded on February 3, 2001, was coincident with, and is suspected to have been triggered by, test injections for brine disposal at the New Avoca Natural Gas Storage (NANGS) facility in Steuben County. The cause of the event likely was the result of an extended period of fluid injection near an existing fault⁴⁴ for the purposes of siting a deep injection well. The injection for the NANGS project occurred numerous times with injection periods lasting 6 to 28 days and is substantially different than the short-duration, controlled injection used for hydraulic fracturing.

⁴² Alpha, 2009, p. 138.

⁴³ Alpha, 2009, p. 141.

⁴⁴ Alpha, 2009, p. 141.

One additional incident suspected to be related to human activity occurred in late 1971 at Texas Brine Corporation's system of wells used for solution mining of brine near Dale, Wyoming County, New York (i.e., the Dale Brine Field). The well system consisted of a central, high pressure injection well (No. 11) and four peripheral brine recovery wells. The central injection well was hydraulically fractured in July 1971 without incident.

The well system was located in the immediate vicinity of the known, mapped, Clarendon-Linden fault zone which is oriented north-south, and extends south of Lake Ontario in Orleans, Genesee, Wyoming, and the northern end of Allegany Counties, New York. The Clarendon-Linden fault zone is not of the same magnitude, scale, or character as the plate boundary fault systems, but nonetheless has been the source of relatively small to moderate quakes in western New York (MCEER, 2009; and Fletcher and Sykes, 1977).

Fluids were injected at well No. 11 from August 3 through October 8, and from October 16 through November 9, 1971. Injections were ceased on November 9, 1971 due to an increase in seismic activity in the area of the injection wells. A decrease in seismic activity occurred when the injections ceased. The tremors attributed to the injections reportedly were felt by residents in the immediate area.

Evaluation of the seismic activity associated with the Dale Brine Field was performed and published by researchers from the Lamont-Doherty Geological Observatory (Fletcher and Sykes, 1977). The evaluation concluded that fluids injected during solution mining activity were able to reach the Clarendon-Linden fault and that the increase of pore fluid pressure along the fault caused an increase in seismic activity. The research states that "the largest earthquake ... that appears to be associated with the brine field..." was 1.4 in magnitude. In comparison, the magnitude of the largest natural quake along the Clarendon-Linden fault system through 1977 was magnitude 2.7, measured in 1973. Similar solution mining well operations in later years located further from the fault system than the Dale Brine Field wells did not create an increase in seismic activity.

Legend

**Recorded Seismic Events
Magnitude (Richter Scale)**

- Less than 3.0
Minor - not felt
- 3.0 to 3.9
Minor - often felt, no damage
- 4.0 to 4.9
Minor - shaking observed
- 5.0 to 5.3
Moderate - Some damage
- Combined Utica and Marcellus Shales
in New York State




FIGURE 4.15

**SEISMIC EVENTS IN
NEW YORK STATE
(1970 to 2009)**

Technical Support Document to the
Draft Supplemental Generic
Environmental Impact Statement



Notes:

- Seismic events recorded December 13, 1970 through July 28, 2009.
- Lamont-Doherty Cooperative Seismographic Network, 2009
(<http://almaty.ldeo.columbia.edu:8080/data.search.html>)

4.5.5 *Monitoring Systems in New York*

Seismicity in New York is monitored by both the US Geological Survey (USGS) and the Lamont-Doherty Cooperative Seismographic Network (LCSN). The LCSN is part of the USGS's Advanced National Seismic System (ANSS) which provides current information on seismic events across the country. Other ANSS stations are located in Binghamton and Lake Ozonia, New York. The New York State Museum also operates a seismic monitoring station in the Cultural Education Center in Albany, New York.

As part of the ANSS, the LCSN monitors earthquakes that occur primarily in the northeastern United States and coordinates and manages data from 40 seismographic stations in seven states, including Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Vermont.⁴⁵ Member organizations that operate LCSN stations include two secondary schools, two environmental research and education centers, three state geological surveys, a museum dedicated to Earth system history, two public places (Central Park, NYC, and Howe Caverns, Cobleskill), three two-year colleges, and 15 four-year universities.⁴⁶

4.6 Naturally Occurring Radioactive Materials (NORM) in Marcellus Shale

NORM is present to varying degrees in virtually all environmental media, including rocks and soils. As mentioned above, black shale typically contains trace levels of uranium and gamma ray logs indicate that this is true of the Marcellus Shale. The Marcellus is known to contain concentrations of NORM such as uranium-238 and radium-226 at higher levels than surrounding rock formations. Normal disturbance of NORM-bearing rock formations by activities such as mining or drilling do not generally pose a threat to workers, the general public or the environment. However, activities having the potential to concentrate NORM need to come under regulatory oversight to ensure adequate protection of workers, the general public and the environment.

Chapter 5 includes radiological information (sampling results) from environmental media at various locations in the Appalachian Basin. Radiological data for the Marcellus in New York were derived from: a) drill cuttings and core samples from wells drilled through or completed in

⁴⁵ Alpha, 2009, p. 142.

⁴⁶ Alpha, 2009, p. 143.

the Marcellus; and b) production brine from vertical wells completed in the Marcellus.

Radiological data for the Marcellus in Pennsylvania and West Virginia were derived from: a) drill cuttings from wells completed in the Marcellus in Pennsylvania; and b) flowback water analyses provided by operators of wells in Pennsylvania and West Virginia. Chapter 6 includes a discussion of potential impacts associated with radioactivity in the Marcellus Shale. Chapter 7 details mitigation measures, including existing regulatory programs, proposed well permit conditions, and proposed future data collection and analysis.

4.7 Naturally-Occurring Methane in New York State

The presence of naturally-occurring methane in ground seeps and water wells is well documented throughout New York State. Naturally-occurring methane can be attributed to swampy areas or where bedrock and unconsolidated aquifers overlie Devonian-age shales or other gas-bearing formations. The highly fractured Devonian shale formations found throughout western New York are particularly well known for shallow methane accumulations. In his 1966 report on the Jamestown Aquifer, Crain explained that natural gas could occur in any water well in the area "which ends in bedrock or in unconsolidated deposits overlain by fine-grained confining material. Depth is not of primary importance because pockets of gas may occur in the bedrock at nearly any depth."⁴⁷ Upper Devonian gas bearing rocks at or near the surface extend across the southern tier of New York from Chautauqua and Erie Counties, east to Delaware and Sullivan counties (Figure 4.16).

As noted below, early explorers and water well drillers in New York reported naturally occurring methane in regions not then associated with natural gas well drilling activity. "Methane can occur naturally in water wells and when it does, it presents unique problems for water well drilling contractors. The major concern relates to flammable and explosive hazards associated with methane."⁴⁸ Gas that occurs naturally in shallow bedrock and unconsolidated sediments has been known to seep to the surface and/or contaminate water supplies including water wells. Often landowners are not aware of the presence of methane in their well. Methane is a colorless,

⁴⁷ NYSDEC, 1992, GEIS, p. 10-6.

⁴⁸ Keech, D. et al, 1982, pp. 33-36.

odorless gas, and is generally considered non-toxic but there could be an explosive hazard if gas is present in significant volumes and the water well is not properly vented.

The existence of naturally occurring methane seeps in New York has been known since the mid 1600s. In August 1669 Rene Robert Cavelier de la Salle and Rene de Brehant de Galinee, while on their way to explore the Mississippi Valley, arrived in the Bristol Hills area of Ontario County, New York. It was here where the explorers observed natural gas flowing from joint planes in the Penn Yan Shale (Upper Devonian) at the foot of a falls over the Genundewa Limestone.⁴⁹ More recent studies and investigations have provided other evidence of naturally occurring methane in eastern New York. A private well in Schenectady County was gaged at 158 MMcf/d of natural gas by the Department in 1965. The well provided natural gas for the owner's domestic use for 30 years.⁵⁰ In 1987 the Times Union reported that contaminants, including methane, were found in well water in the Orchard Park subdivision near New Scotland, Albany County. Engineers from the Department reported the methane as "natural occurrences found in shale bedrock deposits beneath the development."⁵¹ Ten years later, in 1997, a Saratoga Lake couple disclosed to a news reporter the presence of methane gas in their water well. The concentration of gas in the well water was concentrated enough for the owners to ignite the gas from the bathtub faucet.⁵² According to a September 22, 2010 article in the Daily Gazette, water wells in the Brown Road subdivision, Saratoga County became contaminated with methane gas when water wells were "blasted" (fractured) to reach a greater supply of water.⁵³

Methane contamination of groundwater is often mistakenly attributed to or blamed on natural gas well drilling and hydraulic fracturing. There are a number of other, more common, reasons that well water can display sudden changes in quality and quantity. Seasonal variations in recharge, stress on the aquifer from usage demand, and mechanical failures are some factors that could lead to degradation of well water.

⁴⁹ Wells, J. 1963.

⁵⁰ Kucewicz, J. 1997.

⁵¹ Thurman, K. 1987.

⁵² Kruse, M. 1997.

⁵³ Bowen, K. 2010.

Recently, as part of two separate complaint investigations in the towns of Elmira and Collins, New York, the Department documented that methane gas existed in the shallow aquifers at the two sites long before and prior to the exploration and development for natural gas^{54, 55}. The comprehensive investigations included the following:

- Analysis of drilling and completion records of natural gas wells drilled near the water wells;
- Evaluation of well logs to ascertain cement integrity;
- Collection of gas samples for compositional analysis;
- Inspections of the water and natural gas wells; and
- Interviews with landowners and water well drillers.

Both investigations provided clear evidence that methane contamination was present in the area's water wells prior to the commencement of natural gas drilling operations.

Drilling and construction activities may have an adverse impact on groundwater resources. The migration of methane can contaminate well water supplies if well construction practices designed to prevent gas migration are not adhered to. Chapter 6 discusses these potential impacts with mitigation measures addressed in Chapter 7.

In April 2011 researchers from Duke University (Duke) released a report on the occurrence of methane contamination of drinking water associated with Marcellus and Utica Shale gas development.⁵⁶ As part of their study, the authors analyzed groundwater from nine drinking water wells completed in the Genesee Group in Otsego County, New York for the presence of methane. Of the nine wells, Duke classified one well as being in an active gas extraction area (i.e., a gas well within 1 kilometer (km) of the water well), and the remaining eight in a non-active gas extraction area. The analysis showed minimal amounts of methane in this sample group, with concentrations significantly below the minimum methane action level (10 mg/L) to

⁵⁴ NYSDEC, 2011.

⁵⁵ NYSDEC, 2011.

⁵⁶ Osborne, S. et al, 2011.

maintain the safety of structures and the public, as recommended by the U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of Surface Mining.⁵⁷ The water well located in the active gas extraction area had 5 to 10 times less methane than the wells located in the inactive areas.

The Department monitors groundwater conditions in New York as part of an ongoing cooperative project between the USGS and the Department's Division of Water (DOW).⁵⁸ The objectives of this program are to assess and report on the ambient ground-water quality of bedrock and glacial-drift aquifers throughout New York State. In 2010 water samples were collected from 46 drinking water wells in the Delaware, Genesee, and St. Lawrence River Basins. All samples were analyzed for dissolved methane gas using standard USGS protocols. The highest methane concentration from all samples analyzed was 22.4 mg/L from a well in Schoharie County; the average detected value was 0.79 mg/L.⁵⁹ These groundwater results confirm that methane migration to shallow aquifers is a natural phenomenon and can be expected to occur in active and non-active natural gas drilling areas.

⁵⁷ Eltschlager, K. et al, 2001.

⁵⁸ <http://www.dec.ny.gov/lands/36117.html>.

⁵⁹ NYSDEC, 2011.

This page intentionally left blank.



Chapter 5

Natural Gas Development Activities & High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing

This page intentionally left blank.

Chapter 5 - Natural Gas Development Activities & High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing

CHAPTER 5 NATURAL GAS DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES & HIGH-VOLUME HYDRAULIC FRACTURING	5-5
5.1 LAND DISTURBANCE.....	5-6
5.1.1 Access Roads	5-6
5.1.2 Well Pads	5-10
5.1.3 Utility Corridors	5-14
5.1.4 Well Pad Density.....	5-14
5.1.4.1 Historic Well Density.....	5-14
5.1.4.2 Anticipated Well Pad Density	5-16
5.2 HORIZONTAL DRILLING	5-24
5.2.1 Drilling Rigs	5-25
5.2.2 Multi-Well Pad Development	5-30
5.2.3 Drilling Mud	5-32
5.2.4 Cuttings.....	5-33
5.2.4.1 Cuttings Volume.....	5-33
5.2.4.2 NORM in Marcellus Cuttings.....	5-34
5.2.5 Management of Drilling Fluids and Cuttings	5-37
5.2.5.1 Reserve Pits on Multi-Well Pads	5-37
5.2.5.2 Closed-Loop Tank Systems.....	5-37
5.3 HYDRAULIC FRACTURING.....	5-39
5.4 FRACTURING FLUID	5-40
5.4.1 Properties of Fracturing Fluids	5-49
5.4.2 Classes of Additives	5-49
5.4.3 Composition of Fracturing Fluids.....	5-50
5.4.3.1 Chemical Categories and Health Information.....	5-63
5.5 TRANSPORT OF HYDRAULIC FRACTURING ADDITIVES	5-79
5.6 ON-SITE STORAGE AND HANDLING OF HYDRAULIC FRACTURING ADDITIVES	5-80
5.6.1 Summary of Additive Container Types	5-81
5.7 SOURCE WATER FOR HIGH-VOLUME HYDRAULIC FRACTURING	5-83
5.7.1 Delivery of Source Water to the Well Pad.....	5-84
5.7.2 Use of Centralized Impoundments for Fresh Water Storage	5-85
5.8 HYDRAULIC FRACTURING DESIGN	5-88
5.8.1 Fracture Development.....	5-89
5.8.2 Methods for Limiting Fracture Growth	5-90
5.8.3 Hydraulic Fracturing Design – Summary	5-90
5.9 HYDRAULIC FRACTURING PROCEDURE	5-91
5.10 RE-FRACTURING.....	5-98
5.11 FLUID RETURN.....	5-99
5.11.1 Flowback Water Recovery	5-99
5.11.2 Flowback Water Handling at the Wellsite	5-100
5.11.3 Flowback Water Characteristics	5-100
5.11.3.1 Temporal Trends in Flowback Water Composition.....	5-117
5.11.3.2 NORM in Flowback Water	5-117

5.12 FLOWBACK WATER TREATMENT, RECYCLING AND REUSE.....	5-118
5.12.1 Physical and Chemical Separation	5-120
5.12.2 Dilution	5-121
5.12.2.1 Reuse	5-122
5.12.3 Other On-Site Treatment Technologies.....	5-124
5.12.3.1 Membranes / Reverse Osmosis	5-124
5.12.3.2 Thermal Distillation.....	5-125
5.12.3.3 Ion Exchange	5-126
5.12.3.4 Electrodialysis/Electrodialysis Reversal	5-126
5.12.3.5 Ozone/Ultrasonic/Ultraviolet	5-127
5.12.3.6 Crystallization/Zero Liquid Discharge	5-128
5.12.4 Comparison of Potential On-Site Treatment Technologies	5-128
5.13 WASTE DISPOSAL.....	5-129
5.13.1 Cuttings from Mud Drilling	5-129
5.13.2 Reserve Pit Liner from Mud Drilling	5-130
5.13.3 Flowback Water.....	5-130
5.13.3.1 Injection Wells	5-131
5.13.3.2 Municipal Sewage Treatment Facilities	5-132
5.13.3.3 Out-of-State Treatment Plants	5-132
5.13.3.4 Road Spreading.....	5-133
5.13.3.5 Private In-State Industrial Treatment Plants	5-133
5.13.3.6 Enhanced Oil Recovery	5-134
5.13.4 Solid Residuals from Flowback Water Treatment	5-134
5.14 WELL CLEANUP AND TESTING	5-134
5.15 SUMMARY OF OPERATIONS PRIOR TO PRODUCTION.....	5-135
5.16 NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION	5-137
5.16.1 Partial Site Reclamation.....	5-137
5.16.2 Gas Composition.....	5-137
5.16.2.1 Hydrocarbons.....	5-137
5.16.2.2 Hydrogen Sulfide.....	5-138
5.16.3 Production Rate.....	5-138
5.16.4 Well Pad Production Equipment	5-139
5.16.5 Brine Storage	5-141
5.16.6 Brine Disposal	5-141
5.16.7 NORM in Marcellus Production Brine	5-141
5.16.8 Gas Gathering and Compression	5-142
5.17 WELL PLUGGING	5-143

FIGURES

Figure 5.1 - Well Pad Schematic 5-15
Figure 5.2 - Possible well spacing unit configurations and wellbore paths 5-31
Figure 5.3 - Sample Fracturing Fluid Composition (12 Additives), by Weight, from Fayetteville Shale 5-53
Figure 5.4 - Sample Fracturing Fluid Composition (9 Additives), by Weight, from Marcellus Shale (New July 2011). 5-53
Figure 5.5 - Sample Fracturing Fluid Composition (6 Additives), by Weight, from Marcellus Shale (New July 2011). 5-54
Figure 5.6 - Example Fracturing Fluid Composition Including Recycled Flowback Water (New July 2011)..... 5-123
Figure 5.7 - One configuration of potential on-site treatment technologies. 5-124
Figure 5.8 - Simplified Illustration of Gas Production Process..... 5-140

TABLES

Table 5.1 - Ten square mile area (i.e., 6,400 acres), completely drilled with horizontal wells in multi-well units or vertical wells in single-well units (Updated July 2011) 5-23
Table 5.2 - 2009 Marcellus Radiological Data 5-35
Table 5.3 - Gamma Ray Spectroscopy 5-36
Table 5.4 - Fracturing Additive Products – Complete Composition Disclosure Made to the Department (Updated July 2011)..... 5-42
Table 5.5 - Fracturing Additive Products – Partial Composition Disclosure to the Department (Updated July 2011) 5-47
Table 5.6 - Types and Purposes of Additives Proposed for Use in New York State (Updated July 2011)..... 5-50
Table 5.7 - Chemical Constituents in Additives” (Updated July 2011) 5-55
Table 5.8 - Categories based on chemical structure of potential fracturing fluid constituents. (Updated July 2011) 5-64
Table 5.9 - Parameters present in a limited set of flowback analytical results (Updated July 2011) 5-102
Table 5.10 - Typical concentrations of flowback constituents based on limited samples from PA and WV, and regulated in NY’ (Revised July 2011) 5-106
Table 5.11 - Typical concentrations of flowback constituents based on limited samples from PA and WV, not regulated in NY(Revised July 2011) 5-108
Table 5.12 - Conventional Analytes In MSC Study (New July 2011) 5-110
Table 5.13 - Total and Dissolved Metals Analyzed In MSC Study (New July 2011)..... 5-110
Table 5.14 - Volatile Organic Compounds Analyzed in MSC Study (New July 2011) 5-111
Table 5.15 - Semi-Volatile Organics Analyzed in MSC Study (New July 2011)..... 5-112
Table 5.16 - Organochlorine Pesticides Analyzed in MSC Study (New July 2011) 5-112
Table 5.17 - PCBs Analyzed in MSC Study (New July 2011) 5-113
Table 5.18 - Organophosphorus Pesticides Analyzed in MSC Study (New July 2011) 5-113
Table 5.19 - Alcohols Analyzed in MSC Study (New July 2011) 5-113
Table 5.20 - Glycols Analyzed in MSC Study (New July 2011)..... 5-113
Table 5.21 - Acids Analyzed in MSC Study (New July 2011) 5-113
Table 5.22 - Parameter Classes Analyzed for in the MSC Study (New July 2011)..... 5-114
Table 5.23 - Parameter Classes Detected in Flowback Analyticals in MSC Study (New July 2011) 5-114
Table 5.24 - Concentrations of NORM constituents based on limited samples from PA and WV (Revised July 2011)5-118
Table 5.25 - Maximum allowable water quality requirements for fracturing fluids, based on input from one expert panel on Barnett Shale (Revised July 2011)..... 5-119
Table 5.26 - Treatment capabilities of EDR and RO Systems..... 5-127
Table 5.27 - Summary of Characteristics of On-Site Flowback Water Treatment Technologies (Updated July 2011) 5-129
Table 5.28 - Out-of-state treatment plants proposed for disposition of NY flowback water..... 5-133
Table 5.29 - Primary Pre-Production Well Pad Operations (Revised July 2011)..... 5-135
Table 5.30 - Marcellus Gas Composition from Bradford County, PA..... 5-137

PHOTOS

Photo 5.1 - Access Road and Erosion/Sedimentation Controls, Salo 1, Barton, Tioga County NY 5-8

Photo 5.2 - Access Road, Nornew Smyrna Hillbillies 2H, Smyrna, Madison County NY 5-8

Photo 5.3 - In-Service Access Road to Horizontal Marcellus well in Bradford County PA..... 5-9

Photo 5.4 - Access Road and Sedimentation Controls, Moss 1, Corning, Steuben County NY..... 5-9

Photo 5.5 - Chesapeake Energy Marcellus Well Drilling, Bradford County, PA 5-12

Photo 5.6 - Hydraulic fracturing operation, Horizontal Marcellus Well, Upshur County, WV 5-12

Photo 5.7 - Hydraulic Fracturing Operation, Horizontal Marcellus Well, Bradford County, PA 5-13

Photo 5.8 - Locations of Over 44,000 Natural Gas Wells Targeting the Medina Formation, Chautauqua County NY 5-18

Photo 5.9 - Locations of 48 Natural Gas Wells Targeting the Medina Formation, Chautauqua County NY..... 5-19

Photo 5.10 - Locations of 28 Wells in the Town of Poland, Chautauqua County NY..... 5-20

Photo 5.11 - Locations of 77 Wells in the Town of Sheridan, Chautauqua County NY..... 5-21

Photo 5.12 - Double Drilling Rig, Union Drilling Rig 54, Olsen 1B, Town of Fenton, Broome County NY 5-28

Photo 5.13 - Double Drilling Rig, Union Drilling Rig 48, Salo 1, Town of Barton, Tioga County NY 5-28

Photo 5.14 - Triple Drilling Rig, Precision Drilling Rig 26, Ruger 1, Horseheads, Chemung County NY 5-29

Photo 5.15 - Top Drive Single Drilling Rig, Barber and DeLine Rig, Sheckells 1, Town of Cherry Valley, Otsego County NY 5-29

Photo 5.16 - Drilling rig mud system (blue tanks) 5-33

Photo 5.17 - Sand used as proppant in hydraulic fracturing operation in Bradford County, PA..... 5-51

Photo 5.18 - Transport trucks with totes..... 5-82

Photo 5.19 - Fortuna SRBC-Approved Chemung River Water Withdrawal Facility, Towanda PA 5-86

Photo 5.20 - Fresh Water Supply Pond..... 5-86

Photo 5.21 - Water Pipeline from Fortuna Centralized Freshwater Impoundments, Troy PA 5-86

Photo 5.22 - Construction of Freshwater Impoundment, Upshur County WV..... 5-87

Photo 5.23 - Personnel monitoring a hydraulic fracturing procedure. Source: Fortuna Energy. 5-91

Photo 5.24 - Three Fortuna Energy wells being prepared for hydraulic fracturing, with 10,000 psi well head and goat head attached to lines. Troy PA. Source: New York State Department of Environmental Conservation 20095-93

Photo 5.25 - Hydraulic Fracturing Operation Equipment at a Fortuna Energy Multi-Well Site, Troy PA 5-96

Photo 5.26 - Fortuna Energy Multi-Well Site in Troy PA After Removal of Most Hydraulic Fracturing Equipment 5-97

Photo 5.27 - Wellhead and Fracturing Equipment 5-97

Photo 5.28 - Pipeline Compressor in New York. Source: Fortuna Energy 5-143

Chapter 5 NATURAL GAS DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES & HIGH-VOLUME HYDRAULIC FRACTURING

As noted in the 1992 GEIS, New York has a long history of natural gas production. The first gas well was drilled in 1821 in Fredonia, and the 40 Bcf of gas produced in 1938 remained the production peak until 2004 when 46.90 Bcf were produced. Annual production exceeded 50 Bcf from 2005 through 2008, dropping to 44.86 Bcf in 2009 and 35.67 Bcf in 2010. Chapters 9 and 10 of the 1992 GEIS comprehensively discuss well drilling, completion and production operations, including potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures. The history of hydrocarbon development in New York through 1988 is also covered in the 1992 GEIS.

New York counties with actively producing gas wells reported in 2010 were: Allegany, Cattaraugus, Cayuga, Chautauqua, Chemung, Chenango, Erie, Genesee, Livingston, Madison, Niagara, Ontario, Oswego, Schuyler, Seneca, Steuben, Tioga, Wayne, Wyoming and Yates.

Hydraulic fracturing is a well stimulation technique which consists of pumping a fluid and a proppant such as sand down the wellbore under high pressure to create fractures in the hydrocarbon-bearing rock. No blast or explosion is created by the hydraulic fracturing process. The proppant holds the fractures open, allowing hydrocarbons to flow into the wellbore after injected fluids are recovered. Hydraulic fracturing technology was first developed in the late 1940s and, accordingly, it was addressed in the 1992 GEIS. It is estimated that as many as 90% of wells drilled in New York are hydraulically fractured. ICF International provides the following history:¹

Hydraulic Fracturing Technological Milestones²	
Early 1900s	Natural gas extracted from shale wells. Vertical wells fractured with foam.
1983	First gas well drilled in Barnett Shale in Texas
1980-1990s	Cross-linked gel fracturing fluids developed and used in vertical wells
1991	First horizontal well drilled in Barnett Shale
1991	Orientation of induced fractures identified
1996	Slickwater fracturing fluids introduced
1996	Microseismic post-fracturing mapping developed
1998	Slickwater refracturing of originally gel-fractured wells
2002	Multi-stage slickwater fracturing of horizontal wells
2003	First hydraulic fracturing of Marcellus Shale ³
2005	Increased emphasis on improving the recovery factor
2007	Use of multi-well pads and cluster drilling

¹ ICF Task 1, 2009, p. 3.

² Matthews, 2008, as cited by ICF Task 1, 2009, p. 3.

³ Harper, 2008, as cited by ICF Task 1, 2009, p. 3.

5.1 Land Disturbance

Land disturbance directly associated with high-volume hydraulic fracturing will consist primarily of constructed gravel access roads, well pads and utility corridors. According to the most recent industry estimates, the average total disturbance associated with a multi-well pad, including incremental portions of access roads and utility corridors, during the drilling and fracturing stage is estimated at 7.4 acres and the average total disturbance associated with a well pad for a single vertical well during the drilling and fracturing stage is estimated at 4.8 acres. As a result of required partial reclamation, this would generally be reduced to averages of about 5.5 acres and 4.5 acres, respectively, during the production phase. These estimates include access roads to the well pads and incremental portions of utility corridors including gathering lines and compressor facilities, and the access roads associated with compressor facilities. These associated roads and facilities are projected to account for, on average, about 3.95 acres of the land area associated with each pad for the life of the wells. During the long-term production phase, a multi-well pad itself would occupy about 1.5 acres, while a well pad for a single vertical well would occupy about 0.5 acre.^{4,5}

5.1.1 *Access Roads*

The first step in developing a natural gas well site is to construct the access road and well pad. For environmental review and permitting purposes, the acreage and disturbance associated with the access road is considered part of the project as described by Topical Response #4 in the 1992 GEIS. However, instead of one well per access road as was typically the case when the GEIS was prepared, most shale gas development will consist of several wells on a multi-well pad serviced by a single access road. Therefore, in areas developed by horizontal drilling using multi-well pads, fewer access roads as a function of the number of wells will be needed. Industry estimates that 90% of the wells used to develop the Marcellus Shale will be horizontal wells located on multi-well pads.⁶

Access road construction involves clearing the route and preparing the surface for movement of heavy equipment, or reconstruction or improvement of existing roads if present on the property

⁴ ALL Consulting, 2010, pp. 14 – 15.

⁵ Cornue, 2011.

⁶ ALL Consulting, 2010, pp. 7 – 15.

being developed. Ground surface preparation for new roads typically involves staking, grading, stripping and stockpiling of topsoil reserves, then placing a layer of crushed stone, gravel, or cobbles over geotextile fabric. Sedimentation and erosion control features are also constructed as needed along the access roads and culverts may be placed across ditches at the entrance from the main highway or in low spots along the road.

The size of the access road is dictated by the size of equipment to be transported to the well site, distance of the well pad from an existing road and the route dictated by property access rights and environmental concerns. The route selected may not be the shortest distance to the nearest main road. Routes for access roads may be selected to make use of existing roads on a property and to avoid disturbing environmentally sensitive areas such as protected streams, wetlands, or steep slopes. Property access rights and agreements and traffic restrictions on local roads may also limit the location of access routes.

Access road widths would generally range from 20 to 40 feet during the drilling and fracturing phase and from 10 to 20 feet during the production phase. During the construction and drilling phase, additional access road width is necessary to accommodate stockpiled topsoil and excavated material along the roadway and to construct sedimentation and erosion control features such as berms, ditches, sediment traps or sumps, or silt fencing along the length of the access road.

Each 150 feet of a 30-foot wide access road adds about one-tenth of an acre to the total surface acreage disturbance attributed to the well site. Industry estimates an average access road size of 0.27 acre,⁷ which would imply an average length of about 400 feet for a 30-foot wide road. Permit applications for horizontal Marcellus wells received by the Department prior to publication of the 2009 draft SGEIS indicated road lengths ranging from 130 feet to approximately 3,000 feet.

Photos 5.1 – 5.4 depict typical wellsite access roads.

⁷ Cornue, 2011.



Photo 5.1 Access road and erosion/sedimentation controls, Salo 1, Barton, Tioga County NY. Photo taken during drilling phase. This access road is approximately 1,400 feet long. Road width averages 22 feet wide, 28 feet wide at creek crossing (foreground). Width including drainage ditches is approximately 27 feet. Source: NYS DEC 2007.



Photo 5.2 Nornew, Smyrna Hillbillies #2H, access road, Smyrna, Madison County NY. Photo taken during drilling phase of improved existing private dirt road (approximately 0.8 miles long). Not visible in photo is an additional 0.6 mile of new access road construction. Operator added ditches, drainage, gravel & silt fence to existing dirt road. The traveled part of the road surface in the picture is 12.5' wide; width including drainage ditches is approximately 27 feet. Portion of the road crossing a protected stream is approximately 20 feet wide. Source: NYS DEC 2008.



Photo 5.3 In-service access road to horizontal Marcellus well in Bradford County, PA. Source: Chesapeake Energy



Photo 5.4 Access road and sedimentation controls, Moss 1, Corning, Steuben County NY. Photo taken during post-drilling phase. Access road at the curb is approximately 50 feet wide, narrowing to 33 feet wide between curb and access gate. The traveled part of the access road ranges between 13 and 19 feet wide. Access road length is approximately 1,100 feet long. Source: NYS DEC 2004.

5.1.2 Well Pads

Pad size is determined by site topography, number of wells and pattern layout, with consideration given to the ability to stage, move and locate needed drilling and hydraulic fracturing equipment. Location and design of pits, impoundments, tanks, hydraulic fracturing equipment, reduced emission completion equipment, dehydrators and production equipment such as separators, brine tanks and associated control monitoring, as well as office and vehicle parking requirements, can increase square footage. Mandated surface restrictions and setbacks may also impose additional acreage requirements. On the other hand, availability and access to offsite, centralized dehydrators, compressor stations and centralized water storage or handling facilities may reduce acreage requirements for individual well pads.⁸

The activities associated with the preparation of a well pad are similar for both vertical wells and multi-well pads where horizontal drilling and high volume hydraulic fracturing will be used.⁹ Site preparation activities consist primarily of clearing and leveling an area of adequate size and preparing the surface to support movement of heavy equipment. As with access road construction, ground surface preparation typically involves staking, grading, stripping and stockpiling of topsoil reserves, then placing a layer of crushed stone, gravel, or cobbles over geotextile fabric. Site preparation also includes establishing erosion and sediment control structures around the site, and constructing pits for retention of drilling fluid and, possibly, fresh water.

Depending on site topography, part of a slope may be excavated and the excavated material may be used as fill (cut and fill) to extend the well pad, providing for a level working area and more room for equipment and onsite storage. The fill banks must be stabilized using appropriate sedimentation and control measures.

The primary difference in well pad preparation for a well where high-volume hydraulic fracturing will be employed versus a well described by the 1992 GEIS is that more land is disturbed on a per-pad basis, though fewer pads should be needed overall.¹⁰ A larger well pad is

⁸ ICF Task 2, 2009, pp. 4-5.

⁹ Alpha, 2009, p. 6-6.

¹⁰ Alpha, 2009, p. 6-2.

required to accommodate fluid storage and equipment needs associated with the high-volume fracturing operations. In addition, some of the equipment associated with horizontal drilling has a larger surface footprint than the equipment described by the 1992 GEIS.

Industry estimates the average size of a multi-well pad for the drilling and fracturing phase of operations at 3.5 acres.¹¹ Average production pad size, after partial reclamation, is estimated at 1.5 acres for a multi-well pad.¹² Permit applications for horizontal wells received by the Department prior to publication of the 2009 draft SGEIS indicated multi-well pads ranging in size from 2.2 acres to 5.5 acres during the drilling and fracturing phase of operations, and from 0.5 to 2 acres after partial reclamation during the production phase.

The well pad sizes discussed above are consistent with published information regarding drilling operations in other shale formations, as researched by ICF International for NYSERDA.¹³ For example, in an Environmental Assessment published for the Hornbuckle Field Horizontal Drilling Program (Wyoming), the well pad size required for drilling and completion operations is estimated at approximately 460 feet by 340 feet, or about 3.6 acres. This estimate does not include areas disturbed due to access road construction. A study of horizontal gas well sites constructed by SEECO, Inc. in the Fayetteville Shale reports that the operator generally clears 300 feet by 250 feet, or 1.72 acres, for its pad and reserve pits. Fayetteville Shale sites may be as large as 500 feet by 500 feet, or 5.7 acres.

Photos 5.5 – 5.7 depict typical Marcellus well pads, and Figure 5.1 is a schematic representation of a typical drilling site.

¹¹ Cornue, 2011.

¹² ALL Consulting, 2010, p. 15.

¹³ ICF Task 2, 2009, p. 4.



Photo 5.5 Chesapeake Energy Marcellus well drilling, Bradford County, PA
Source: Chesapeake Energy



Photo 5.6 Hydraulic fracturing operation, horizontal Marcellus well, Upshur County, WV
Source: Chesapeake Energy, 2008



Photo 5.7 Hydraulic fracturing operation, horizontal Marcellus well, Bradford County, PA
Source: Chesapeake Energy, 2008

5.1.3 Utility Corridors

Utility corridors associated with high-volume hydraulic fracturing will include acreage used for potential water lines, above ground or underground electrical lines, gas gathering lines and compressor facilities, with average per-well pad acreage estimates as follows:

- 1.35 acres for water and electrical lines;
- 1.66 acres for gas gathering lines; and
- 0.67 acre for compression (because a compressor facility will service more than one well pad, this estimate is for an *incremental* portion assigned to a single well pad of a compressor facility and its associated sales line and access roads).¹⁴

Gathering lines may follow the access road associated with the well pad, so clearing and disturbance for the gathering line may be conducted during the initial site construction phase, thereby adding to the access road width. For example, some proposals include a 20-foot access road to the well pad with an additional 10-foot right-of-way for the gathering line.

Activities associated with constructing compressor facility pads are similar to those described above for well pads.

5.1.4 Well Pad Density


5.1.4.1 Historic Well Density

Well operators reported 6,732 producing natural gas wells in New York in 2010, approximately half of which (3,358) are in Chautauqua County. With 1,056 square miles of land in Chautauqua County, 3,358 reported producing wells equates to at least three producing wells per square mile. For the most part, these wells are at separate surface locations. Actual drilled density where the resource has been developed is somewhat greater than that, because not every well drilled is currently producing and some areas are not drilled. The Department issued 5,490 permits to drill in Chautauqua County between 1962 and June 30, 2011, or five permits per square mile. Of those permits, 62% (3,396) were issued during a 10-year period between 1975 and 1984, for an

¹⁴ Cornue, 2011.

average rate of 340 permits per year in a single county. Again, most of these wells were drilled at separate surface locations, each with its own access road and attendant disturbance. Although the number of wells is lower, parts of Seneca and Cayuga County have also been densely drilled. Many areas in all three counties – Chautauqua, Seneca and Cayuga – have been developed with “conventional” gas wells on 40-acre spacing (i.e., 16 wells per square mile, at separate surface locations). Therefore, while recognizing that some aspects of shale development activity will be different from what is described in the 1992 GEIS, it is worthwhile to note that this pre-1992 drilling rate and site density were part of the experience upon which the 1992 GEIS and its findings are based.

Figure 5.1 - Well Pad Schematic



Not to scale (As reported to NYSERDA by ICF International, derived from Argonne National Laboratory: EVS-Trip Report for Field Visit to Fayetteville Shale Gas Wells, plus expert judgment)

Photos 5.8 through 5.11 are photos and aerial views of existing well sites in Chautauqua County, provided for informational purposes. As discussed above, well pads where high-volume hydraulic fracturing will be employed will necessarily be larger in order to accommodate the associated equipment. In areas developed by horizontal drilling, well pads will be less densely spaced, reducing the number of access roads and gathering lines needed.

5.1.4.2 Anticipated Well Pad Density

The number of wells and well sites that may exist per square mile is dictated by gas reservoir geology and productivity, mineral rights distribution, and statutory well spacing requirements set forth in ECL Article 23, Title 5, as amended in 2008. The statute provides three statewide spacing options for shale wells, which are described below. Although the options include vertical drilling and single-well pad horizontal drilling, the Department anticipates that multi-well pad horizontal drilling (which results in the lowest density and least land disturbance) will be the predominant approach, for the following reasons:

- Industry estimates that 90% of the wells drilled to develop the Marcellus Shale will be horizontal wells on multi-well pads;¹⁵
- The addition to the ECL of provisions to address multi-well pad drilling was one of the primary objectives of the 2008 amendments, and was supported by the Department because of the reduced environmental impact;
- Multi-well pad drilling reduces operators' costs, by reducing the number of access roads and gathering lines that must be constructed as well as potentially reducing the number of equipment mobilizations; and
- Multi-well pad drilling reduces the number of regulatory hurdles for operators, because each well pad location would only need to be reviewed once for environmental concerns, stormwater permitting purposes and to determine conformance to SEQRA requirements, including the 1992 GEIS and the Final SGEIS.

¹⁵ ALL Consulting, 2010, p. 7.

Vertical Wells

Statewide spacing for vertical shale wells provides for one well per 40-acre spacing unit.¹⁶ This is the spacing requirement that has historically governed most gas well drilling in the State, and as mentioned above, many square miles of Chautauqua, Seneca and Cayuga counties have been developed on this spacing. One well per 40 acres equates to a density of 16 wells per square mile (i.e., 640 acres). Infill wells, resulting in more than one well per 40 acres, may be drilled upon justification to the Department that they are necessary to efficiently recover gas reserves. Gas well development on 40-acre spacing, with the possibility of infill wells, has been the prevalent gas well development method in New York for many decades. However, as reported by the Ground Water Protection Council,¹⁷ economic and technological considerations favor the use of horizontal drilling for shale gas development. As explained below, horizontal drilling necessarily results in larger spacing units and reduced well pad density. Industry estimates that 10% of the wells drilled to develop shale resources by high-volume hydraulic fracturing will be vertical.¹⁸

¹⁶ A spacing unit is the geographic area assigned to the well for the purposes of sharing costs and production. ECL §23-0501(2) requires that the applicant control the oil and gas rights for 60% of the acreage in a spacing unit for a permit to be issued. Uncontrolled acreage is addressed through the compulsory integration process set forth in ECL §23-0901(3).

¹⁷ GPWC, April 2009, pp. 46-47.

¹⁸ ALL Consulting, 2010, p. 7.



Natural Gas Wells in Chautauqua County

Photo 5.8 This map shows the locations of over 4,400 Medina formation natural gas wells in Chautauqua County from the Mineral Resources database. The wells were typically drilled on 40 to 80 acre well spacing, making the distance between wells at least 1/4 mile.

Readers can re-create this map by using the DEC on-line searchable database using County = Chautauqua and exporting the results to a Google Earth KML file.

Year Permit Issued	Total
Pre-1962 (before permit program)	315
1962-1979	1,440
1980-1989	1,989
1990-1999	233
2000-2009	426
Grand Total	4,403




Photo 5.9 a & b The above map shows a portion of the Chautauqua County map, near Gerry. Well #1 (API Hole number 25468) shown in the photo to the right was drilled and completed for production in 2008 to a total depth of 4,095 feet. Of the other 47 Medina gas wells shown above, the nearest is approximately 1,600 feet to the north.

These Medina wells use single well pads. Marcellus multi-well pads will be larger and will have more wellheads and tanks.






Photo 5.10 a & b This map shows 28 wells in the Town of Poland, Chautauqua County. Well #2 (API Hole number 24422) was drilled in 2006 to a depth of 4,250 feet and completed for production in 2007. The nearest other well is 1,700 feet away.





Photo 5.11 a & b The map above shows 77 wells. Well #3 (API Hole number 16427) identified in the map above, and shown in the photo below, was completed in the Town of Sheridan, Chautauqua County in 1981 and was drilled to a depth of 2,012 feet. The map indicates that the nearest producing well to Well #3 is 1/4 mile away.



Horizontal Wells in Single-Well Spacing Units

Statewide spacing for horizontal wells where only one well will be drilled at the surface site provides for one well per 40 acres plus the necessary and sufficient acreage so that there will be 330 feet between the wellbore in the target formation and the spacing unit boundary. This means that the width of the spacing unit will be at least 660 feet and the distance within the target formation between wellbores will also always be at least 660 feet. Surface locations may be somewhat closer together because of the need to begin building angle in the wellbore about 500 feet above the target formation. However, unless the horizontal length of the wellbores within the target formation is limited to 1,980 feet, the spacing units will exceed 40 acres in size. Although it is possible to drill horizontal wellbores of this length, all information provided to date indicates that, in actual practice, lateral distance drilled will normally exceed 2,000 feet and as an example would most likely be 4,000 feet or more, requiring substantially more than 40 acres. Therefore, the overall density of surface locations would be less than 16 wells per square mile. For example, with 4,000 feet as the length of a horizontal wellbore in the target shale formation, a spacing unit would be 4,660 feet long by 660 feet wide, or about 71 acres in size. Nine, instead of 16, spacing units would fit within a square mile, necessitating nine instead of 16 access roads and nine instead of 16 gas gathering lines. Longer laterals would further reduce the number of well pads per square mile. The Department anticipates that the vast majority of horizontal wells will be drilled from common pads (i.e., multi-well pads), reducing surface disturbance even more.

Horizontal Wells with Multiple Wells Drilled from Common Pads

The third statewide spacing option for shale wells provides, initially, for spacing units of up to 640 acres with all the horizontal wells in the unit drilled from a common well pad. Industry estimates that 90% of the wells drilled to develop shale resources by high-volume hydraulic fracturing will be horizontal;¹⁹ as stated above, the Department anticipates that the vast majority of them will be drilled from multi-well pads. This method provides the most flexibility to avoid environmentally sensitive locations within the acreage to be developed and significantly reduces the number of needed well pads and associated roads.

¹⁹ ALL Consulting, 2010, p. 7.

With respect to overall land disturbance, the larger surface area of an individual multi-well pad will be more than offset by the fewer total number of well pads within a given area and the need for only a single access road and gas gathering system to service multiple wells on a single pad. Overall, there clearly is a smaller total area of land disturbance associated with horizontal wells for shale gas development than that for vertical wells.²⁰ For example, a spacing of 40 acres per well for vertical shale gas wells would result in, on average, of 70 – 80 acres of disturbance for the well pads, access roads and utility corridors (4.8 acres per well²¹) to develop an area of 640 acres. By contrast, a single well pad with 6 to 8 horizontal shale gas wells could access all 640 acres with an average of 7.4 acres of total land disturbance. Table 5.1 below provides another comparison between the well pad acreage disturbed within a 10-square mile area completely developed by multi-well pad horizontal drilling versus single-well pad vertical drilling.²²

Table 5.1 - Ten square mile area (i.e., 6,400 acres), completely drilled with horizontal wells in multi-well units or vertical wells in single-well units (Updated July 2011)

Spacing Option	Multi-Well 640 Acre	Single-Well 40 Acre
Number of Pads	10	160
Total Disturbance - Drilling Phase	74 Acres (7.4 acres per pad)	768 Acres (4.8 ac. per pad)
% Disturbance - Drilling Phase	1.2%	12%
Total Disturbance - Production Phase	15 Acres (1.5 ac. per pad)	80 Acres (0.5 ac. per pad)
% Disturbance - Production Phase	0.23%	1.25%

It is possible that a single well-pad could be positioned to site wells to reach adjacent units, thereby developing 1,280 acres or more without increasing the land disturbance described above for multi-well pads. Use of longer lateral wellbores is another potential method for developing larger areas with less land disturbance.²³

²⁰ Alpha, 2009, p. 6-2.

²¹ ALL Consulting, 2010, p. 14.

²² NTC, 2009, p. 29, updated with information from ALL Consulting, 2010.

²³ ALL Consulting, 2010, p. 87.

Variances or Non-Conforming Spacing Units

The ECL has always provided for variances from statewide spacing or non-conforming spacing units, with justification, which could result in a greater well density for any of the above options. A variance from statewide spacing or a non-conforming spacing unit requires the Department to issue a well-specific spacing order following public comment and, if necessary, an adjudicatory hearing. Environmental impacts associated with any well to be drilled under a particular spacing order will continue to be reviewed separately from the spacing variance upon receipt of a specific well permit application.

5.2 Horizontal Drilling

The first horizontal well in New York was drilled in 1989, and in 2008 approximately 10% of the well permit applications received by the Department were for directional or horizontal wells. The predominant use of horizontal drilling associated with natural gas development in New York has been for production from the Black River and Herkimer Formations during the past several years. The combination of horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing is widely used in other areas of the United States as a means of recovering gas from tight shale formations.

Except for the use of specialized downhole tools, horizontal drilling is performed using similar equipment and technology as vertical drilling, with the same protocols in place for aquifer protection, fluid containment and waste handling. As described below, there are four primary differences between horizontal drilling for shale gas development and the drilling described in the 1992 GEIS. One is that larger rigs may be used for all or part of the drilling, with longer per-well drilling times than were described in the 1992 GEIS. The second is that multiple wells are likely to be drilled from each well site (or well pad). The third is that drilling mud rather than air may be used while drilling the horizontal portion of the wellbore to lubricate and cool the drill bit and to clean the wellbore. Fourth and finally, the volume of rock cuttings returned to the surface from the target formation will be greater for a horizontal well than for a vertical well.

Vertical drilling depth will vary based on target formation and location within the state. Chapter 5 of the 1992 GEIS discusses New York State's geology with respect to oil and gas production. Chapter 4 of this SGEIS expands upon that discussion, with emphasis on the Marcellus and Utica Shales. Chapter 4 includes maps which show depths and thicknesses related to these two shales.

In general, wells will be drilled vertically to a depth of about 500 feet above the top of a target interval, such as the Union Springs Member of the Marcellus Shale. Drilling may continue with the same rig, or a larger drill rig may be brought onto the location to build angle and drill the horizontal portion of the wellbore. A downhole motor behind the drill bit at the end of the drill pipe is used to accomplish the angled or directional drilling deep within the earth. The drill pipe is also equipped with inclination and azimuth sensors located about 60 feet behind the drill bit to continuously record and report the drill bit's location.

Current drilling technology for onshore consolidated strata results in maximum lateral lengths that do not greatly exceed the depth of the well. For example, a 5,000-foot deep well would generally not have a lateral length of significantly greater than 5,000 feet.²⁴ This may change, however, as drilling technology continues to evolve. The length of the horizontal wellbore can also be affected by the operator's lease position or compulsory integration status within the spacing unit, the configuration of the approved spacing unit and wellbore paths, and other factors which influence well design.

5.2.1 Drilling Rigs

Wells for shale gas development using high-volume hydraulic fracturing will be drilled with rotary rigs. Rotary rigs are described in the 1992 GEIS, with the typical rotary rigs used in New York at the time characterized as either 40 to 45-foot high "singles" or 70 to 80-foot high "doubles." These rigs can, respectively, hold upright one joint of drill pipe or two connected joints. "Triples," which hold three connected joints of drill pipe upright and are over 100 feet high, were not commonly used in New York State when the 1992 GEIS was prepared. However, triples have been more common in New York since 1992 for natural gas storage field drilling and to drill some Trenton-Black River wells, and may be used for drilling wells in the Marcellus Shale and other low-permeability reservoirs.

Operators may use one large rig to drill an entire wellbore from the surface to toe of the horizontal bore, or may use two or three different rigs in sequence. For each well, only one rig is over the hole at a time. At a multi-well site, two rigs may be present on the pad at once, but more than two are unlikely because of logistical and space considerations as described below.

²⁴ ALL Consulting, 2010, pp. 87-88.

When two rigs are used (in sequence) to drill a well, a smaller rig of similar dimensions to the typical rotary rigs described in the 1992 GEIS would first drill the vertical portion of the well. Only the rig used to drill the horizontal portion of the well is likely to be significantly larger than what is described in the 1992 GEIS. This rig may be a triple, with a substructure height of about 20 feet, a mast height of about 150 feet, and a surface footprint with its auxiliary equipment of about 14,000 square feet. Auxiliary equipment includes various tanks (for water, fuel and drilling mud), generators, compressors, solids control equipment (shale shaker, de-silter, de-sander), choke manifold, accumulator, pipe racks and the crew's office space (dog house). Initial work with the smaller rig would typically take up to two weeks, followed by another up to two weeks of work with the larger rig. These estimates include time for casing and cementing the well, and may be extended if drilling is slower than anticipated because of properties of the rock, or if other problems or unexpected delays occur.

When three rigs are used to drill a well, the first rig is used to drill, case, and cement the surface hole. This event generally takes about 8 to 12 hours. The dimensions of this rig would be consistent with what is described in the 1992 GEIS. The second rig for drilling the remainder of the vertical hole would also be consistent with 1992 GEIS descriptions and would again typically be working for up to 14 days, or longer if drilling is slow or problems occur. The third rig, equipped to drill horizontally, would, as noted above, be the only one that might exceed 1992 GEIS dimensions, with a substructure height of about 20 feet, a mast height of about 150 feet, and a surface footprint with its auxiliary equipment of about 14,000 square feet. Work with this rig would take up to 14 days, or longer if drilling is slow or other problems or delays occur.

An important component of the drilling rig is the blow-out prevention (BOP) system. This system is discussed in the 1992 GEIS. In summary, BOP system on a rotary drilling rig is a pressure control system designed specifically to contain and control a "kick" (i.e., unexpected pressure resulting in the flow of formation fluids into the wellbore during drilling operations). Other than the well itself, the BOP system basically consists of four parts: 1) the blow-out preventer stack, 2) the accumulator unit, 3) the choke manifold, and 4) the kill line. Blow-out preventers are manually or hydraulically operated devices installed at the top of the surface casing. Within the blow-out preventer there may be a combination of different types of devices to seal off the well. Pipe rams contain two metal blocks with semi-circular notches that fit

together around the outside of the drill pipe when it is in the hole to block movement of fluids around the pipe. Blind rams contain two rubber faced metal blocks that can completely seal off the hole when there is no drill pipe in it. Annular or "bag" type blowout preventers contain a resilient packing element which expands inward to seal off the hole with or without drill pipe. In accordance with 6 NYCRR §554.4, the BOP system must be maintained and in proper working order during operations. A BOP test program is employed to ensure the BOP system is functioning properly if and when needed.

Appendix 7 includes sample rig specifications provided by Chesapeake Energy. As noted on the specs, fuel storage tanks associated with the larger rigs would hold volumes of 10,000 to 12,000 gallons.

In summary, the rig work for a single horizontal well – including drilling, casing and cementing – would generally last about four to five weeks, subject to extension for slow drilling or other unexpected problems or delays. A 150-foot tall, large-footprint rotary rig may be used for the entire duration or only for the actual horizontal drilling. In the latter case, smaller, 1992 GEIS-consistent rigs would be used to drill the vertical portion of the wellbore. The rig and its associated auxiliary equipment would typically move off the well before fracturing operations commence.

Photos 5.12 – 5.15 are photographs of drilling rigs.



Photo 5.12 Double. Union Drilling Rig 54, Olsen 1B, Town of Fenton, Broome County NY. Credit: NYS DEC 2005.



Photo 5.13 Double. Union Drilling Rig 48. Trenton-Black River well, Salo 1, Town of Barton, Tioga County NY. Source: NYS DEC 2008.



Photo 5.14 Triple. Precision Drilling Rig 26. Ruger 1 well, Horseheads, Chemung County. Credit: NYS DEC 2009.



Photo 5.15 Top Drive Single. Barber and DeLine rig, Sheckells 1, Town of Cherry Valley, Otsego County. Credit: NYS DEC 2007.

5.2.2 Multi-Well Pad Development

Horizontal drilling from multi-well pads is the common development method employed to develop Marcellus Shale reserves in the northern tier of Pennsylvania and is expected to be common in New York as well. In New York, ECL 23 requires that all horizontal wells in a multi-well shale unit be drilled within three years of the date the first well in the unit commences drilling, to prevent operators from holding acreage within large spacing units without fully developing the acreage.²⁵

As described above, the space required for hydraulic fracturing operations for a multi-well pad is dictated by a number of factors but is expected to most commonly be about 3.5 acres.²⁶ The well pad is often centered in the spacing unit.

Several factors determine the optimal drilling pattern within the target formation. These include geologic controls such as formation depth and thickness, mechanical and physical factors associated with the well construction program, production experience in the area, lease position and topography or surface restrictions that affect the size or placement of pads.²⁷ Often, evenly spaced parallel horizontal bores are drilled in opposite directions from surface locations arranged in two parallel rows. When fully developed, the resultant horizontal well pattern underground could resemble two back-to-back pitchforks [Figure 5.2]. Other, more complex patterns may also be proposed.

²⁵ ECL §23-0501.

²⁶ Cornue, 2011.

²⁷ ALL Consulting, 2010, p. 88.




Figure 5.2 - Possible well spacing unit configurations and wellbore paths

Because of the close well spacing at the surface, most operators have indicated that only one drilling rig at a time would be operating on any given well pad. One operator has stated that on a well pad where six or more wells are needed, it is possible that two triple-style rigs may operate concurrently. Efficiency and the economics of mobilizing equipment and crews would dictate that all wells on a pad be drilled sequentially, during a single mobilization. However, this may be affected by the timing of compulsory integration proceedings if wellbores are proposed to intersect unleased acreage.²⁸ Other considerations may result in gaps between well drilling episodes at a well pad. For instance, early development in a given area may consist of initially drilling and stimulating one to three wells on a pad to test productivity, followed by additional wells later, but within the required 3-year time frame. As development in a given area matures and the results become more predictable, the frequency of drilling and completing all the wells on each pad with continuous activity in a single mobilization would be expected to increase.

²⁸ ECL §23-0501 2.b. prohibits the wellbore from crossing unleased acreage prior to issuance of a compulsory integration order.

5.2.3 *Drilling Mud*

The vertical portion of each well, including the portion that is drilled through any fresh water aquifers, will typically be drilled using either compressed air or freshwater mud as the drilling fluid. Operators who provided responses to the Department's information requests stated that the horizontal portion, drilled after any fresh water aquifers have been sealed behind cemented surface casing, and typically cemented intermediate casing, may be drilled with a mud that may be (i) water-based, (ii) potassium chloride/polymer-based with a mineral oil lubricant, or (iii) synthetic oil-based. Synthetic oil-based muds are described as "food-grade" or "environmentally friendly." When drilling horizontally, mud is needed for (1) powering and cooling the downhole motor and bit used for directional drilling, (2) using navigational tools which require mud to transmit sensor readings, (3) providing stability to the horizontal borehole while drilling and (4) efficiently removing cuttings from the horizontal hole. Other operators may drill the horizontal bore "on air," (i.e., with compressed air) using special equipment to control fluids and gases that enter the wellbore. Historically, most wells in New York are drilled on air and air drilling is addressed by the 1992 GEIS.

Drilling mud is contained and managed on-site through the rig's mud system which is comprised of a series of piping, separation equipment, and tanks. Photo 5.16 depicts some typical mud-system components. During drilling or circulating mud is pumped from the mud holding tanks at the surface down hole through the drill string and out the drill bit, and returns to the surface through the annular space between the drill string and the walls of the bore hole, where it enters the flowline and is directed to the separation equipment. Typical separation equipment includes shale shakers, desanders, desilters and centrifuges which separate the mud from the rock cuttings. The mud is then re-circulated back into the mud tanks where it is withdrawn by the mud pump for continued use in the well. As described in the 1992 GEIS, used drilling mud is typically reconditioned for use at a subsequent well. The subsequent well may be located on the same well pad or at another location.



Photo 5.16 - Drilling rig mud system (blue tanks)

5.2.4 *Cuttings*

The rock chips and very fine-grained rock fragments removed by the drilling process and returned to the surface in the drilling fluid are known as “cuttings” and are contained and managed either in a lined on-site reserve pit or in a closed-loop tank system.²⁹ As described in Section 5.13.1, the proper disposal method for cuttings is determined by the composition of the fluid or fluids used during drilling. The proper disposal method will also dictate how the cuttings must be contained on-site prior to disposal, as described by Section 7.1.9.

5.2.4.1 *Cuttings Volume*

Horizontal drilling penetrates a greater linear distance of rock and therefore produces a larger volume of drill cuttings than does a well drilled vertically to the same depth below the ground

²⁹ Adapted from Alpha, 2009, p. 133.

surface. For example, a vertical well with surface, intermediate and production casing drilled to a total depth of 7,000 feet produces approximately 154 cubic yards of cuttings, while a horizontally drilled well with the same casing program to the same target depth with an example 4,000-foot lateral section produces a total volume of approximately 217 cubic yards of cuttings (i.e., about 40% more). A multi-well site would produce approximately that volume of cuttings from each well.

5.2.4.2 NORM in Marcellus Cuttings

To determine NORM concentrations and the potential for exposure to NORM contamination in Marcellus rock cuttings and cores (i.e., continuous rock samples, typically cylindrical, recovered during specialized drilling operations), the Department conducted field and sample surveys using portable Geiger counter and gamma ray spectroscopy methods. Gamma ray spectroscopy analyses were performed on composited Marcellus samples collected from two vertical wells drilled through the Marcellus, one in Lebanon (Madison County), and one in Bath (Steuben County). The results of these analyses are presented in Table 5.2a. Department staff also used a Geiger counter to screen three types of Marcellus samples: cores from the New York State Museum's collection in Albany; regional outcrops of the unit; and various Marcellus well sites from the west-central part of the state, where most of the vertical Marcellus wells in NYS are currently located. These screening data are presented in Table 5.2b. Additional radiological analytical data for Marcellus Shale drill cuttings has been reported from Marcellus wells in Pennsylvania. Samples were collected from loads of drill cuttings being transported for disposal, as well as directly from the drilling rigs during drilling of the horizontal legs of the wells. The materials sampled were screened in-situ with a micro R meter, and analyzed by gamma ray spectroscopy. These data are provided in Table 5.3. As discussed further in Chapter 6, the results, which indicate levels of radioactivity that are essentially equal to background values, do not indicate an exposure concern for workers or the general public associated with Marcellus cuttings.

Table 5.2 - 2009 Marcellus Radiological Data

Well (Depth)	API #	Date Collected	Town (County)	Parameter	Result +/- Uncertainty
Crouch C 4H (1040 feet - 1115 feet)	31-053-26305-00-00	3/17/09	Lebanon (Madison)	K-40	14.438 +/- 1.727 pCi/g
				Tl-208	0.197 +/- 0.069 pCi/g
				Pb-210	2.358 +/- 1.062 pCi/g
				Bi-212	0.853 +/- 0.114 pCi/g
				Bi-214	1.743 +/- 0.208 pCi/g
				Pb-214	1.879 +/- 0.170 pCi/g
				Ra-226	1.843 +/- 0.573 pCi/g
				Ac-228	0.850 +/- 0.169 pCi/g
				Th-234	1.021 +/- 0.412 pCi/g
				U-235	0.185 +/- 0.083 pCi/g
Blair 2A (2550' - 2610')	31-101-02698-01-00	3/26/09	Bath (Steuben)	K-40	22.845 +/- 2.248 pCi/g
				Tl-208	0.381 +/- 0.065 pCi/g
				Pb-210	0.535 +/- 0.712 pCi/g
				Bi-212	1.174 +/- 0.130 pCi/g
				Bi-214	0.779 +/- 0.120 pCi/g
				Pb-214	0.868 +/- 0.114 pCi/g
				Ra-226	0.872 +/- 0.330 pCi/g
				Ac-228	1.087 +/- 0.161 pCi/g
				Th-234	0.567 +/- 0.316 pCi/g
				U-235	0.079 +/- 0.058 pCi/g

Media Screened	Well	Date	Location (County)	Results
Cores	Beaver Meadow 1	3/12/09	NYS Museum (Albany)	0.005 - 0.080 mR/hr
	Oxford 1	3/12/09	NYS Museum (Albany)	0.005 - 0.065 mR/hr
	75 NY-14	3/12/09	NYS Museum (Albany)	0.015 - 0.065 mR/hr
	EGSP #4	3/12/09	NYS Museum (Albany)	0.005 - 0.045 mR/hr
	Jim Tiede	3/12/09	NYS Museum (Albany)	0.005 - 0.025 mR/hr
	75 NY-18	3/12/09	NYS Museum (Albany)	0.005 - 0.045 mR/hr
	75 NY-12	3/12/09	NYS Museum (Albany)	0.015 - 0.045 mR/hr
	75 NY-21	3/12/09	NYS Museum (Albany)	0.005 - 0.040 mR/hr
	75 NY-15	3/12/09	NYS Museum (Albany)	0.005 - 0.045 mR/hr
	Matejka	3/12/09	NYS Museum (Albany)	0.005 - 0.090 mR/hr
Outcrops	N/A	3/24/2009	Onesquethaw Creek (Albany)	0.02 - 0.04 mR/hr
	N/A	3/24/2009	DOT Garage, CR 2 (Albany)	0.01 - 0.04 mR/hr
	N/A	3/24/2009	SR 20, near SR 166 (Otsego)	0.01 - 0.04 mR/hr
	N/A	3/24/2009	Richfield Springs (Otsego)	0.01 - 0.06 mR/hr
	N/A	3/24/2009	SR 20 (Otsego)	0.01 - 0.03 mR/hr
	N/A	3/24/2009	Gulf Rd (Herkimer)	0.01 - 0.04 mR/hr
Well Sites	Beagell 2B	4/7/2009	Kirkwood (Broome)	0.04 mR/hr *
	Hulsebosch 1	4/2/2009	Elmira City (Chemung)	0.03 mR/hr *
	Bush S1	4/2/2009	Elmira (Chemung)	0.03 mR/hr *

	Parker 1	4/7/2009	Oxford (Chenango)	0.05 mR/hr *
Well Sites	Donovan Farms 2	3/30/2009	West Sparta (Livingston)	0.03 mR/hr *
	Fee 1	3/30/2009	Sparta (Livingston)	0.02 mR/hr *
	Meter 1	3/30/2009	West Sparta (Livingston)	0.03 mR/hr *
	Schiavone 2	4/6/2009	Reading (Schuyler)	0.05 mR/hr *
	WGI 10	4/6/2009	Dix (Schuyler)	0.07 mR/hr *
	WGI 11	4/6/2009	Dix (Schuyler)	0.07 mR/hr *
	Calabro T1	3/26/2009	Orange (Schuyler)	0.03 mR/hr *
	Calabro T2	3/26/2009	Orange (Schuyler)	0.05 mR/hr *
	Frost 2A	3/26/2009	Orange (Schuyler)	0.05 mR/hr *
	Webster T1	3/26/2009	Orange (Schuyler)	0.05 mR/hr *
	Haines 1	4/1/2009	Avoca (Steuben)	0.03 mR/hr *
	Haines 2	4/1/2009	Avoca (Steuben)	0.03 mR/hr *
	McDaniels 1A	4/1/2009	Urbana (Steuben)	0.03 mR/hr *
	Drumm G2	4/1/2009	Bradford (Steuben)	0.07 mR/hr *
	Hemley G2	3/26/2009	Hornby (Steuben)	0.03 mR/hr *
	Lancaster M1	3/26/2009	Hornby (Steuben)	0.03 mR/hr *
	Maxwell 1C	4/2/2009	Caton (Steuben)	0.07 mR/hr *
	Scudder 1	3/26/2009	Bath (Steuben)	0.03 mR/hr *
	Blair 2A	3/26/2009	Bath (Steuben)	0.03 mR/hr *
	Retherford 1	4/1/2009	Troupsburg (Steuben)	0.05 mR/hr *
	Carpenter 1	4/1/2009	Troupsburg (Steuben)	0.05 mR/hr *
	Cook 1	4/1/2009	Troupsburg (Steuben)	0.05 mR/hr *
	Zinck 1	4/1/2009	Woodhull (Steuben)	0.07 mR/hr *
	Tiffany 1	4/7/2009	Owego (Tioga)	0.03 mR/hr *

*maximum values detected

Table 5.3 - Gamma Ray Spectroscopy

LAB ID#	Sample#	Date Collected	Sample Location	Material Type	Depth (feet)	Gamma* (uR/hr)	Radionuclide Concentration (per wet mass)							
							Radium-226 (pCi/g)		Thorium-232 (pCi/g)		Potassium-40 (pCi/g)			
Gas Drill Rig Cuttings														
738-1	31110A	3/11/2010	Bradford Co., Pa.	Marcellus shale	5942	8 / 10	2.4	± 0.2	0.5	± 0.1	12.9	± 1.0		
738-2	31110B	3/11/2010	Bradford Co., Pa.	Hamilton Limestone	6562	5 / 5**	1.1	± 0.1	0.9	± 0.1	17.8	± 1.0		
738-3	31110C	3/11/2010	Bradford Co., Pa.	Marcellus shale	6687	11 / 8	4.3	± 0.2	0.9	± 0.1	15.8	± 0.9		
738-5	31910A	3/19/2010	Tioga County, Pa.	Marcellus shale	6101	5 / 10	2.8	± 0.2	0.9	± 0.1	17.4	± 1.0		
738-6	31910B	3/19/2010	Tioga County, Pa.	Marc. shale with Bayrite	6101	5 / 10	0.6	± 0.1	0.2	± 0.0	3.4	± 0.2		
738-13	1-M1	3/2/2010	Landfill, Lowman, NY	transported gas rig cuttings	unk.	12	2.3	± 0.1	0.7	± 0.1	17.2	± 1.1		
738-11	2-M2	3/2/2010	Landfill, Painted Post, NY	transported gas rig cuttings	unk.	12	0.9	± 0.1	1.2	± 0.1	16.7	± 1.1		
738-12	3-M1	3/2/2010	Landfill, Angelica, NY	transported gas rig cuttings	unk.	12	2.7	± 0.2	0.8	± 0.1	12.6	± 0.8		
AVERAGE							2.1	± 1.2	0.7	± 0.3	14.2	± 4.8		

5.2.5 Management of Drilling Fluids and Cuttings

The 1992 GEIS discusses the use of reserve pits and tanks, either alone or in conjunction with one another, to contain the cuttings and fluids associated with the drilling process. Both systems result in complete capture of the fluids and cuttings; however the use of tanks in closed-loop tank systems facilitates off-site disposal of wastes while more efficiently utilizing drilling fluid and providing additional insurance against environmental releases.

5.2.5.1 Reserve Pits on Multi-Well Pads

The 1992 GEIS describes the construction, use and reclamation of lined reserve pits, (also called “drilling pits” or “mud pits”) to contain cuttings and fluids associated with the drilling process.

Rather than using a separate pit for each well on a multi-well pad, operators may propose to maintain a single pit on the well pad until all wells are drilled and completed. The pit would need to be adequately sized to hold cuttings from all the wells, unless the cuttings are removed intermittently as needed to ensure adequate room for drilling-associated fluids and precipitation. Under existing regulations, fluid associated with each well would have to be removed within 45 days of the cessation of drilling operations, unless the operator has submitted a plan to use the fluids in subsequent operations and the Department has inspected and approved the pit.³⁰

Chapter 7 discusses restrictions related to the use of reserve pits for managing drilling fluids and cuttings for high-volume hydraulic fracturing.

5.2.5.2 Closed-Loop Tank Systems

The design and configuration of closed-loop tank systems will vary from operator to operator, but all such systems contain drilling fluids and cuttings in a series of containers, thereby eliminating the need for a reserve pit. The containers may include tanks or bins that may have closed tops, open tops or open tops in combination with open sides. They may be stationary or truck-, trailer-, or skid-mounted. Regardless of the specific design of the containers, the objective is to fully contain the cuttings and fluids in such a manner as to prevent direct contact with the ground surface or the need to construct a lined reserve pit.

Depending on the drilling fluid utilized, a variety of types of separation equipment may be employed within a closed-loop tank system to separate the liquids from the cuttings prior to

³⁰ 6 NYCRR §554.1(c)(3).

capture within the system's containers. For air drilling employing a closed-loop tank system, shale shakers or other gravity-based equipment would likely be utilized to separate any formation fluids from the cuttings whereas mud drilling would employ equipment which is virtually identical to that of the drilling mud systems described previously in Section 5.2.3.

In addition to the equipment typically employed in a drilling mud system, operators may elect to utilize additional solids control equipment within the closed-loop system when drilling on mud, in an effort to further separate liquids from the cuttings. Such equipment could include but is not limited to drying shakers, vertical or horizontal rotary cuttings dryers, squeeze presses, or centrifuges³¹ and when oil-based drilling muds are utilized the separation process may also include treatment to reduce surface tension between the mud and the cuttings.^{32,33} The additional separation results in greater recovery of the drilling mud for re-circulation and produces dryer cuttings for off-site disposal.

Depending on the moisture-content of the cuttings, operators may drain or vacuum free-liquids from the cuttings container, or they may mix absorbent agents such as lime, saw dust or wood chips into the cuttings in order to absorb any free-liquids prior to hauling off-site for disposal. This mixing may take place in the primary capture container where the cuttings are initially collected following separation or in a secondary container located on the well pad.

Operators may simply employ primary capture containers which are suitable for capturing and transporting cuttings from the well site, or they may transfer cuttings from the primary capture container to a secondary capture container for transport purposes. If cuttings will be transferred between containers, front end loaders, vacuum trucks or other equipment would be utilized and all transfers will be required to occur in a designated transfer area on the well pad, which will be required to be lined.

³¹ ANL, 2011(a).

³² The American Oil & Gas Reporter, August 2010, p. 92-93.

³³ Dugan, April 2008.

Depending on the configuration and design of a closed-loop tank system use of such a system can offer the following advantages:

- Eliminates the time and expense associated with reserve pit construction and reclamation;
- Reduces the surface disturbance associated with the well pad;
- Reduces the amount of water and mud additives required as a result of re-circulation of drilling mud;
- Lowers mud replacement costs by capturing and re-circulating drilling mud;
- Reduces the wastes associated with drilling by separating additional drilling mud from the cuttings; and
- Reduces expenses and truck traffic associated with transporting drilling waste due to the reduced volume of the waste.

5.3 Hydraulic Fracturing

The 1992 GEIS discusses, in Chapter 9, hydraulic fracturing operations using water-based gel and foam, and describes the use of water, hydrochloric acid and additives including surfactants, bactericides,³⁴ clay and iron inhibitors and nitrogen. The fracturing fluid is an engineered product; service providers vary the design of the fluid based on the characteristics of the reservoir formation and the well operator's objectives. In the late 1990s, operators and service companies in other states developed a technology known as "slickwater fracturing" to develop shale formations, primarily by increasing the amount and proportion of water used, reducing the use of gelling agents and adding friction reducers. Any fracturing fluid may also contain scale and corrosion inhibitors.

ICF International, which reviewed the current state of practice of hydraulic fracturing under contract with NYSERDA, states that the development of water fracturing technologies has reduced the quantity of chemicals required to hydraulically fracture target reservoirs and that

³⁴ Bactericides must be registered for use in New York in accordance with ECL §33-0701. Well operators, service companies, and chemical supply companies were reminded of this requirement in an October 28, 2008 letter from the Division of Mineral Resources formulated in consultation with the former Division of Solid and Hazardous Materials, now Materials Management. This correspondence also reminded industry of the corresponding requirement that all bactericides be properly labeled and that the labels for such products be kept on-site during application and storage.

slickwater treatments have yielded better results than gel treatments in the Barnett Shale.³⁵ Poor proppant suspension and transport characteristics of water versus gel are overcome by the low permeability of shale formations which allow the use of finer-grained proppants and lower proppant concentrations.³⁶ The use of friction reducers in slickwater fracturing procedures reduce the required pumping pressure at the surface, thereby reducing the number and power of pumping trucks needed.³⁷ In addition, according to ICF, slickwater fracturing causes less formation damage than other techniques such as gel fracturing.³⁸

Both slickwater fracturing and foam fracturing have been proposed for Marcellus Shale development. As foam fracturing is already addressed by the 1992 GEIS, this document focuses on slickwater fracturing. This type of hydraulic fracturing is referred to herein as “high-volume hydraulic fracturing” because of the large water volumes required.

5.4 Fracturing Fluid

The fluid used for slickwater fracturing is typically comprised of more than 98% fresh water and sand, with chemical additives comprising 2% or less of the fluid.³⁹ The Department has collected compositional information on many of the additives proposed for use in fracturing shale formations in New York directly from chemical suppliers and service companies. This information has been evaluated by the Department’s Division of Air Resources (DAR) and DOW as well as the NYSDOH’s Bureaus of Water Supply Protection and Toxic Substances Assessment. It has also been reviewed by technical consultants contracted by NYSERDA⁴⁰ to conduct research related to the preparation of this document. Discussion of potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures in Chapters 6 and 7 of this SGEIS reflect analysis and input by all of the foregoing entities.

³⁵ ICF Task 1, 2009. pp. 10, 19.

³⁶ ICF Task 1, 2009. pp. 10, 19.

³⁷ ICF Task 1, 2009. P. 12.

³⁸ ICF Task 1, 2009. P. 19.

³⁹ GWPC, April 2009, pp. 61-62.

⁴⁰ Alpha Environmental Consultants, Inc., ICF International, URS Corporation.

Six service companies⁴¹ and 15 chemical suppliers⁴² have provided additive product compositional information to the Department in the form of product Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDSs)⁴³ and product composition disclosures consisting of chemical constituent names and their associated Chemical Abstract Service (CAS) Numbers,⁴⁴ as well as chemical constituent percent by weight information. Altogether, some compositional information is on file with the Department for 235 products, with complete⁴⁵ product composition disclosures and MSDSs on file for 167 of those products. Within these products are 322 unique chemicals whose CAS Numbers have been disclosed to the Department and at least 21 additional compounds whose CAS Numbers have not been disclosed due to the fact that many are mixtures. Table 5.4 is an alphabetical list of all products for which complete chemical information, including complete product composition disclosures and MSDSs, has been provided to the Department. Table 5.5 is an alphabetical list of products for which only partial chemical composition information has been provided to the Department, either in the form of product MSDSs or product composition disclosures which appear to be lacking information. Any product whose name does not appear within Table 5.4 or Table 5.5 was not evaluated in this SGEIS either because no chemical information was submitted to the Department or because the product has not been proposed for use in high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations in New York to date. These tables are included for informational purposes only and are not intended to restrict the proposal of additional additive products. See Chapter 8, Section 8.2.1.2 for a description of the permitting requirements related to fracturing additive information.

⁴¹ BJ Services, Frac Tech Services, Halliburton, Superior Well Services, Universal Well Services, Schlumberger.

⁴² Baker Petrolite, CESI/Floteck, Champion Technologies/Special Products, Chem EOR, Cortec, Fleurin Fragrances, Industrial Compounding, Kemira, Nalco, PFP Technologies, SNF Inc., Stepan Company, TBC-Brinadd/Texas United Chemical, Weatherford/Clearwater, and WSP Chemicals & Technology.

⁴³ MSDSs are regulated by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA)'s Hazard Communication Standard, 29 CFR 1910.1200(g) and are described in Chapter 8.

⁴⁴ Chemical Abstracts Service (CAS) is a division of the American Chemical Society. CAS assigns unique numerical identifiers to every chemical described in the literature. The intention is to make database searches more convenient, as chemicals often have many names.

⁴⁵ The Department defines a complete product composition disclosure to include the chemical names and associated CAS Numbers of every constituent within a product, as well as the percent by weight information associated with each constituent of a product.

Table 5.4 - Fracturing Additive Products – Complete Composition
Disclosure Made to the Department (Updated July 2011)

Product Name
ABF
Acetic Acid 0.1-10%
Acid Pensurf / Pensurf
Activator W
AGA 150 / Super Acid Gell 150
AI-2
Aldacide G
Alpha 125
Ammonium Persulfate/OB Breaker
APB-1, Ammonium Persulfate Breaker
AQF-2
ASP-820
B315 / Friction Reducer B315
B317 / Scale Inhibitor B317
B859 / EZEFL0 Surfactant B859 / EZEFL0 F103 Surfactant
B867 / Breaker B867 / Breaker J218
B868 / EB-CLEAN B868 LT Encapsulated Breaker / EB-Clean J479 LT Encapsulated Breaker
B875 / Borate Crosslinker B875 / Borate Crosslinker J532
B880 / EB-CLEAN B880 Breaker / EB-CLEAN J475 Breaker
B890 / EZEFL0 Surfactant B890 / EZEFL0 F100 Surfactant
B900 / EZEFL0 Surfactant B900/ EZEFL0 F108 Surfactant
B910 / Corrosion Inhibitor B910 / Corrosion Inhibitor A264
B916 / Gelling Agent ClearFRAC XT B916 / Gelling Agent ClearFRAC XT J590
BA-2
BA-20
BA-40L
BA-40LM
BC-140
BC-140 X2
BE-3S
BE-6
BE-7

Product Name
BE-9
BF-1
BF-7 / BF-7L
BioClear 1000 / Unicide 1000
Bio-Clear 200 / Unicide 2000
Breaker FR
BXL-2, Crosslinker/ Buffer
BXL-STD / XL-300MB
Carbon Dioxide
CC-302T
CI-14
CL-31
CLA-CHEK LP
Claproteck CF
CLA-STA XP
Clay Treat PP
Clay Treat TS
Clay Treat-3C
Clayfix II
Clayfix II plus
CPF-X Plus
Cronox 245 ES
CS-250 SI
CS-650 OS, Oxygen Scavenger
CS-Polybreak 210
CS-Polybreak 210 Winterized
CT-ARMOR
EB-4L
Enzyme G-NE
FAC-1W / Petrostep FAC-1W
FAC-3W / Petrostop FAC-3W
FE-1A
FE-2
FE-2A
FE-5A
Ferchek
Ferchek A
Ferrotrol 300L
Flomax 50
Flomax 70 / VX9173

Product Name
FLOPAM DR-6000 / DR-6000
FLOPAM DR-7000 / DR-7000
Formic Acid
FR-46
FR-48W
FR-56
FRP-121
FRW-14
GasPerm 1000
GBL-8X / LEB-10X / GB-L / En-breaker
GBW-30 Breaker
Green-Cide 25G / B244 / B244A
H015 / Hydrochloric Acid 15% H15
HAI-OS Acid Inhibitor
HC-2
High Perm SW-LB
HPH Breaker
HPH foamer
Hydrochloric Acid
Hydrochloric Acid (HCl)
Hydrochloric Acid 10.1-15%
HYG-3
IC 100L
ICA-720 / IC-250
ICA-8 / IC-200
ICI-3240
Inflo-250
InFlo-250W / InFlo-250 Winterized
Iron Check / Iron Chek
Iron Sta IIC / Iron Sta II
Isopropyl Alcohol
J313 / Water Friction-Reducing Agent J313
J534 / Urea Ammonium Nitrate Solution J534
J580 / Water Gelling-Agent J580
K-34
K-35
KCI
L058 / Iron Stabilizer L58
L064 / Temporary Clay Stabilizer L64
LGC-35 CBM

Product Name
LGC-36 UC
LGC-VI UC
Losurf 300M
M003 / Soda Ash M3
MA-844W
Methanol
MO-67
Morflo III
MSA-II
Muriatic Acid 36%
Musol A
N002 / Nitrogen N ₂
NCL-100
Nitrogen
Nitrogen, Liquid N ₂
OptiKleen-WF
Para Clear D290 / ParaClean II
Paragon 100 E+
Parasperse
Parasperse Cleaner
PSI-720
PSI-7208
Salt
SAS-2
Scalechek LP-55
Scalechek LP-65
Scalechek SCP-2 / SCP-2
Scalehib 100 / Super Scale Inhibitor / Scale Clear SI-112
SGA II
Shale Surf 1000
Shale Surf 1000 Winterized
SI 103
Sodium Citrate
SP Breaker
STIM-50 / LT-32
Super OW 3
Super Pen 2000
SuperGel 15
U042 / Chelating Agent U42
U066 / Mutual Solvent U66

Product Name
Unicide 100 / EC6116A
Unifoam
Unigel 5F
UniHibA / SP-43X
UnihibG / S-11
Unislik ST 50 / Stim Lube
Vicon NF
WG-11
WG-17
WG-18
WG-35
WG-36
WLC-6
XL-1
XL-8
XLW-32
Xylene

Table 5.5 - Fracturing Additive Products – Partial Composition Disclosure
to the Department (Updated July 2011)

Product Name
20 Degree Baume Muriatic Acid
AcTivator / 78-ACTW
AMB-100
B869 / Corrosion Inhibitor B869 / Corrosion Inhibitor A262
B885 / ClearFRAC LT B885 / ClearFRAC LT J551A
B892 / EZEFLO B892 / EZEFLO F110 Surfactant
CL-22UC
CL-28M
Clay Master 5C
Corrosion Inhibitor A261
FAW- 5
FDP-S798-05
FDP-S819-05
FE ACID
FR-48
FRW-16
FRW-18
Fracstal FR-143
Fracstal III
Fracstal NE-137
Fracstal Ultra
Fracstal Ultra-FM1
Fracstal Ultra-FM2
Fracstal Ultra-FM3
Fracstal Waterbase
Fracstal Waterbase-M1
FRW-25M
GA 8713
GBW-15L
GW-3LDF
HVG-1, Fast Hydrating Guar Slurry
ICA 400
ICP-1000
Inflo-102
Inhibisal Ultra CS-135
Inhibisal Ultra SI-141
J134L / Enzyme Breaker J134L
KCLS-2, KCL Substitute

Product Name
L065 / Scale Inhibitor L065
LP-65
Magnacide 575 Microbiocide
MSA ACID
Multifunctional Surfactant F105
Nitrogen, Refrigerated Liquid
Product 239
PS 550
S-150
SandWedge WF
SilkWater FR-A
Super TSC / Super Scale Control TSC
Super Sol 10/20/30
Ultra Breake-C
Ultra Breake-CG
Ultra Breake-M
Ultra-Breake-MG
Unislick 30 / Cyanaflo 105L
WC-5584
WCS 5177 Corrosion Scale Inhibitor
WCW219 Combination Inhibitor
WF-12B Foamer
WF-12B Salt Inhibitor Stix
WF-12B SI Foamer/Salt Inhibitor
WF12BH Foamer
WRR-5
WFR-C
XLBHT-1
XLBHT-2

Information in sections 5.4.1-3 below was compiled primarily by URS Corporation,⁴⁶ under contract to NYSERDA.

5.4.1 Properties of Fracturing Fluids

Additives are used in hydraulic fracturing operations to elicit certain properties and characteristics that would aide and enhance the operation. The desired properties and characteristics include:

- Non-reactive;
- Non-flammable;
- Minimal residuals;
- Minimal potential for scale or corrosion;
- Low entrained solids;
- Neutral pH (pH 6.5 – 7.5) for maximum polymer hydration;
- Limited formation damage;
- Appropriately modify properties of water to carry proppant deep into the shale;
- Economical to modify fluid properties; and
- Minimal environmental effects.

5.4.2 Classes of Additives

Table 5.6 lists the types, purposes and examples of additives that have been proposed to date for use in hydraulic fracturing of gas wells in New York State.

⁴⁶ URS, 2011, p. 2-1 & 2009, p. 2-1.

Table 5.6 - Types and Purposes of Additives Proposed for Use in New York State (Updated July 2011)

Additive Type	Description of Purpose	Examples of Chemicals ⁴⁷
Proppant	“Props” open fractures and allows gas / fluids to flow more freely to the well bore.	Sand [Sintered bauxite; zirconium oxide; ceramic beads]
Acid	Removes cement and drilling mud from casing perforations prior to fracturing fluid injection, and provides accessible path to formation.	Hydrochloric acid (HCl, 3% to 28%) or muriatic acid
Breaker	Reduces the viscosity of the fluid in order to release proppant into fractures and enhance the recovery of the fracturing fluid.	Peroxydisulfates
Bactericide / Biocide / Antibacterial Agent	Inhibits growth of organisms that could produce gases (particularly hydrogen sulfide) that could contaminate methane gas. Also prevents the growth of bacteria which can reduce the ability of the fluid to carry proppant into the fractures.	Gluteraldehyde; 2,2-dibromo-3-nitrilopropionamide
Buffer / pH Adjusting Agent	Adjusts and controls the pH of the fluid in order to maximize the effectiveness of other additives such as crosslinkers	Sodium or potassium carbonate; acetic acid
Clay Stabilizer / Control /KCl	Prevents swelling and migration of formation clays which could block pore spaces thereby reducing permeability.	Salts (e.g., tetramethyl ammonium chloride Potassium chloride (KCl)
Corrosion Inhibitor (including Oxygen Scavengers)	Reduces rust formation on steel tubing, well casings, tools, and tanks (used only in fracturing fluids that contain acid).	Methanol; ammonium bisulfate for Oxygen Scavengers
Crosslinker	Increases fluid viscosity using phosphate esters combined with metals. The metals are referred to as crosslinking agents. The increased fracturing fluid viscosity allows the fluid to carry more proppant into the fractures.	Potassium hydroxide; borate salts
Friction Reducer	Allows fracture fluids to be injected at optimum rates and pressures by minimizing friction.	Sodium acrylate-acrylamide copolymer; polyacrylamide (PAM); petroleum distillates
Gelling Agent	Increases fracturing fluid viscosity, allowing the fluid to carry more proppant into the fractures.	Guar gum; petroleum distillates
Iron Control	Prevents the precipitation of metal oxides which could plug off the formation.	Citric acid;
Scale Inhibitor	Prevents the precipitation of carbonates and sulfates (calcium carbonate, calcium sulfate, barium sulfate) which could plug off the formation.	Ammonium chloride; ethylene glycol;
Solvent	Additive which is soluble in oil, water & acid-based treatment fluids which is used to control the wettability of contact surfaces or to prevent or break emulsions	Various aromatic hydrocarbons
Surfactant	Reduces fracturing fluid surface tension thereby aiding fluid recovery.	Methanol; isopropanol; ethoxylated alcohol

5.4.3 Composition of Fracturing Fluids

The composition of the fracturing fluid used may vary from one geologic basin or formation to another or from one area to another in order to meet the specific needs of each operation; but the

⁴⁷ Chemicals in brackets [] have not been proposed for use in the State of New York to date, but are known to be used in other states or shale formations.

range of additive types available for potential use remains the same. There are a number of different products for each additive type; however, only one product of each type is typically utilized in any given hydraulic fracturing job. The selection may be driven by the formation and potential interactions between additives. Additionally not all additive types will be utilized in every fracturing job.

Sample compositions, by weight, of fracturing fluid are provided in Figure 5.3, Figure 5.4 and Figure 5.5. The composition depicted in Figure 5.3 is based on data from the Fayetteville Shale⁴⁸ while those depicted in Figure 5.4 and Figure 5.5 are based on data from Marcellus Shale development in Pennsylvania. Based on this data, between approximately 84 and 90 percent of the fracturing fluid is water; between approximately 8 and 15 % is proppant (Photo 5.17); the remainder, typically less than 1 % consists of chemical additives listed above.

Photo 5.17 - Sand used as proppant in hydraulic fracturing operation in Bradford County, PA



⁴⁸ Similar to the Marcellus Shale, the Fayetteville Shale is a marine shale rich in unoxidized carbon (i.e. a black shale). The two shales are at similar depths, and vertical and horizontal wells have been drilled/fractured at both shales.

Barnett Shale is considered to be the first instance of extensive high-volume hydraulic fracturing technology use; the technology has since been applied in other areas such as the Fayetteville Shale and the Haynesville Shale. URS notes that data collected from applications to drill Marcellus Shale wells in New York indicate that the typical fracture fluid composition for operations in the Marcellus Shale is similar to the provided composition in the Fayetteville Shale. Even though no horizontal wells have been drilled in the Marcellus Shale in New York, applications filed to date as well as information provided by the industry⁴⁹ indicate that it is realistic to expect that the composition of fracture fluids used in the Marcellus Shale in New York would be similar to the fluids used in the Fayetteville Shale and the Marcellus Shale in Pennsylvania.

⁴⁹ ALL Consulting, 2010, p. 80.

Figure 5.3 - Sample Fracturing Fluid Composition (12 Additives), by Weight, from Fayetteville Shale⁵⁰






Figure 5.4 - Sample Fracturing Fluid Composition (9 Additives), by Weight, from Marcellus Shale⁵¹ (New July 2011)



⁵⁰ URS, 2009, p. 2-4.

⁵¹ URS, 2011, p. 2-4, adapted from ALL Consulting, 2010, p.81.

Figure 5.5 - Sample Fracturing Fluid Composition (6 Additives), by Weight, from Marcellus Shale⁵² (New July 2011)



Each product within the 13 classes of additives may be made up of one or more chemical constituents. Table 5.7 is a list of chemical constituents and their CAS numbers, that have been extracted from product composition disclosures and MSDSs submitted to the Department for 235 products used or proposed for use in hydraulic fracturing operations in the Marcellus Shale in New York. It is important to note that several manufacturers/suppliers provide similar products (i.e., chemicals that would serve the same purpose) for any class of additive, and that not all types of additives are used in a single well.

Data provided to the Department to date indicates similar fracturing fluid compositions for vertically and horizontally drilled wells.

⁵² URS, 2011, p.2-5, adapted from ALL Consulting, 2010, p. 81.

Table 5.7.- Chemical Constituents in Additives^{53,54,55} (Updated July 2011)

CAS Number ⁵⁶	Chemical Constituent
106-24-1	(2E)-3,7-dimethylocta-2,6-dien-1-ol
67701-10-4	(C8-C18) and (C18) Unsaturated Alkylcarboxylic Acid Sodium Salt
2634-33-5	1,2 Benzisothiazolin-2-one / 1,2-benzisothiazolin-3-one
95-63-6	1,2,4 trimethylbenzene
93858-78-7	1,2,4-Butanetricarboxylic acid, 2-phosphono-, potassium salt
123-91-1	1,4 Dioxane
3452-07-1	1-eicosene
629-73-2	1-hexadecene
104-46-1	1-Methoxy-4-propenylbenzene
124-28-7	1-Octadecanamine, N, N-dimethyl- / N,N-Dimthyoctadecylamine
	1-Octadecanaminium, N,N,N-Trimethyl-, Chloride
112-03-8	/Trimethyloctadecylammonium chloride
112-88-9	1-octadecene
40623-73-2	1-Propanesulfonic acid
1120-36-1	1-tetradecene
95077-68-2	2- Propenoic acid, homopolymer sodium salt
98-55-5	2-(4-methyl-1-cyclohex-3-enyl)propan-2-ol
10222-01-2	2,2 Dibromo-3-nitrilopropionamide
27776-21-2	2,2'-azobis- {2-(imidazlin-2-yl)propane}-dihydrochloride
73003-80-2	2,2-Dobromomalonamide
15214-89-8	2-Acrylamido-2-methylpropanesulphonic acid sodium salt polymer
46830-22-2	2-acryloyloxyethyl(benzyl)dimethylammonium chloride
52-51-7	2-Bromo-2-nitro-1,3-propanediol
111-76-2	2-Butoxy ethanol / Ethylene glycol monobutyl ether / Butyl Cellusolve
1113-55-9	2-Dibromo-3-Nitriloprionamide (2-Monobromo-3-nitriilopropionamide)
104-76-7	2-Ethyl Hexanol
67-63-0	2-Propanol / Isopropyl Alcohol / Isopropanol / Propan-2-ol
26062-79-3	2-Propen-1-aminium, N,N-dimethyl-N-2-propenyl-chloride, homopolymer
9003-03-6	2-propenoic acid, homopolymer, ammonium salt
25987-30-8	2-Propenoic acid, polymer with 2 p-propenamide, sodium salt / Copolymer of acrylamide and sodium acrylate
71050-62-9	2-Propenoic acid, polymer with sodium phosphinate (1:1)
66019-18-9	2-propenoic acid, telomer with sodium hydrogen sulfite

⁵³ Table 5.7, is a list of chemical constituents and their CAS numbers that have been extracted from product composition disclosures and MSDSs submitted to the Department. It was compiled by URS Corporation (2011) and was adapted by the Department to ensure that it accurately reflects the data submitted.

⁵⁴ These are the chemical constituents of all chemical additives proposed to be used in New York for hydraulic fracturing operations at shale wells. Only a few chemicals would be used in a single well; the list of chemical constituents used in an individual well would be correspondingly smaller.

⁵⁵ This list does not include chemicals that are exclusively used for drilling.

⁵⁶ Chemical Abstracts Service (CAS) is a division of the American Chemical Society. CAS assigns unique numerical identifiers to every chemical described in the literature. The intention is to make database searches more convenient, as chemicals often have many names. Almost all molecule databases today allow searching by CAS number.

CAS Number ⁵⁶	Chemical Constituent
107-19-7	2-Propyn-1-ol / Progargyl Alcohol
51229-78-8	3,5,7-Triaza-1-azoniatricyclo[3.3.1.1.3,7]decane, 1-(3-chloro-2-propenyl)-chloride,
106-22-9	3,7 - dimethyl-6-octen-1-ol
5392-40-5	3,7- dimethyl-2,6-octadienal
115-19-5	3-methyl-1-butyn-3-ol
104-55-2	3-phenyl-2-propenal
127-41-3	4-(2,6,6-trimethyl-1-cyclohex-2-enyl)-3-buten-2-one
121-33-5	4-hydroxy-3-methoxybenzaldehyde
127087-87-0	4-Nonylphenol Polyethylene Glycol Ether Branched / Nonylphenol ethoxylated / Oxyalkylated Phenol
64-19-7	Acetic acid
68442-62-6	Acetic acid, hydroxy-, reaction products with triethanolamine
108-24-7	Acetic Anhydride
67-64-1	Acetone
79-06-1	Acrylamide
38193-60-1	Acrylamide - sodium 2-acrylamido-2-methylpropane sulfonate copolymer
25085-02-3	Acrylamide - Sodium Acrylate Copolymer / Anionic Polyacrylamide / 2-Propanoic Acid
69418-26-4	Acrylamide polymer with N,N,N-trimethyl-2[1-oxo-2-propenyl]oxy Ethanaminium chloride / Ethanaminium, N, N, N-trimethyl-2-[(1-oxo-2-propenyl)oxy]-, chloride, polymer with 2-propenamamide (9Cl)
68891-29-2	Alcohols C8-10, ethoxylated, monoether with sulfuric acid, ammonium salt
68526-86-3	Alcohols, C11-14-iso, C13-rich
68551-12-2	Alcohols, C12-C16, Ethoxylated / Ethoxylated alcohol
64742-47-8	Aliphatic Hydrocarbon / Hydrotreated light distillate / Petroleum Distillates / Isoparaffinic Solvent / Paraffin Solvent / Napthenic Solvent
64743-02-8	Alkenes
68439-57-6	Alkyl (C14-C16) olefin sulfonate, sodium salt
9016-45-9	Alkylphenol ethoxylate surfactants
1327-41-9	Aluminum chloride
68155-07-7	Amides, C8-18 and C19-Unsatd., N,N-Bis(hydroxyethyl)
73138-27-9	Amines, C12-14-tert-alkyl, ethoxylated
71011-04-6	Amines, Ditallow alkyl, ethoxylated
68551-33-7	Amines, tallow alkyl, ethoxylated, acetates
1336-21-6	Ammonia
631-61-8	Ammonium acetate
68037-05-8	Ammonium Alcohol Ether Sulfate
7783-20-2	Ammonium bisulfate
10192-30-0	Ammonium Bisulphite
12125-02-9	Ammonium Chloride
7632-50-0	Ammonium citrate
37475-88-0	Ammonium Cumene Sulfonate
1341-49-7	Ammonium hydrogen-difluoride
6484-52-2	Ammonium nitrate
7727-54-0	Ammonium Persulfate / Diammonium peroxidisulphate

CAS Number ⁵⁶	Chemical Constituent
1762-95-4	Ammonium Thiocyanate
12174-11-7	Attapulgite Clay
121888-68-4	Bentonite, benzyl(hydrogenated tallow alkyl) dimethylammonium stearate complex / organophilic clay
71-43-2	Benzene
119345-04-9	Benzene, 1,1'-oxybis, tetrapropylene derivatives, sulfonated, sodium salts
74153-51-8	Benzenemethanaminium, N,N-dimethyl-N-[2-[(1-oxo-2-propenyl)oxy]ethyl]-, chloride, polymer with 2-propenamide
122-91-8	Benzenemethanol,4-methoxy-, 1-formate
1300-72-7	Benzenesulfonic acid, Dimethyl-, Sodium salt /Sodium xylene sulfonate
140-11-4	Benzyl acetate
76-22-2	Bicyclo (2.2.1) heptan-2-one, 1,7,7-trimethyl-
68153-72-0	Blown lard oil amine
68876-82-4	Blown rapeseed amine
1319-33-1	Borate Salt
10043-35-3	Boric acid
1303-86-2	Boric oxide / Boric Anhydride
71-36-3	Butan-1-ol
68002-97-1	C10 - C16 Ethoxylated Alcohol
68131-39-5	C12-15 Alcohol, Ethoxylated
1317-65-3	Calcium Carbonate
10043-52-4	Calcium chloride
1305-62-0	Calcium Hydroxide
1305-79-9	Calcium Peroxide
124-38-9	Carbon Dioxide
68130-15-4	Carboxymethylhydroxypropyl guar
9012-54-8	Cellulase / Hemicellulase Enzyme
9004-34-6	Cellulose
10049-04-4	Chlorine Dioxide
78-73-9	Choline Bicarbonate
67-48-1	Choline Chloride
91-64-5	Chromen-2-one
77-92-9	Citric Acid
94266-47-4	Citrus Terpenes
61789-40-0	Cocamidopropyl Betaine
68155-09-9	Cocamidopropylamine Oxide
68424-94-2	Coco-betaine
7758-98-7	Copper (II) Sulfate
14808-60-7	Crystalline Silica (Quartz)
7447-39-4	Cupric chloride dihydrate
1490-04-6	Cyclohexanol,5-methyl-2-(1-methylethyl)
8007-02-1	Cymbopogon citratus leaf oil
8000-29-1	Cymbopogon winterianus jowitt oil
1120-24-7	Decyldimethyl Amine
2605-79-0	Decyl-dimethyl Amine Oxide

CAS Number ⁵⁶	Chemical Constituent
3252-43-5	Dibromoacetonitrile
25340-17-4	Diethylbenzene
111-46-6	Diethylene Glycol
22042-96-2	Diethylenetriamine penta (methylenephonic acid) sodium salt
28757-00-8	Diisopropyl naphthalenesulfonic acid
68607-28-3	Dimethylcocoamine, bis(chloroethyl) ether, diquaternary ammonium salt
7398-69-8	Dimethyldiallylammonium chloride
25265-71-8	Dipropylene glycol
34590-94-8	Dipropylene Glycol Methyl Ether
139-33-3	Disodium Ethylene Diamine Tetra Acetate
64741-77-1	Distillates, petroleum, light hydrocracked
5989-27-5	D-Limonene
123-01-3	Dodecylbenzene
27176-87-0	Dodecylbenzene sulfonic acid
42504-46-1	Dodecylbenzenesulfonate isopropanolamine
50-70-4	D-Sorbitol / Sorbitol
37288-54-3	Endo-1,4-beta-mannanase, or Hemicellulase
149879-98-1	Erucic Amidopropyl Dimethyl Betaine
89-65-6	Erythorbic acid, anhydrous
54076-97-0	Ethanaminium, N,N,N-trimethyl-2-[(1-oxo-2-propenyl)oxy]-, chloride, homopolymer
107-21-1	Ethane-1,2-diol / Ethylene Glycol
111-42-2	Ethanol, 2,2-iminobis-
26027-38-3	Ethoxylated 4-nonylphenol
9002-93-1	Ethoxylated 4-tert-octylphenol
68439-50-9	Ethoxylated alcohol
126950-60-5	Ethoxylated alcohol
67254-71-1	Ethoxylated alcohol (C10-12)
68951-67-7	Ethoxylated alcohol (C14-15)
68439-46-3	Ethoxylated alcohol (C9-11)
66455-15-0	Ethoxylated Alcohols
84133-50-6	Ethoxylated Alcohols (C12-14 Secondary)
68439-51-0	Ethoxylated Alcohols (C12-14)
78330-21-9	Ethoxylated branch alcohol
34398-01-1	Ethoxylated C11 alcohol
78330-21-8	Ethoxylated C11-14-iso, C13-rich alcohols
61791-12-6	Ethoxylated Castor Oil
61791-29-5	Ethoxylated fatty acid, coco
61791-08-0	Ethoxylated fatty acid, coco, reaction product with ethanolamine
68439-45-2	Ethoxylated hexanol
9036-19-5	Ethoxylated octylphenol
9005-67-8	Ethoxylated Sorbitan Monostearate
9005-70-3	Ethoxylated Sorbitan Trioleate
64-17-5	Ethyl alcohol / ethanol
100-41-4	Ethyl Benzene

CAS Number ⁵⁶	Chemical Constituent
93-89-0	Ethyl benzoate
97-64-3	Ethyl Lactate
9003-11-6	Ethylene Glycol-Propylene Glycol Copolymer (Oxirane, methyl-, polymer with oxirane)
75-21-8	Ethylene oxide
5877-42-9	Ethyl octynol
8000-48-4	Eucalyptus globulus leaf oil
61790-12-3	Fatty Acids
68604-35-3	Fatty acids, C 8-18 and C18-unsaturated compounds with diethanolamine
68188-40-9	Fatty acids, tall oil reaction products w/ acetophenone, formaldehyde & thiourea
9043-30-5	Fatty alcohol polyglycol ether surfactant
7705-08-0	Ferric chloride
7782-63-0	Ferrous sulfate, heptahydrate
50-00-0	Formaldehyde
29316-47-0	Formaldehyde polymer with 4,1,1-dimethylethyl phenolmethyl oxirane
153795-76-7	Formaldehyde, polymers with branched 4-nonylphenol, ethylene oxide and propylene oxide
75-12-7	Formamide
64-18-6	Formic acid
110-17-8	Fumaric acid
111-30-8	Glutaraldehyde
56-81-5	Glycerol / glycerine
9000-30-0	Guar Gum
64742-94-5	Heavy aromatic petroleum naphtha
9025-56-3	Hemicellulase
7647-01-0	Hydrochloric Acid / Hydrogen Chloride / muriatic acid
7722-84-1	Hydrogen Peroxide
64742-52-5	Hydrotreated heavy naphthenic (petroleum) distillate
79-14-1	Hydroxy acetic acid
35249-89-9	Hydroxyacetic acid ammonium salt
9004-62-0	Hydroxyethyl cellulose
5470-11-1	Hydroxylamine hydrochloride
39421-75-5	Hydroxypropyl guar
35674-56-7	Isomeric Aromatic Ammonium Salt
64742-88-7	Isoparaffinic Petroleum Hydrocarbons, Synthetic
64-63-0	Isopropanol
98-82-8	Isopropylbenzene (cumene)
68909-80-8	Isoquinoline, reaction products with benzyl chloride and quinoline
8008-20-6	Kerosene
64742-81-0	Kerosine, hydrodesulfurized
63-42-3	Lactose
8022-15-9	Lavandula hybrida abrial herb oil
64742-95-6	Light aromatic solvent naphtha
1120-21-4	Light Paraffin Oil

CAS Number ⁵⁶	Chemical Constituent
546-93-0	Magnesium Carbonate
1309-48-4	Magnesium Oxide
1335-26-8	Magnesium Peroxide
14807-96-6	Magnesium Silicate Hydrate (Talc)
1184-78-7	methanamine, N,N-dimethyl-, N-oxide
67-56-1	Methanol
119-36-8	Methyl 2-hydroxybenzoate
68891-11-2	Methyloxirane polymer with oxirane, mono (nonylphenol) ether, branched
8052-41-3	Mineral spirits / Stoddard Solvent
64742-46-7	Mixture of severely hydrotreated and hydrocracked base oil
141-43-5	Monoethanolamine
44992-01-0	N,N,N-trimethyl-2[1-oxo-2-propenyl]oxy Ethanaminium chloride
64742-48-9	Naphtha (petroleum), hydrotreated heavy
91-20-3	Naphthalene
38640-62-9	Naphthalene bis(1-methylethyl)
93-18-5	Naphthalene, 2-ethoxy-
68909-18-2	N-benzyl-alkyl-pyridinium chloride
68139-30-0	N-Cocoamidopropyl-N,N-dimethyl-N-2-hydroxypropylsulfobetaine
68424-94-2	N-Cocoamidopropyl-N,N-dimethyl-N-2-hydroxypropylsulfobetaine
7727-37-9	Nitrogen, Liquid form
68412-54-4	Nonylphenol Polyethoxylate
8000-27-9	Oils, cedarwood
121888-66-2	Organophilic Clays
628-63-7	Pentyl acetate
540-18-1	Pentyl butanoate
8009-03-8	Petrolatum
64742-65-0	Petroleum Base Oil
64741-68-0	Petroleum naphtha
101-84-8	Phenoxybenzene
70714-66-8	Phosphonic acid, [[[phosphonomethyl]imino]bis[2,1-ethanediylnitrilobis(methylene)]]tetrakis-, ammonium salt
8000-41-7	Pine Oil
8002-09-3	Pine Oils
60828-78-6	Poly(oxy-1,2-ethanediyl), a-[3,5-dimethyl-1-(2-methylpropyl)hexyl]-w-hydroxy-
25322-68-3	Poly(oxy-1,2-ethanediyl), a-hydro-w-hydroxy / Polyethylene Glycol
31726-34-8	Poly(oxy-1,2-ethanediyl), alpha-hexyl-omega-hydroxy
24938-91-8	Poly(oxy-1,2-ethanediyl), α -tridecyl- ω -hydroxy-
9004-32-4	Polyanionic Cellulose
51838-31-4	Polyepichlorohydrin, trimethylamine quaternized
56449-46-8	Polyethylene glycol oleate ester
9046-01-9	Polyethoxylated tridecyl ether phosphate
63428-86-4	Polyethylene glycol hexyl ether sulfate, ammonium salt
62649-23-4	Polymer with 2-propenoic acid and sodium 2-propenoate
9005-65-6	Polyoxyethylene Sorbitan Monooleate

CAS Number ⁵⁶	Chemical Constituent
61791-26-2	Polyoxylated fatty amine salt
65997-18-4	Polyphosphate
127-08-2	Potassium acetate
12712-38-8	Potassium borate
1332-77-0	Potassium borate
20786-60-1	Potassium Borate
584-08-7	Potassium carbonate
7447-40-7	Potassium chloride
590-29-4	Potassium formate
1310-58-3	Potassium Hydroxide
13709-94-9	Potassium metaborate
24634-61-5	Potassium Sorbate
112926-00-8	Precipitated silica / silica gel
57-55-6	Propane-1,2-diol, /Propylene glycol
107-98-2	Propylene glycol monomethyl ether
68953-58-2	Quaternary Ammonium Compounds
62763-89-7	Quinoline,2-methyl-, hydrochloride
62763-89-7	Quinoline,2-methyl-, hydrochloride
15619-48-4	Quinolinium, 1-(phenylmethl),chloride
8000-25-7	Rosmarinus officinalis l. leaf oil
7631-86-9	Silica, Dissolved
5324-84-5	Sodium 1-octanesulfonate
127-09-3	Sodium acetate
95371-16-7	Sodium Alpha-olefin Sulfonate
532-32-1	Sodium Benzoate
144-55-8	Sodium bicarbonate
7631-90-5	Sodium bisulfate
7647-15-6	Sodium Bromide
497-19-8	Sodium carbonate
7647-14-5	Sodium Chloride
7758-19-2	Sodium chlorite
3926-62-3	Sodium Chloroacetate
68-04-2	Sodium citrate
6381-77-7	Sodium erythorbate / isoascorbic acid, sodium salt
2836-32-0	Sodium Glycolate
1310-73-2	Sodium Hydroxide
7681-52-9	Sodium hypochlorite
7775-19-1	Sodium Metaborate .8H ₂ O
10486-00-7	Sodium perborate tetrahydrate
7775-27-1	Sodium persulphate
68608-26-4	Sodium petroleum sulfonate
9003-04-7	Sodium polyacrylate
7757-82-6	Sodium sulfate
1303-96-4	Sodium tetraborate decahydrate
7772-98-7	Sodium Thiosulfate

CAS Number⁵⁶	Chemical Constituent
1338-43-8	Sorbitan Monooleate
57-50-1	Sucrose
5329-14-6	Sulfamic acid
68442-77-3	Surfactant: Modified Amine
112945-52-5	Synthetic Amorphous / Pyrogenic Silica / Amorphous Silica
68155-20-4	Tall Oil Fatty Acid Diethanolamine
8052-48-0	Tallow fatty acids sodium salt
72480-70-7	Tar bases, quinoline derivs., benzyl chloride-quaternized
68647-72-3	Terpene and terpenoids
68956-56-9	Terpene hydrocarbon byproducts
533-74-4	Tetrahydro-3,5-dimethyl-2H-1,3,5-thiadiazine-2-thione (a.k.a. Dazomet)
55566-30-8	Tetrakis(hydroxymethyl)phosphonium sulfate (THPS)
75-57-0	Tetramethyl ammonium chloride
64-02-8	Tetrasodium Ethylenediaminetetraacetate
68-11-1	Thioglycolic acid
62-56-6	Thiourea
68527-49-1	Thiourea, polymer with formaldehyde and 1-phenylethanone
68917-35-1	Thuja plicata donn ex. D. don leaf oil
108-88-3	Toluene
81741-28-8	Tributyl tetradecyl phosphonium chloride
68299-02-5	Triethanolamine hydroxyacetate
68442-62-6	Triethanolamine hydroxyacetate
112-27-6	Triethylene Glycol
52624-57-4	Trimethylolpropane, Ethoxylated, Propoxylated
150-38-9	Trisodium Ethylenediaminetetraacetate
5064-31-3	Trisodium Nitrilotriacetate
7601-54-9	Trisodium ortho phosphate
57-13-6	Urea
25038-72-6	Vinylidene Chloride/Methylacrylate Copolymer
7732-18-5	Water
8042-47-5	White Mineral Oil
11138-66-2	Xanthan gum
1330-20-7	Xylene
13601-19-9	Yellow Sodium of Prussiate

Chemical Constituent

Aliphatic acids
Aliphatic alcohol glycol ether
Alkyl Aryl Polyethoxy Ethanol
Alkylaryl Sulfonate
Anionic copolymer
Aromatic hydrocarbons
Aromatic ketones
Citric acid base formula
Ethoxylated alcohol blend/mixture

Hydroxy acetic acid
Oxyalkylated alkylphenol
Petroleum distillate blend
Polyethoxylated alkanol
Polymeric Hydrocarbons
Quaternary amine
Quaternary ammonium compound
Salt of amine-carbonyl condensate
Salt of fatty acid/polyamine reaction product
Sugar
Surfactant blend
Triethanolamine

The chemical constituents listed in Table 5.7 are not linked to the product names listed in Table 5.4 and Table 5.5 because a significant number of product compositions have been properly justified as trade secrets within the coverage of disclosure exceptions of the Freedom of Information Law [Public Officers Law §87.2(d)] and the Department's implementing regulation, 6 NYCRR § 616.7. The Department however, considers MSDSs to be public information ineligible for exception from disclosure as trade secrets or confidential business information.

5.4.3.1 Chemical Categories and Health Information

The Department requested assistance from NYSDOH in identifying potential exposure pathways and constituents of concern associated with high-volume hydraulic fracturing for low-permeability gas reservoir development. The Department provided DOH with fracturing additive product constituents based on MSDSs and product-composition disclosures for hydraulic fracturing additive products that were provided by well-service companies and the chemical supply companies that manufacture the products.

Compound-specific toxicity data are very limited for many chemical additives to fracturing fluids, so chemicals potentially present in fracturing fluids were grouped together into categories according to their chemical structure (or function in the case of microbiocides) in Table 5.8, compiled by NYSDOH. As explained above, any given individual fracturing job will only involve a handful of chemicals and may not include every category of chemicals.

Table 5.8 - Categories based on chemical structure of potential fracturing fluid constituents.⁵⁷ (Updated July 2011)

Chemical	CAS Number
Amides	
Formamide	75-12-7
acrylamide	79-06-1
Amides, C8-18 and C19-Unsatd., N,N-Bis(hydroxyethyl)	68155-07-7
Amines	
urea	57-13-6
thiourea	62-56-6
Choline chloride	67-48-1
tetramethyl ammonium chloride	75-57-0
Choline Bicarbonate	78-73-9
Ethanol, 2,2-Iminobis-	111-42-2
1-Octadecanaminium, N,N,N, Trimethyl-, Chloride (aka Trimethyloctadecylammonium choride)	112-03-8
1-Octadecanamine, N,N-Dimethyl- (aka N,N-Dimethyloctadecylamine)	124-28-7
monoethanolamine	141-43-5
Decyldimethyl Amine	1120-24-7
methanamine, N,N-dimethyl-, N-oxide	1184-78-7
Decyl-dimethyl Amine Oxide	2605-79-0
dimethyldiallylammonium chloride	7398-69-8
polydimethyl dially ammonium chloride	26062-79-3
dodecylbenzenesulfonate isopropanolamine	42504-46-1
N,N,N-trimethyl-2[1-oxo-2-propenyl]oxy ethanaminium chloride	44992-01-0
2-acryloyloxyethyl(benzyl)dimethylammonium chloride	46830-22-2
ethanaminium, N,N,N-trimethyl-2-[(1-oxo-2-propenyl)oxy]-, chloride, homopolymer	54076-97-0
Cocamidopropyl Betaine	61789-40-0
Quaternary Ammonium Chloride	61789-71-7
polyoxylated fatty amine salt	61791-26-2
quinoline, 2-methyl, hydrochloride	62763-89-7
N-cocoamidopropyl-N,N-dimethyl-N-2-hydroxypropylsulfobetaine	68139-30-0
tall oil fatty acid diethanolamine	68155-20-4
N-cocoamidopropyl-N,N-dimethyl-N-2-hydroxypropylsulfobetaine	68424-94-2
amines, tallow alkyl, ethoxylated, acetates	68551-33-7
quaternary ammonium compounds, bis(hydrogenated tallow alkyl) dimethyl, salts with bentonite	68953-58-2

⁵⁷ The chemicals listed in this table are organized in order of ascending CAS Number by category.

Chemical	CAS Number
amines, ditallow alkyl, ethoxylated	71011-04-6
amines, C-12-14-tert-alkyl, ethoxylated	73138-27-9
benzenemethanaminium, N,N-dimethyl-N-[2-[(1-oxo-2-propenyl)oxy]ethyl]-, chloride, polymer with 2-propenamide	74153-51-8
Erucic Amidopropyl Dimethyl Betaine	149879-98-1
Petroleum Distillates	
light paraffin oil	1120-21-4
kerosene	8008-20-6
Petrolatum	8009-03-8
White Mineral Oil	8042-47-5
stoddard solvent	8052-41-3
Distillates, petroleum, light hydrocracked	64741-77-1
petroleum naphtha	64741-68-0
Mixture of severely hydrotreated and hydrocracked base oil	64742-46-7
<u>Multiple names listed under same CAS#:</u> LVP aliphatic hydrocarbon, hydrotreated light distillate, low odor paraffin solvent, paraffin solvent, paraffinic naphthenic solvent, isoparaffinic solvent, distillates (petroleum) hydrotreated light, petroleum light distillate, aliphatic hydrocarbon, petroleum distillates, mixture of severely hydrotreated and hydrocracked base oil	64742-47-8
naphtha, hydrotreated heavy	64742-48-9
<u>Multiple names listed under same CAS#:</u> hydrotreated heavy naphthenic distillate, Petroleum distillates	64742-52-5
petroleum base oil	64742-65-0
kerosine (petroleum, hydrodesulfurized)	64742-81-0
kerosine (petroleum, hydrodesulfurized)	64742-88-7
<u>Multiple names listed under same CAS#:</u> heavy aromatic petroleum naphtha, light aromatic solvent naphtha	64742-94-5
light aromatic solvent naphtha	64742-95-6
alkenes, C> 10 α -	64743-02-8
Aromatic Hydrocarbons	
benzene	71-43-2
naphthalene	91-20-3
naphthalene, 2-ethoxy	93-18-5

Chemical	CAS Number
1,2,4-trimethylbenzene	95-63-6
cumene	98-82-8
ethyl benzene	100-41-4
toluene	108-88-3
dodecylbenzene	123-01-3
xylene	1330-20-7
diethylbenzene	25340-17-4
naphthalene bis(1-methylethyl)	38640-62-9
Alcohols & Aldehydes	
formaldehyde	50-00-0
sorbitol (or) D-sorbitol	50-70-4
Glycerol	56-81-5
propylene glycol	57-55-6
ethanol	64-17-5
isopropyl alcohol	67-63-0
methanol	67-56-1
isopropyl alcohol	67-63-0
butanol	71-36-3
2-(4-methyl-1-cyclohex-3-enyl)propan-2-ol	98-55-5
3-phenylprop-2-enal	104-55-2
2-ethyl-1-hexanol	104-76-7
3,7 - dimethyloct-6-en-1-ol	106-22-9
(2E)-3,7-dimethylocta-2,6-dien-1-ol	106-24-1
propargyl alcohol	107-19-7
ethylene glycol	107-21-1
Diethylene Glycol	111-46-6
3-methyl-1-butyn-3-ol	115-19-5
4-hydroxy-3-methoxybenzaldehyde	121-33-5
5-methyl-2-propan-2-ylcyclohexan-1-ol	1490-04-6
3,7-dimethylocta-2,6-dienal	5392-40-5
Ethyl octynol	5877-42-9
Glycol Ethers, Ethoxylated Alcohols & Other Ethers	
phenoxybenzene	101-84-8
1-methoxy-4-prop-1-enylbenzene	104-46-1
propylene glycol monomethyl ether	107-98-2
ethylene glycol monobutyl ether	111-76-2

Chemical	CAS Number
triethylene glycol	112-27-6
ethoxylated 4-tert-octylphenol	9002-93-1
ethoxylated sorbitan trioleate	9005-70-3
Polysorbate 80	9005-65-6
ethoxylated sorbitan monostearate	9005-67-8
Polyethylene glycol-(phenol) ethers	9016-45-9
Polyethylene glycol-(phenol) ethers	9036-19-5
fatty alcohol polyglycol ether surfactant	9043-30-5
Poly(oxy-1,2-ethanediyl), α -tridecyl- ω -hydroxy-	24938-91-8
Dipropylene glycol	25265-71-8
Nonylphenol Ethoxylate	26027-38-3
crissanol A-55	31726-34-8
Polyethylene glycol-(alcohol) ethers	34398-01-1
dipropylene glycol methyl ether	34590-94-8
Trimethylolpropane, Ethoxylated, Propoxylated	52624-57-4
Polyethylene glycol-(alcohol) ethers	60828-78-6
Ethoxylated castor oil [PEG-10 Castor oil]	61791-12-6
ethoxylated alcohols	66455-15-0
ethoxylated alcohol	67254-71-1
Ethoxylated alcohols (9 – 16 carbon atoms)	68002-97-1
ammonium alcohol ether sulfate	68037-05-8
Polyethylene glycol-(alcohol) ethers	68131-39-5
Polyethylene glycol-(phenol) ethers	68412-54-4
ethoxylated hexanol	68439-45-2
Polyethylene glycol-(alcohol) ethers	68439-46-3
Ethoxylated alcohols (9 – 16 carbon atoms)	68439-50-9
C12-C14 ethoxylated alcohols	68439-51-0
Exxal 13	68526-86-3
Ethoxylated alcohols (9 – 16 carbon atoms)	68551-12-2
alcohols, C-14-15, ethoxylated	68951-67-7
Ethoxylated C11-14-iso, C13-rich alcohols	78330-21-8
Ethoxylated Branched C11-14, C-13-rich Alcohols	78330-21-9
Ethoxylated alcohols (9 – 16 carbon atoms)	84133-5-6
alcohol ethoxylated	126950-60-5
Polyethylene glycol-(phenol) ethers	127087-87-0
Microbiocides	
bronopol	52-51-7

Chemical	CAS Number
glutaraldehyde	111-30-8
2-monobromo-3-nitrilopropionamide	1113-55-9
1,2-benzisothiazolin-3-one	2634-33-5
dibromoacetonitrile	3252-43-5
dazomet	533-74-4
Hydrogen Peroxide	7722-84-1
2,2-dibromo-3-nitrilopropionamide	10222-01-2
tetrakis	55566-30-8
2,2-dibromo-malonamide	73003-80-2
Organic Acids, Salts, Esters and Related Chemicals	
tetrasodium EDTA	64-02-8
formic acid	64-18-6
acetic acid	64-19-7
sodium citrate	68-04-2
thioglycolic acid	68-11-1
hydroxyacetic acid	79-14-1
erythorbic acid, anhydrous	89-65-6
ethyl benzoate	93-89-0
ethyl lactate	97-64-3
acetic anhydride	108-24-7
fumaric acid	110-17-8
ethyl 2-hydroxybenzoate	118-61-6
methyl 2-hydroxybenzoate	119-36-8
(4-methoxyphenyl) methyl formate	122-91-8
potassium acetate	127-08-2
sodium acetate	127-09-3
Disodium Ethylene Diamine Tetra Acetate	139-33-3
benzyl acetate	140-11-4
Trisodium Ethylenediamine tetraacetate	150-38-9
sodium benzoate	532-32-1
pentyl butanoate	540-18-1
potassium formate	590-29-4
pentyl acetate	628-63-7
ammonium acetate	631-61-8
Benzenesulfonic acid, Dimethyl-, Sodium salt (aka Sodium xylene sulfonate)	1300-72-7
Sodium Glycolate	2836-32-0
Sodium Chloroacetate	3926-62-3

Chemical	CAS Number
trisodium nitrilotriacetate	5064-31-3
sodium 1-octanesulfonate	5324-84-5
Sodium Erythorbate	6381-77-7
ammonium citrate	7632-50-0
tallow fatty acids sodium salt	8052-48-0
Polyethoxylated tridecyl ether phosphate	9046-01-9
quinolinium, 1-(phenylmethyl), chloride	15619-48-4
diethylenetriamine penta (methylenephonic acid) sodium salt	22042-96-2
potassium sorbate	24634-61-5
dodecylbenzene sulfonic acid	27176-87-0
diisopropyl naphthalenesulfonic acid	28757-00-8
hydroxyacetic acid ammonium salt	35249-89-9
isomeric aromatic ammonium salt	35674-56-7
ammonium cumene sulfonate	37475-88-0
Fatty Acids	61790-12-3
Fatty acids, coco, reaction products with ethanolamine, ethoxylated	61791-08-0
fatty acid, coco, ethoxylated	61791-29-5
2-propenoic acid, telomer with sodium hydrogen sulfite	66019-18-9
fatty acides, c8-18 and c18-unsatd., sodium salts	67701-10-4
carboxymethylhydroxypropyl guar	68130-15-4
Blown lard oil amine	68153-72-0
Tall oil Fatty Acid Diethanolamine	68155-20-8
fatty acids, tall oil reaction products w/ acetophenone, formaldehyde & thiourea	68188-40-9
triethanolamine hydroxyacetate	68299-02-5
alkyl (C14-C16) olefin sulfonate, sodium salt	68439-57-6
triethanolamine hydroxyacetate	68442-62-6
Modified Amine	68442-77-3
fatty acids, c-18-18 and c18-unsatd., compds with diethanolamine	68604-35-3
Sodium petroleum sulfonate	68608-26-4
Blown rapeseed amine	68876-82-4
Poly(oxy-1,2-ethanediyl), α -sulfo- ω -hydroxy-, c8-10-alkyl ethers, ammonium salts	68891-29-2
N-benzyl-alkyl-pyridinium chloride	68909-18-2
phosphonic acid, [[(phosphonomethyl)imino]bis[2,1-ethanediyl]nitrilobis (methylene)]]tetrakis-ammonium salt	70714-66-8
tributyl tetradecyl phosphonium chloride	81741-28-8
2-Phosphonobutane-1,2,4-tricarboxylic acid, potassium salt	93858-78-7
sodium alpha-olefin sulfonate	95371-16-7
benzene, 1,1'-oxybis, tetratpropylene derivatives, sulfonated, sodium salts	119345-04-9

Chemical	CAS Number
Polymers	
guar gum	9000-30-0
guar gum	9000-30-01
2-propenoic acid, homopolymer, ammonium salt	9003-03-6
low mol wt polyacrylate	9003-04-7
Low Mol. Wt. Polyacrylate	9003-04-7
<u>Multiple names listed under same CAS#:</u> oxirane, methyl-, polymer with oxirane, Ethylene Glycol-Propylene Glycol Copolymer	9003-11-6
<u>Polyanionic Cellulose</u>	9004-32-4
cellulose	9004-34-6
hydroxyethyl cellulose	9004-62-0
cellulase/hemicellulase enzyme	9012-54-8
hemicellulase	9025-56-3
xanthan gum	11138-66-2
acrylamide-sodium acrylate copolymer	25085-02-3
Vinylidene Chloride/Methylacrylate Copolymer	25038-72-6
polyethylene glycol	25322-68-3
copolymer of acrylamide and sodium acrylate	25987-30-8
formaldehyde polymer with 4,1,1-dimethylethyl phenolmethyl oxirane	29316-47-0
hemicellulase	37288-54-3
acrylamide - sodium 2-acrylamido-2-methylpropane sulfonate copolymer	38193-60-1
TerPoly (Acrylamide-AMPS Acrylic Acid)	40623-73-2
oxiranemthanaminium, N,N,N-trimethyl-, chloride, homopolymer (aka: polyepichlorohydrin, trimethylamine quaternized)	51838-31-4
polyethylene glycol oleate ester	56449-46-8
polymer with 2-propenoic acid and sodium 2-propenoate	62649-23-4
modified thiourea polymer	68527-49-1
methyloxirane polymer with oxirane, mono (nonylphenol) ether, branched	68891-11-2
acrylamide polymer with N,N,N-trimethyl-2[1-oxo-2-propenyl]oxy ethanaminium chloride	69418-26-4
2-propenoic acid, polymer with sodium phosphinate (1:1)	71050-62-9
2- Propenoic acid, homopolymer sodium salt	95077-68-2
formaldehyde, polymers with branched 4-nonylphenol, ethylene oxide and propylene oxide	153795-76-7
Minerals, Metals and other Inorganics	
carbon dioxide	124-38-9
sodium bicarbonate	144-55-8
Sodium Carbonate	497-19-8
Magnesium Carbonate	546-93-0

Chemical	CAS Number
Potassium Carbonate	584-08-7
Boric Anhydride (a.k.a. Boric Oxide)	1303-86-2
sodium tetraborate decahydrate	1303-96-4
Calcium Hydroxide	1305-62-0
Calcium Peroxide	1305-79-9
Magnesium Oxide	1309-48-4
Potassium Hydroxide	1310-58-3
sodium hydroxide	1310-73-2
Calcium Carbonate	1317-65-3
Borate Salt	1319-33-1
aluminum chloride, basic	1327-41-9
Magnesium Peroxide	1335-26-8
sodium tetraborate decahydrate	1332-77-0
aqua ammonia 29.4%	1336-21-6
ammonium hydrogen-difluoride	1341-49-7
ammonium thiocyanate	1762-95-4
sulfamic acid	5329-14-6
hydroxylamine hydrochloride	5470-11-1
ammonium nitrate	6484-52-2
cupric chloride dihydrate	7447-39-4
potassium chloride	7447-40-7
Trisodium ortho phosphate	7601-54-9
Non-Crystalline Silica	7631-86-9
sodium bisulfate	7631-90-5
hydrochloric acid	7647-01-0
sodium chloride	7647-14-5
sodium bromide	7647-15-6
aqueous ammonia	7664-41-7
sodium hypochlorite	7681-52-9
ferric chloride	7705-08-0
nitrogen	7727-37-9
ammonium persulfate	7727-54-0
water	7732-18-5
sodium sulfate	7757-82-6
sodium chlorite	7758-19-2
sodium thiosulfate	7772-98-7
Sodium Metaborate.8H2O	7775-19-01
Sodium Persulphate	7775-27-1

Chemical	CAS Number
ferrous sulfate, heptahydrate	7782-63-0
ammonium bisulfate	7783-20-2
boric acid	10043-35-3
Calcium Chloride	10043-52-4
Chlorine Dioxide	10049-04-4
ammonium bisulphite	10192-30-0
sodium perborate tetrahydrate	10486-00-7
ammonium chloride	12125-02-9
Attapulgate Clay	12174-11-7
potassium borate	12714-38-8
Yellow Sodium of Prussiate	13601-19-9
potassium metaborate	13709-94-9
Magnesium Silicate Hydrate (Talc)	14807-96-6
crystalline silica (quartz)	14808-60-7
glassy calcium magnesium phosphate	65997-17-3
Polyphosphate	65997-18-4
silica gel	112926-00-8
synthetic amorphous, pyrogenic silica	112945-52-5
synthetic amorphous, pyrogenic silica	121888-66-2
Miscellaneous	
Sucrose	57-50-1
lactose	63-42-3
acetone	67-64-1
ethylene oxide	75-21-8
1,7,7-trimethylbicyclo[2.2.1]heptan-2-one	76-22-2
chromen-2-one	91-64-5
1-octadecene	112-88-9
1,4-dioxane	123-91-1
(E)-4-(2,6,6-trimethyl-1-cyclohex-2-enyl)but-3-en-2-one	127-41-3
1-hexadecene	629-73-2
1-tetradecene	1120-36-1
sorbitan monooleate	1338-43-8
1-eicosene	3452-07-1
D-Limonene	5989-27-5
rosmarinus officinalis l. leaf oil	8000-25-7
oils, cedarwood	8000-27-9
cymbopogan winterianus jowitt oil	8000-29-1

Chemical	CAS Number
Pine Oil	8000-41-7
eucalyptus globulus leaf oil	8000-48-4
oils, pine	8002-09-3
cymbopogon citratus leaf oil	8007-02-1
lavandula hydrida abrial herb oil	8022-15-9
2,2'-azobis- {2-(imidazlin-2-yl)propane} -dihydrochloride	27776-21-2
3,5,7-triaza-1-azoniatricyclo[3.3.1.1.3,7]decane, 1-(3-chloro-2-propenyl)-chloride	51229-78-8
alkenes	64743-02-8
Cocamidopropyl Oxide	68155-09-9
terpene and terpenoids	68647-72-3
thuja plicata donn ex. D. don leaf oil	68917-35-1
terpene hydrocarbon byproducts	68956-56-9
tar bases, quinoline derivs., benzyl chloride-quaternized	72780-70-7
citrus terpenes	94266-47-4
organophilic clays	121888-68-4
Listed without CAS Number⁵⁸	
belongs with amines	
proprietary quaternary ammonium compounds	NA
quaternary ammonium compound	NA
triethanolamine (tea) 85%, drum	NA
Quaternary amine	NA
Fatty amidoalkyl betaine	NA
belongs with petroleum distillates	
petroleum distillate blend	NA
belongs with aromatic hydrocarbons	
aromatic hydrocarbon	NA
aromatic ketones	NA
belongs with glycol ethers, ethoxylated alcohols & other ethers	
Acetylenic Alcohol	NA
Aliphatic Alcohols, ethoxylated	NA
Aliphatic Alcohol glycol ether	NA
Ethoxylated alcohol linear	NA
Ethoxylated alcohols	NA
aliphatic alcohol polyglycol ether	NA

⁵⁸ Constituents listed without CAS #'s were tentatively placed in chemical categories based on the name listed on the MSDS or within confidential product composition disclosures. Many of the constituents reported without CAS #s, are mixtures which require further disclosure to the Department.

Chemical	CAS Number
alkyl aryl polyethoxy ethanol	NA
mixture of ethoxylated alcohols	NA
nonylphenol ethoxylate	NA
oxyalkylated alkylphenol	NA
polyethoxylated alkanol	NA
Oxyalkylated alcohol	NA
belongs with organic acids, salts, esters and related chemicals	
Aliphatic acids derivative	NA
Aliphatic Acids	NA
hydroxy acetic acid	NA
citric acid 50%, base formula	NA
Alkylaryl Sulfonate	NA
belongs with polymers	
hydroxypropyl guar	NA
2-acrylamido-2-methylpropanesulphonic acid sodium salt polymer	NA
Anionic copolymer	NA
Anionic polymer	NA
belongs with minerals, metals and other inorganics	
precipitated silica	NA
sodium hydroxide	NA
belongs with miscellaneous	
epa inert ingredient	NA
non-hazardous ingredients	NA
proprietary surfactant	NA
salt of fatty acid/polyamine reaction product	NA
salt of amine-carbonyl condensate	NA
surfactant blend	NA
sugar	NA
polymeric hydrocarbon mixture	NA
water and inert ingredients	NA

Although exposure to fracturing additives would not occur absent a failure of operational controls such as an accident, a spill or other non-routine incident, the health concerns noted by NYSDOH for each chemical category are discussed below. The discussion is based on available qualitative hazard information for chemicals from each category. Qualitative descriptions of potential health concerns discussed below generally apply to all exposure routes (i.e., ingestion, inhalation or skin contact) unless a specific exposure route is mentioned. For most chemical

categories, health information is available for only some of the chemicals in the category.

Toxicity testing data is quite limited for some chemicals, and less is known about their potential adverse effects. In particular, there is little meaningful information one way or the other about the potential impact on human health of chronic low level exposures to many of these chemicals, as could occur if an aquifer were to be contaminated as the result of a spill or release that is undetected and/or unremediated.

The overall risk of human health impacts occurring from hydraulic fracturing would depend on whether any human exposure occurs, such as, for example, in the event of a spill. If an actual contamination event such as a spill were to occur, more specific assessment of health risks would require obtaining detailed information specific to the event such as the specific additives being used and site-specific information about exposure pathways and environmental contaminant levels. Potential human health risks of a specific event would be assessed by comparison of case-specific data with existing drinking water standards or ambient air guidelines.⁵⁹ If needed, other chemical-specific health comparison values would be developed, based on a case-specific review of toxicity literature for the chemicals involved. A case-specific assessment would include information on how potential health effects might differ (both qualitatively and quantitatively) depending on the route of exposure.

Petroleum Distillate Products

Petroleum-based constituents are included in some fracturing fluid additive products. They are listed in MSDSs as various petroleum distillate fractions including kerosene, petroleum naphtha, aliphatic hydrocarbon, petroleum base oil, heavy aromatic petroleum naphtha, mineral spirits, hydrotreated light petroleum distillates, stoddard solvent or aromatic hydrocarbon. These can be found in a variety of additive products including corrosion inhibitors, friction reducers and solvents. Petroleum distillate products are mixtures that vary in their composition, but they have similar adverse health effects. Accidental ingestion that results in exposure to large amounts of petroleum distillates is associated with adverse effects on the gastrointestinal system and central nervous system. Skin contact with kerosene for short periods can cause skin irritation, blistering or peeling. Breathing petroleum distillate vapors can adversely affect the central nervous system.

⁵⁹ 10 NYCRR Part 5: Drinking Water Supplies; Subpart 5-1: Public Water Systems, Maximum Contaminant Levels; Department Policy DAR-1: Guidelines for the Control of Toxic Ambient Air Contaminants.

Aromatic Hydrocarbons

Some fracturing additive products contain specific aromatic hydrocarbon compounds that can also occur in petroleum distillates (benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene and xylenes or BTEX; naphthalene and related derivatives, trimethylbenzene, diethylbenzene, dodecylbenzene, cumene). BTEX compounds are associated with adverse effects on the nervous system, liver, kidneys and blood-cell-forming tissues. Benzene has been associated with an increased risk of leukemia in industrial workers who breathed elevated levels of the chemical over long periods of time in workplace air. Exposure to high levels of xylene has damaged the unborn offspring of laboratory animals exposed during pregnancy. Naphthalene is associated with adverse effects on red blood cells when people consumed naphthalene mothballs or when infants wore cloth diapers stored in mothballs. Laboratory animals breathing naphthalene vapors for their lifetimes had damage to their respiratory tracts and increased risk of nasal and lung tumors.

Glycols

Glycols occur in several fracturing fluid additives including crosslinkers, breakers, clay and iron controllers, friction reducers and scale inhibitors. Propylene glycol has low inherent toxicity and is used as an additive in food, cosmetic and drug products. However, high exposure levels of ethylene glycol adversely affect the kidneys and reproduction in laboratory animals.

Glycol Ethers

Glycol ethers and related ethoxylated alcohols and phenols are present in fracturing fluid additives, including corrosion inhibitors, surfactants and friction reducers. Some glycol ethers [e.g., monomethoxyethanol, monoethoxyethanol, propylene glycol monomethyl ether, ethylene glycol monobutyl ether (also known as 2-butoxyethanol)] can affect the male reproductive system and red blood cell formation in laboratory animals at high exposure levels.

Alcohols and Aldehydes

Alcohols are present in some fracturing fluid additive products, including corrosion inhibitors, foaming agents, iron and scale inhibitors and surfactants. Exposure to high levels of some alcohols (e.g., ethanol, methanol) affects the central nervous system.

Aldehydes are present in some fracturing fluid additive products, including corrosion inhibitors, scale inhibitors, surfactants and foaming agents. Aldehydes can be irritating to tissues when coming into direct contact with them. The most common symptoms include irritation of the skin, eyes, nose and throat, along with increased tearing. Formaldehyde is present in several additive products, although in most cases the concentration listed in the product is relatively low (< 1%) and is listed alongside a formaldehyde-based polymer constituent. Severe pain, vomiting, coma and possibly death can occur after drinking large amounts of formaldehyde. Several studies of laboratory rats exposed for life to high amounts of formaldehyde in air found that the rats developed nose cancer. Some studies of humans exposed to lower amounts of formaldehyde in workplace air found more cases of cancer of the nose and throat (nasopharyngeal cancer) than expected, but other studies have not found nasopharyngeal cancer in other groups of workers exposed to formaldehyde in air.

Amides

Acrylamide is used in some fracturing fluid additives to create polymers during the stimulation process. These polymers are part of some friction reducers and scale inhibitors. Although the reacted polymers that form during fracturing are of low inherent toxicity, unreacted acrylamide may be present in the fracturing fluid, or breakdown of the polymers could release acrylamide back into the flowback water. High levels of acrylamide damage the nervous system and reproductive system in laboratory animals and also cause cancer in laboratory animals.

Formamide may be used in some corrosion inhibitors products. Ingesting high levels of formamide adversely affects the female reproductive system in laboratory animals.

Amines

Amines are constituents of fracturing fluid products including corrosion inhibitors, cross-linkers, friction reducers, iron and clay controllers and surfactants. Chronic ingestion of mono-, di- or tri-ethanolamine adversely affects the liver and kidneys of laboratory animals.

Some quaternary ammonium compounds, such as dimethyldiallyl ammonium chloride, can react with chemicals used in some systems for drinking water disinfection to form nitrosamines. Nitrosamines cause genetic damage and cancer when ingested by laboratory animals.

Organic Acids, Salts, Esters and Related Chemicals

Organic acids and related chemicals are constituents of fracturing fluid products including acids, buffers, corrosion and scale inhibitors, friction reducers, iron and clay controllers, solvents and surfactants. Some short-chain organic acids such as formic, acetic and citric acids can be corrosive or irritating to skin and mucous membranes at high concentrations. However, acetic and citric acids are regularly consumed in foods (such as vinegar and citrus fruits) where they occur naturally at lower levels that are not harmful.

Some foaming agents and surfactant products contain organic chemicals included in this category that contain a sulfonic acid group (sulfonates). Exposure to elevated levels of sulfonates is irritating to the skin and mucous membranes.

Microbiocides

Microbiocides are antimicrobial pesticide products intended to inhibit the growth of various types of bacteria in the well. A variety of different chemicals are used in different microbiocide products that are proposed for Marcellus wells. Toxicity information is limited for several of the microbiocide chemicals. However, for some, high exposure has caused effects in the respiratory and gastrointestinal tracts, the kidneys, the liver and the nervous system in laboratory animals.

Other Constituents

The remaining chemicals listed in MSDSs and confidential product composition disclosures provided to the Department are included in Table 5.8 under the following categories: polymers, miscellaneous chemicals that did not fit another chemical category and product constituents that were not identified by a CAS number. Readily available health effects information is lacking for many of these constituents, but one that is relatively well studied is discussed here. In the event of environmental contamination involving chemicals lacking readily available health effects information, the toxicology literature would have to be researched for chemical-specific toxicity data or toxicity data for closely-related chemicals.

1,4-dioxane may be used in some surfactant products. 1,4-Dioxane is irritating to the eyes and nose when vapors are breathed. Exposure to very high levels may cause severe kidney and liver effects and possibly death. Studies in animals have shown that breathing vapors of 1,4-dioxane,

swallowing liquid 1,4-dioxane or contaminated drinking water, or having skin contact with liquid 1,4-dioxane affects mainly the liver and kidneys. Laboratory rats and mice that drank water containing 1,4-dioxane during most of their lives developed liver cancer; the rats also developed cancer inside the nose.

Conclusions

The hydraulic fracturing product additives proposed for use in NYS and used for fracturing horizontal Marcellus Shale wells in other states contain similar types of chemical constituents as the products that have been used for many years for hydraulic fracturing of traditional vertical wells in NYS. Some of the same products are used in both well types. Chemicals in products proposed for use in high-volume hydraulic fracturing include some that, based mainly on occupational studies or high-level exposures in laboratory animals, have been shown to cause effects such as carcinogenicity, mutagenicity, reproductive toxicity, neurotoxicity or organ damage. This information only indicates the types of toxic effects these chemicals can cause under certain circumstances but does not mean that use of these chemicals would cause exposure in every case or that exposure would cause those effects in every case. Whether or not people actually experience a toxic effect from a chemical depends on whether or not they experience any exposure to the chemical along with many other factors including, among others, the amount, timing, duration and route of exposure and individual characteristics that can contribute to differences in susceptibility.

The total amount of fracturing additives and water used in hydraulic fracturing of horizontal wells is considerably larger than for traditional vertical wells. This suggests the potential environmental consequences of an upset condition could be proportionally larger for horizontal well drilling and fracturing operations. As mentioned earlier, the 1992 GEIS addressed hydraulic fracturing in Chapter 9, and NYSDOH's review did not identify any potential exposure scenarios associated with horizontal drilling and high-volume hydraulic fracturing that are qualitatively different from those addressed in the 1992 GEIS.

5.5 Transport of Hydraulic Fracturing Additives

Fracturing additives are transported in "DOT-approved" trucks or containers. The trucks are typically flat-bed trucks that carry a number of strapped-on plastic totes which contain the liquid

additive products. (Totes are further described in Section 5.6.). Liquid products used in smaller quantities are transported in one-gallon sealed jugs carried in the side boxes of the flat-bed. Some liquid constituents, such as hydrochloric acid, are transferred in tank trucks.

Dry additives are transported on flat-beds in 50- or 55-pound bags which are set on pallets containing 40 bags each and shrink-wrapped, or in five-gallon sealed plastic buckets. When smaller quantities of some dry products such as powdered biocides are used, they are contained in a double-bag system and may be transported in the side boxes of the truck that constitutes the blender unit.

Regulations that reference “DOT-approved” trucks or containers that are applicable to the transportation and storage of hazardous fracturing additives refer to federal (USDOT) regulations for registering and permitting commercial motor carriers and drivers, and established standards for hazardous containers. The United Nations (UN) also has established standards and criteria for containers. New York is one of many states where the state agency (NYSDOT) has adopted the federal regulations for transporting hazardous materials interstate. The NYSDOT has its own requirements for intrastate transportation.⁶⁰ For informational purposes, Chapter 8 contains descriptions of applicable NYSDOT and USDOT regulations.

Transporting fracturing additives that are hazardous is comprehensively regulated under existing regulations. The regulated materials include the hazardous additives and mixtures containing threshold levels of hazardous materials. These transported materials are maintained in the USDOT or UN-approved storage containers until the materials are consumed at the drill sites.⁶¹

5.6 On-Site Storage and Handling of Hydraulic Fracturing Additives

Prior to use, additives remain at the wellsite in the containers and on the trucks in which they are transported and delivered. Storage time is generally less than a week for economic and logistical reasons, materials are not delivered until fracturing operations are set to commence, and only the amount needed for scheduled continuous fracturing operations is delivered at any one time.

⁶⁰ Alpha 2009, p. 31.

⁶¹ Alpha 2009, p. 31.

As detailed in Section 5.4.3, there are 13 classes of additives, based on their purpose or use; not all classes would be used at every well; and only one product in each class would typically be used per job. Therefore, although the chemical lists in Table 5.7 and Table 5.8 reflect the constituents of 235 products, typically no more than 12 products consisting of far fewer chemicals than listed would be present at one time at any given site.

When the hydraulic fracturing procedure commences, hoses are used to transfer liquid additives from storage containers to a truck-mounted blending unit. The flat-bed trucks that deliver liquid totes to the site may be equipped with their own pumping systems for transferring the liquid additive to the blending unit when fracturing operations are in progress. Flat-beds that do not have their own pumps rely on pumps attached to the blending unit. Additives delivered in tank trucks are pumped to the blending unit or the well directly from the tank truck. Dry additives are poured by hand into a feeder system on the blending unit. The blended fracturing solution is not stored, but is immediately mixed with proppant and pumped into the cased and cemented wellbore. This process is conducted and monitored by qualified personnel, and devices such as manual valves provide additional controls when liquids are transferred. Common observed practices during visits to drill sites in the northern tier of Pennsylvania included lined containments and protective barriers where chemicals were stored and blending took place.⁶²

5.6.1 Summary of Additive Container Types

The most common containers are 220-gallon to 375-gallon high-density polyethylene (HDPE) totes, which are generally cube-shaped and encased in a metal cage. These totes have a bottom release port to transfer the chemicals, which is closed and capped during transport, and a top fill port with a screw-on cap and temporary lock mechanism. Photo 5.18 depicts a transport truck with totes.

⁶² Alpha, 2009, p. 35.



Photo 5.18 - Transport trucks with totes

To summarize, the storage containers at any given site during the short period of time between delivery and completion of continuous fracturing operations will consist of all or some of the following:

- Plastic totes encased in metal cages, ranging in volume from 220 gallons to 375 gallons, which are strapped on to flat bed trucks pursuant to USDOT and NYSDOT regulations;
- Tank trucks;
- Palletized 50-55 gallon bags, made of coated paper or plastic (40 bags per pallet, shrink-wrapped as a unit and then wrapped again in plastic);
- One-gallon jugs with perforated sealed twist lids stored inside boxes on the flat-bed; and
- Smaller double-bag systems stored inside boxes on the blending unit.

5.7 Source Water for High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing

As discussed in Chapter 6, it is estimated, based on water withdrawals in the Susquehanna River Basin in Pennsylvania, that average water use per well in New York could be 3.6 million gallons. Operators could withdraw water from surface or ground water sources themselves or may purchase it from suppliers. The suppliers may include, among others, municipalities with excess capacity in their public supply systems, or industrial entities with wastewater effluent streams that meet usability criteria for hydraulic fracturing. Potential environmental impacts of water sourcing are discussed in Chapter 6, and mitigation measures to address potential environmental impacts are discussed in Chapter 7. Photos 5.19 a and b depict a water withdrawal facility along the Chemung River in the northern tier of Pennsylvania.

Factors affecting usability of a given source include:⁶³

Availability – The “owner” of the source needs to be identified, contact made, and agreements negotiated.

Distance/route from the source to the point of use – The costs of trucking large quantities of water increases and water supply efficiency decreases when longer distances and travel times are involved. Also, the selected routes need to consider roadway wear, bridge weight limits, local zoning limits, impacts on residents, and related traffic concerns.

Available quantity – Use of fewer, larger water sources avoids the need to utilize multiple smaller sources.

Reliability – A source that is less prone to supply fluctuations or periods of unavailability would be more highly valued than an intermittent and less steady source.

Accessibility – Water from deep mines and saline aquifers may be more difficult to access than a surface water source unless adequate infrastructure is in place. Access to a municipal or industrial plant or reservoir may be inconvenient due to security or other concerns. Access to a stream may be difficult due to terrain, competing land uses, or other issues.

⁶³ URS, 2009, p. 7-1.

Quality of water – The fracturing fluid serves a very specific purpose at different stages of the fracturing process. The composition of the water could affect the efficacy of the additives and equipment used. The water may require pre-treatment or additional additives may be needed to overcome problematic characteristics.

Potential concerns with water quality include scaling from precipitation of barium sulfate and calcium sulfate; high concentrations of chlorides, which could increase the need for friction reducers; very high or low pH (e.g., water from mines); high concentrations of iron (water from quarries or mines) which could potentially plug fractures; microbes that can accelerate corrosion, scaling or other gas production; and high concentrations of sulfur (e.g. water from flue gas desulfurization impoundments), which could contaminate natural gas. In addition, water sources of variable quality could present difficulties.

Permittability – Applicable permits and approvals would need to be identified and assessed as to feasibility and schedule for obtaining approvals, conditions and limitations on approval that could impact the activity or require mitigation, and initial and ongoing fees and charges. Preliminary discussions with regulating authorities would be prudent to identify fatal flaws or obstacles.

Disposal – Proper disposal of flowback from hydraulic fracturing will be necessary, or appropriate treatment for re-use provided. Utilizing an alternate source with sub-standard quality water could add to treatment and disposal costs.

Cost – Sources that have a higher associated cost to acquire, treat, transport, permit, access or dispose, typically will be less desirable.

5.7.1 Delivery of Source Water to the Well Pad

Water could be delivered by truck or pipeline directly from the source to the well pad, or could be delivered by trucks or pipeline from centralized water storage or staging facilities consisting of tanks or engineered impoundments. Photo 5.21 shows a fresh water pipeline in Bradford County, Pennsylvania, to move fresh water from an impoundment to a well pad.

At the well pad, water is typically stored in 500-barrel steel tanks. These mobile storage tanks provide temporary storage of fresh water, and preclude the need for installation of centralized impoundments. They are double-walled, wheeled tanks with sealed entry and fill ports on top and heavy-duty drain valves with locking mechanisms at the base. These tanks are similar in construction to the ones used to temporarily store flowback water; see Photo 5.7.

Potential environmental impacts related to water transportation, including the number and duration of truck trips for moving both fluid and temporary storage tanks, will be addressed in Chapter 6. Mitigation measures are described in Chapter 7.

5.7.2 Use of Centralized Impoundments for Fresh Water Storage

Operators have indicated that centralized water storage impoundments will likely be utilized as part of a water management plan. Such facilities would allow the operators to withdraw water from surface water bodies during periods of high flow and store the water for use in future hydraulic fracturing activities, thus avoiding or reducing the need to withdraw water during lower-flow periods when the potential for negative impacts to aquatic environments and municipal drinking water suppliers is greater.

The proposed engineered impoundments would likely be constructed from compacted earth excavated from the impoundment site and then compressed to form embankments around the excavated area. Typically, such impoundments would then be lined to minimize the loss of water due to infiltration. See Section 8.2.2.2 for a description of the Department's existing regulatory program related to construction, operation and maintenance of such impoundments.

It is likely that an impoundment would service well pads within a radius of up to four miles, and that impoundment volume could be several million gallons with surface acreage of up to five acres. The siting and sizing of such impoundments would be affected by factors such as terrain, environmental conditions, natural barriers, surrounding land use and proximity to nearby development, particularly residential development, as well as by the operators' lease positions. It is not anticipated that a single centralized impoundment would service wells from more than one well operator.

Photo 5.22 depicts a centralized freshwater impoundment and its construction.



Photos 5.19 a & b Fortuna SRBC-approved Chemung River water withdrawal facility, Towanda PA. Source:



Photo 5.20 Fresh water supply pond. Black pipe in pond is a float to keep suction away from pond bottom liner. Ponds are completely enclosed by wire fence. Source: NYS DEC 2009.



Photo 5.21 Water pipeline from Fortuna central freshwater impoundments, Troy PA. Source: NYS DEC 2009.



Photo 5.22 Construction of freshwater impoundment in Upshur Co. WV. Source: Chesapeake Energy

5.8 Hydraulic Fracturing Design

Service companies design hydraulic fracturing procedures based on the rock properties of the prospective hydrocarbon reservoir. For any given area and formation, hydraulic fracturing design is an iterative process, i.e., it is continually improved and refined as development progresses and more data is collected. In a new area, it may begin with computer modeling to simulate various fracturing designs and their effect on the height, length and orientation of the induced fractures.⁶⁴ After the procedure is actually performed, the data gathered can be used to optimize future treatments.⁶⁵ Data to define the extent and orientation of fracturing may be gathered during fracturing treatments by use of microseismic fracture mapping, tilt measurements, tracers, or proppant tagging.^{66,67} ICF International, under contract to NYSERDA to provide research assistance for this document, observed that fracture monitoring by these methods is not regularly used because of cost, but is commonly reserved for evaluating new techniques, determining the effectiveness of fracturing in newly developed areas, or calibrating hydraulic fracturing models.⁶⁸ Comparison of production pressure and flow-rate analysis to pre-fracture modeling is a more common method for evaluating the results of a hydraulic fracturing procedure.⁶⁹

The objective in any hydraulic fracturing procedure is to limit fractures to the target formation. Excessive fracturing is undesirable from a cost standpoint because of the expense associated with unnecessary use of time and materials.⁷⁰ Economics would also dictate limiting the use of water, additives and proppants, as well as the need for fluid storage and handling equipment, to what is needed to treat the target formation.⁷¹ In addition, if adjacent rock formations contain water, then fracturing into them would bring water into the reservoir formation and the well. This could

⁶⁴ GWPC, April 2009, p. 57.

⁶⁵ GWPC, April 2009, p. 57.

⁶⁶ GWPC, April 2009, p. 57.

⁶⁷ ICF, 2009, pp. 5-6.

⁶⁸ ICF, 2009, p.6.

⁶⁹ ICF, 2009, pp. 6-8.

⁷⁰ GWPC, April 2009, p. 58.

⁷¹ ICF, 2009, p. 14.

result in added costs to handle production brine, or could result in loss of economic hydrocarbon production from the well.⁷²

5.8.1 Fracture Development

ICF reviewed how hydraulic fracturing is affected by the rock's natural compressive stresses.⁷³

The dimensions of a solid material are controlled by major, intermediate and minor principal stresses within the material. In rock layers in their natural setting, these stresses are vertical and horizontal. Vertical stress increases with the thickness of overlying rock and exerts pressure on a rock formation to compress it vertically and expand it laterally. However, because rock layers are nearly infinite in horizontal extent relative to their thickness, lateral expansion is constrained by the pressure of the horizontally adjacent rock mass.⁷⁴

Rock stresses may decrease over geologic time as a result of erosion acting to decrease vertical rock thickness. Horizontal stress decreases due to erosion more slowly than vertical stress, so rock layers that are closer to the surface have a higher ratio of horizontal stress to vertical stress.⁷⁵

Fractures form perpendicular to the direction of least stress. If the minor principal stress is horizontal, fractures will be vertical. The vertical fractures would then propagate horizontally in the direction of the major and intermediate principal stresses.⁷⁶

ICF notes that the initial stress field created during deposition and uniform erosion may become more complex as a result of geologic processes such as non-uniform erosion, folding and uplift. These processes result in topographic features that create differential stresses, which tend to die out at depths approximating the scale of the topographic features.⁷⁷ ICF – citing PTTC, 2006 – concludes that: “In the Appalachian Basin, the stress state would be expected to lead to

⁷² GWPC, April 2009, p. 58.

⁷³ ICF, 2009, pp. 14-15.

⁷⁴ ICF, 2009, pp. 14-15.

⁷⁵ ICF, 2009, pp. 14-15.

⁷⁶ ICF, 2009, pp. 14-15.

⁷⁷ ICF, 2009, pp. 14-15.

predominantly vertical fractures below about 2500 feet, with a tendency towards horizontal fractures at shallower depths.”⁷⁸

5.8.2 *Methods for Limiting Fracture Growth*

ICF reports that, despite ongoing laboratory and field experimentation, the mechanisms that limit vertical fracture growth are not completely understood.⁷⁹ Pre-treatment modeling, as discussed above, is one tool for designing fracture treatments based on projected fracture behavior. Other control techniques identified by ICF include:⁸⁰

- Use of a friction reducer, which helps to limit fracture height by reducing pumping loss within fractures, thereby maintaining higher fluid pressure at the fracture tip;
- Measuring fracture growth in real time by microseismic analysis, allowing the fracturing process to be stopped upon achieving the desired fracturing extent; and
- Reducing the length of wellbore fractured in each stage of the procedure, thereby focusing the applied pressure and proppant placement, and allowing for modifications to the procedure in subsequent stages based on monitoring the results of each stage.

5.8.3 *Hydraulic Fracturing Design – Summary*

ICF provided the following summary of the current state of hydraulic fracturing design to contain induced fractures in the target formation:

Hydraulic fracturing analysis, design, and field practices have advanced dramatically in the last quarter century. Materials and techniques are constantly evolving to increase the efficiency of the fracturing process and increase reservoir production. Analytical techniques to predict fracture development, although still imperfect, provide better estimates of the fracturing results. Perhaps most significantly, fracture monitoring techniques are now available that provide confirmation of the extent of fracturing, allowing refinement of the procedures for subsequent stimulation activities to confine the fractures to the desired production zone.⁸¹

Photo 5.23 shows personnel monitoring a hydraulic fracturing procedure.

⁷⁸ ICF, 2009, pp. 14-15.

⁷⁹ ICF, 2009, p. 16.

⁸⁰ ICF, 2009, p. 17.

⁸¹ ICF, 2009, p. 19.



Photo 5.23 _Personnel monitoring a hydraulic fracturing procedure. Source: Fortuna Energy.

5.9 Hydraulic Fracturing Procedure

The fracturing procedure involves the controlled use of water and chemical additives, pumped under pressure into the cased and cemented wellbore. Composition, purpose, transportation, storage and handling of additives are addressed in previous sections of this document. Water and fluid management, including source, transportation, storage and disposition, are also discussed elsewhere in this document. Potential impacts, mitigation measures and the permit process are addressed in Chapters 6, 7, and 8. The discussion in this section describes only the specific physical procedure of high-volume hydraulic fracturing. Except where other references are specifically noted, operational details are derived from permit applications on file with the Department's Division of Mineral Resources (DMN) and responses to the Department's information requests provided by several operators and service companies about their planned operations in New York.

Hydraulic fracturing occurs after the well is cased and cemented to protect fresh water zones and isolate the target hydrocarbon-bearing zone, and after the drilling rig and its associated

equipment have been removed. There will typically be at least three strings of cemented casing in the well during fracturing operations. The outer string (i.e., surface casing) extends below fresh ground water and would have been cemented to the surface before the well was drilled deeper. The intermediate casing string, also called protective string, is installed between the surface and production strings. The inner string (i.e., production casing) typically extends from the ground surface to the toe of the horizontal well. Depending on the depth of the well and local geologic conditions, there may be one or more intermediate casing strings. The inner production casing is the only casing string that will experience the high pressures associated with the fracturing treatment.⁸² Anticipated Marcellus Shale fracturing pressures range from 5,000 pounds per square inch (psi) to 10,000 psi, so production casing with a greater internal yield pressure than the anticipated fracturing pressure must be installed.

The last steps prior to fracturing are installation of a wellhead (referred to as a “frac tree”) that is designed and pressure-rated specifically for the fracturing operation, and pressure testing of the hydraulic fracturing system. Photo 5.24 depicts a frac tree that is pressure-rated for 10,000 psi. Before perforating the casing and pumping fracturing fluid into the well, the operator pumps fresh water, brine or drilling mud to pressure test the production casing, frac tree and associated lines. Test pumping is performed to at least the maximum anticipated treatment pressure, which is maintained for a period of time while the operator monitors pressure gauges. The purpose of this test is to verify, prior to pumping fracturing fluid, that the casing, frac tree and associated lines will successfully hold pressure and contain the treatment. The test pressure may exceed the maximum anticipated treatment pressure, but must remain below the working pressure of the lowest rated component of the hydraulic fracturing system, including the production casing.

Flowback equipment, including pipes, manifolds, a gas-water separator and tanks are connected to the frac tree and this portion of the flowback system is pressure tested prior to flowing the well.

⁸² For more details on wellbore casing and cement: see Appendix 8 for current casing and cementing practices required for all wells in New York, Appendix 9 for additional permit conditions for wells drilled within the mapped areas of primary and principal aquifers, and Chapter 7 and Appendix 10 for proposed new permit conditions to address high-volume hydraulic fracturing.



Photo 5.24 - Three Fortuna Energy wells being prepared for hydraulic fracturing, with 10,000 psi well head and goat head attached to lines. Troy PA. Source: New York State Department of Environmental Conservation 2009

The hydraulic fracturing process itself is conducted in stages by successively isolating, perforating and fracturing portions of the horizontal wellbore starting with the far end, or toe. Reasons for conducting the operation in stages are to maintain sufficient pressure to fracture the entire length of the wellbore,⁸³ to achieve better control of fracture placement and to allow changes from stage to stage to accommodate varying geological conditions along the wellbore if necessary.⁸⁴ The length of wellbore treated in each stage will vary based on site-specific geology and the characteristics of the well itself, but may typically be 300 to 500 feet. In that case, the multi-stage fracturing operation for a 4,000-foot lateral would consist of eight to 13 fracturing stages. Each stage may require 300,000 to 600,000 gallons of water, so that the entire multi-stage fracturing operation for a single well would require 2.4 million to 7.8 million gallons

⁸³ GPWC, April 2009, p. 58.

⁸⁴ GPWC, April 2009, p. 58.

of water.⁸⁵ More or less water may be used depending on local conditions, evolution in fracturing technology, or other factors which influence the operator's and service company's decisions.

The entire multi-stage fracturing operation for a single horizontal well typically takes two to five days, but may take longer for longer lateral wellbores, for many-stage jobs or if unexpected delays occur. Not all of this time is spent actually pumping fluid under pressure, as intervals are required between stages for preparing the hole and equipment for the next stage. Pumping rate may be as high as 1,260 to 3,000 gallons per minute (gpm).^{86,87} At these rates, all the stages in the largest volume fracturing job described in the previous paragraph would require between approximately 40 and 100 hours of intermittent pumping during a 2- to 5-day period. Pumping rates may vary from job-to-job and some operators have reported pump rates in excess of 3,000 gpm and hydraulic fracturing at these higher rates could shorten the overall time spent pumping.

The time spent pumping is the only time, except for when the well is shut-in, that wellbore pressure exceeds pressure in the surrounding formation. Therefore, the hours spent pumping are the only time that fluid in fractures and in the rocks surrounding the fractures would move away from the wellbore instead of towards it. ICF International, under contract to NYSERDA, estimated the maximum rate of seepage in strata lying above the target Marcellus zone, assuming hypothetically that the entire bedrock column between the Marcellus and a fresh groundwater aquifer is hydraulically connected. Under most conditions evaluated by ICF, the seepage rate would be substantially less than 10 feet per day, or 5 inches per hour of pumping time.⁸⁸ More information about ICF's analysis is in Chapter 6 and in Appendix 11.

Within each fracturing stage is a series of sub-stages, or steps.^{89, 90} The first step is typically an acid treatment, which may also involve corrosion inhibitors and iron controls. Acid cleans the

⁸⁵ Applications on file with the Department propose volumes on the lower end of this range. The higher end of the range is based on GWPC (April 2009), pp. 58-59, where an example of a single-stage Marcellus fracturing treatment using 578,000 gallons of fluid is presented. Stage lengths used in the above calculation (300 – 500 feet) were provided by Fortuna Energy and Chesapeake Energy in presentations to Department staff during field tours of operations in the northern tier of Pennsylvania.

⁸⁶ ICF Task 1, 2009, p. 3.

⁸⁷ GPWC, April 2009, p. 59.

⁸⁸ ICF Task 1, 2009, pp. 27-28.

⁸⁹ URS, 2009, pp. 2-12.

near-wellbore area accessed through the perforated casing and cement, while the other additives that may be used in this phase reduce rust formation and prevent precipitation of metal oxides that could plug the shale. The acid treatment is followed by the “slickwater pad,” comprised primarily of water and a friction-reducing agent which helps optimize the pumping rate. Fractures form during this stage when the fluid pressure exceeds the minimum normal stress in the rock mass plus whatever minimal tensile stress exists.⁹¹ The fractures are filled with fluid, and as the fracture width grows, more fluid must be pumped at the same or greater pressure exerted to maintain and propagate the fractures.⁹² As proppant is added, other additives such as a gelling agent and crosslinker may be used to increase viscosity and improve the fluid’s capacity to carry proppant. Fine-grained proppant is added first, and carried deepest into the newly induced fractures, followed by coarser-grained proppant. Breakers may be used to reduce the fluid viscosity and help release the proppant into the fractures. Biocides may also be added to inhibit the growth of bacteria that could interfere with the process and produce hydrogen sulfide. Clay stabilizers may be used to prevent swelling and migration of formation clays. The final step in the hydraulic fracturing process is a freshwater or brine flush to clean out the wellbore and equipment. After hydraulic fracturing is complete, the stage plugs are removed through a milling process routinely accomplished by a relatively small workover rig, snubbing unit and/or coiled tubing unit. A snubbing unit or coiled tubing unit may be required if the well is not dead or if pressure is anticipated after milling through the plugs. Stage plugs may be removed before or after initial flowback depending upon the type of plug used.

Photos 5.25 and 5.26 depict the same wellsite during and after hydraulic fracturing operations, with Photo 5.25 labeled to identify the equipment that is present onsite. Photo 5.27 is a labeled close-up of a wellhead and equipment at the site during hydraulic fracturing operations.

⁹⁰ GWPC, April 2009, pp. 58-60.

⁹¹ ICF Task 1, 2009. p. 16.

⁹² ICF Task 1, 2009. p. 16.



Photo 5.25 (Above) Hydraulic Fracturing Operation

These photos show a hydraulic fracturing operation at a Fortuna Energy multi-well site in Troy PA. At the time the photos were taken, preparations for fracturing were underway but fracturing had not yet occurred for any of the wells.

Hydraulic Fracturing Operation Equipment

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Well head and frac tree with ‘Goat Head’ (See Figure 5.27 for more detail) | 11. Frac additive trucks |
| 2. Flow line (for flowback & testing) | 12. Blender |
| 3. Sand separator for flowback | 13. Frac control and monitoring center |
| 4. Flowback tanks | 14. Fresh water impoundment |
| 5. Line heaters | 15. Fresh water supply pipeline |
| 6. Flare stack | 16. Extra tanks |
| 7. Pump trucks | |
| 8. Sand hogs | |
| 9. Sand trucks | |
| 10. Acid trucks | |

Production equipment

- | |
|--------------------------|
| 17. Line heaters |
| 18. Separator-meter skid |
| 19. Production manifold |



Photo 5.26 Fortuna multi-well pad after hydraulic fracturing of three wells and removal of most hydraulic fracturing equipment. Production equipment for wells on right side of photo. Source: Fortuna Energy, July, 2009.




Photo 5.27. Wellhead and Frac Equipment

- A. Well head and frac tree (valves)
- B. Goat Head (for frac flow connections)
- C. Wireline (used to convey equipment into wellbore)
- D. Wireline Blow Out Preventer
- E. Wireline lubricator
- F. Crane to support wireline equipment
- G. Additional wells
- H. Flow line (for flowback & testing)

5.10 Re-fracturing

Developers may decide to re-fracture a well to extend its economic life whenever the production rate declines significantly below past production rates or below the estimated reservoir potential.⁹³ According to ICF International, fractured Barnett Shale wells generally would benefit from re-fracturing within five years of completion, but the time between fracture stimulations can be less than one year or greater than ten years.⁹⁴ However, Marcellus operators with whom the Department has discussed this question have stated their expectation that re-fracturing will be a rare event.

It is too early in the development of shale reservoirs in New York to predict the frequency with which re-fracturing of horizontal wells, using the slickwater method, may occur. ICF provided some general information on the topic of re-fracturing.

Wells may be re-fractured multiple times, may be fractured along sections of the wellbore that were not previously fractured, and may be subject to variations from the original fracturing technique.⁹⁵ The Department notes that while one stated reason to re-fracture may be to treat sections of the wellbore that were not previously fractured, this scenario does not seem applicable to Marcellus Shale development. Current practice in the Marcellus Shale in the northern tier of Pennsylvania is to treat the entire lateral wellbore, in stages, during the initial procedure.

Several other reasons may develop to repeat the fracturing procedure at a given well. Fracture conductivity may decline due to proppant embedment into the fracture walls, proppant crushing, closure of fractures under increased effective stress as the pore pressure declines, clogging from fines migration, and capillary entrapment of liquid at the fracture and formation boundary.⁹⁶ Re-fracturing can restore the original fracture height and length, and can often extend the fracture length beyond the original fracture dimensions.⁹⁷ Changes in formation stresses due to the

⁹³ ICF Task 1, 2009, p. 18.

⁹⁴ ICF Task 1, 2009, p. 18.

⁹⁵ ICF Task 1, 2009, p. 17.

⁹⁶ ICF Task 1, 2009, p. 17.

⁹⁷ ICF Task 1, 2009, p. 17.

reduction in pressure from production can sometimes cause new fractures to propagate at a different orientation than the original fractures, further extending the fracture zone.⁹⁸

Factors that influence the decision to re-fracture include past well production rates, experience with other wells in the same formation, the costs of re-fracturing, and the current price for gas.⁹⁹ Factors in addition to the costs of re-fracturing and the market price for gas that determine cost-effectiveness include the characteristics of the geologic formation and the time value of money.¹⁰⁰

Regardless of how often it occurs, if the high-volume hydraulic fracturing procedure is repeated it will entail the same type and duration of surface activity at the well pad as the initial procedure. The rate of subsurface fluid movement during pumping operations would be the same as discussed above. It is important to note, however, that between fracturing operations, while the well is producing, flow direction is towards the fracture zone and the wellbore. Therefore, total fluid movement away from the wellbore as a result of repeated fracture treatments would be less than the sum of the distance moved during each fracture treatment.

5.11 Fluid Return

After the hydraulic fracturing procedure is completed and pressure is released, the direction of fluid flow reverses. The well is "cleaned up" by allowing water and excess proppant to flow up through the wellbore to the surface. Both the process and the returned water are commonly referred to as "flowback."

5.11.1 Flowback Water Recovery

Flowback water recoveries reported from horizontal Marcellus wells in the northern tier of Pennsylvania range between 9 and 35 percent of the fracturing fluid pumped. Flowback water volume, then, could be 216,000 gallons to 2.7 million gallons per well, based on a pumped fluid estimate of 2.4 million to 7.8 million gallons, as presented in Section 5.9. This volume is generally recovered within two to eight weeks, then the well's water production rate sharply

⁹⁸ ICF Task 1, 2009, pp. 17-18.

⁹⁹ ICF Task 1, 2009, p. 18.

¹⁰⁰ ICF Task 1, 2009, p. 18.

declines and levels off at a few barrels per day for the remainder of its producing life. URS Corporation reported that limited time-series data indicates that approximately 60 percent of the total flowback occurs in the first four days after fracturing.¹⁰¹

5.11.2 Flowback Water Handling at the Wellsite

As discussed throughout this document, the Department will require water-tight tanks for on-site (i.e., well pad) handling of flowback water for wells covered by the SGEIS.

5.11.3 Flowback Water Characteristics

The 1992 GEIS identified high TDS, chlorides, surfactants, gelling agents and metals as the components of greatest concern in spent gel and foam fracturing fluids (i.e., flowback). Slickwater fracturing fluids proposed for Marcellus well stimulation may contain other additives such as corrosion inhibitors, friction reducers and microbiocides, in addition to the contaminants of concern identified in the GEIS. Most fracturing fluid additives used in a well can be expected in the flowback water, although some are expected to be consumed in the well (e.g., strong acids) or react during the fracturing process to form different products (e.g., polymer precursors).

The following description of flowback water characteristics was provided by URS Corporation,¹⁰² under contract to NYSERDA. This discussion is based on a limited number of analyses from out-of-state operations, without corresponding complete compositional information on the fracturing additives that were used at the source wells. The Department did not direct or oversee sample collection or analysis efforts. Most fracturing fluid components are not included as analytes in standard chemical scans of flowback samples that were provided to the Department, so little information is available to document whether and at what concentrations most fracturing chemicals occur in flowback water. Because of the limited availability at this time of flowback water quality data, conservative and strict mitigation measures regarding flowback water handling are proposed in Chapter 7, and additional data will be required for alternative proposals.

¹⁰¹ URS, 2009, p. 3-2.

¹⁰² URS, 2009, p. 3-2 & 2011, p. 3-2.

Flowback fluids include the fracturing fluids pumped into the well, which consists of water and additives discussed in Section 5.4; any new compounds that may have formed due to reactions between additives; and substances mobilized from within the shale formation due to the fracturing operation. Some portion of the proppant may return to the surface with flowback, but operators strive to minimize proppant return: the ultimate goal of hydraulic fracturing is to convey and deposit the proppant within fractures in the shale to maximize gas flow.

Marcellus Shale is of marine origin and, therefore, contains high levels of salt. This is further evidenced by analytical results of flowback provided to the Department by well operators and service companies from operations based in Pennsylvania. The results vary in level of detail. Some companies provided analytical results for one day for several wells, while other companies provided several analytical results for different days of the same well (i.e. time-series).

Typical classes of parameters present in flowback fluid are:

- Dissolved solids (chlorides, sulfates, and calcium);
- Metals (calcium, magnesium, barium, strontium);
- Suspended solids;
- Mineral scales (calcium carbonate and barium sulfate);
- Bacteria - acid producing bacteria and sulfate reducing bacteria;
- Friction reducers;
- Iron solids (iron oxide and iron sulfide);
- Dispersed clay fines, colloids & silts; and
- Acid gases (carbon dioxide, hydrogen sulfide).

A list of parameters detected in a limited set of analytical results is provided in Table 5.9.

Typical concentrations of parameters other than radionuclides, based on limited data from Pennsylvania and West Virginia, are provided in Table 5.10 and Table 5.11. Flowback parameters were organized by CAS number, whenever available. Radionuclides are separately discussed and tabulated in Section 5.11.3.3.

Table 5.9 - Parameters present in a limited set of flowback analytical results¹⁰³ (Updated July 2011)

CAS Number	Parameters Detected in Flowback from PA and WV Operations
00087-61-6	1,2,3-Trichlorobenzene
00095-63-6	1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene
00108-67-8	1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene
00105-67-9	2,4-Dimethylphenol
00087-65-0	2,6-Dichlorophenol
00078-93-3	2-Butanone / Methyl ethyl ketone
00091-57-6	2-Methylnaphthalene
00095-48-7	2-Methylphenol
109-06-8	2-Picoline (2-methyl pyridine)
00067-63-0	2-Propanol / Isopropyl Alcohol / Isopropanol / Propan-2-ol
00108-39-4	3-Methylphenol
00106-44-5	4-Methylphenol
00072-55-9	4,4 DDE
00057-97-6	7,12-Dimethylbenz(a)anthracene
00064-19-7	Acetic acid
00067-64-1	Acetone
00098-86-2	Acetophenone
00107-13-1	Acrylonitrile
00309-00-2	Aldrin
07439-90-5	Aluminum
07440-36-0	Antimony
07664-41-7	Aqueous ammonia
12672-29-6	Aroclor 1248
07440-38-2	Arsenic
07440-39-3	Barium
00071-43-2	Benzene
00050-32-8	Benzo(a)pyrene
00205-99-2	Benzo(b)fluoranthene
191-24-2	Benzo(ghi)perylene
00207-08-9	Benzo(k)fluoranthene
00100-51-6	Benzyl alcohol
07440-41-7	Beryllium
00111-44-4	Bis(2-Chloroethyl) ether
00117-81-7	Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate / Di (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate
07440-42-8	Boron
24959-67-9	Bromide
00075-25-2	Bromoform
07440-43-9	Cadmium
07440-70-2	Calcium
00124-38-9	Carbon Dioxide
00075-15-0	Carbondisulfide
00124-48-1	Chlorodibromomethane
00067-66-3	Chloroform
07440-47-3	Chromium

¹⁰³ This table contains information compiled from flowback analyses submitted to the Department by well operators as well as flowback information from the Marcellus Shale Coalition Study.

CAS Number	Parameters Detected in Flowback from PA and WV Operations
07440-48-4	Cobalt
07440-50-8	Copper
00057-12-5	Cyanide
00319-85-7	Cyclohexane (beta BHC)
00058-89-9	Cyclohexane (gamma BHC)
00055-70-3	Dibenz(a,h)anthracene
00075-27-4	Dichlorobromomethane
00084-74-2	Di-n-butyl phthalate
00122-39-4	Diphenylamine
00959-98-8	Endosulfan I
33213-65-9	Endosulfan II
07421-93-4	Endrin aldehyde
00107-21-1	Ethane-1,2-diol / Ethylene Glycol
00100-41-4	Ethyl Benzene
00206-44-0	Fluoranthene
00086-73-7	Fluorene
16984-48-8	Fluoride
00076-44-8	Heptachlor
01024-57-3	Heptachlor epoxide
00193-39-5	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene
07439-89-6	Iron
00098-82-8	Isopropylbenzene (cumene)
07439-92-1	Lead
07439-93-2	Lithium
07439-95-4	Magnesium
07439-96-5	Manganese
07439-97-6	Mercury
00067-56-1	Methanol
00074-83-9	Methyl Bromide
00074-87-3	Methyl Chloride
07439-98-7	Molybdenum
00091-20-3	Naphthalene
07440-02-0	Nickel
00086-30-6	N-Nitrosodiphenylamine
00085-01-8	Phenanthrene
00108-95-2	Phenol
57723-14-0	Phosphorus
07440-09-7	Potassium
00057-55-6	Propylene glycol
00110-86-1	Pyridine
00094-59-7	Safrole
07782-49-2	Selenium
07440-22-4	Silver
07440-23-5	Sodium
07440-24-6	Strontium
14808-79-8	Sulfate
14265-45-3	Sulfite
00127-18-4	Tetrachloroethylene
07440-28-0	Thallium

CAS Number	Parameters Detected in Flowback from PA and WV Operations
07440-32-6	Titanium
00108-88-3	Toluene
07440-62-2	Vanadium
07440-66-6	Zinc
	2-Picoline
	Alkalinity
	Alkalinity, Carbonate, as CaCO ₃
	Alpha radiation
	Aluminum, Dissolved
	Barium Strontium P.S.
	Barium, Dissolved
	Beta radiation
	Bicarbonates
	Biochemical Oxygen Demand
	Cadmium, Dissolved
	Calcium, Dissolved
	Cesium 137
	Chemical Oxygen Demand
	Chloride
	Chromium (VI)
	Chromium (VI), dissolved
	Chromium, (III)
	Chromium, Dissolved
	Cobalt, dissolved
	Coliform
	Color
	Conductivity
	Hardness
	Heterotrophic plate count
	Iron, Dissolved
	Lithium, Dissolved
	Magnesium, Dissolved
	Manganese, Dissolved
	Nickel, Dissolved
	Nitrate, as N
	Nitrogen, Total as N
	Oil and Grease
	Petroleum hydrocarbons
	pH
	Phenols
	Potassium, Dissolved
	Radium
	Radium 226
	Radium 228
	Salt
	Scale Inhibitor
	Selenium, Dissolved
	Silver, Dissolved
	Sodium, Dissolved

CAS Number **Parameters Detected in Flowback from PA and WV Operations**

Strontium, Dissolved
Sulfide
Surfactants
Total Alkalinity
Total Dissolved Solids
Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen
Total Organic Carbon
Total Suspended Solids
Volatile Acids
Xylenes
Zinc, Dissolved
Zirconium

Parameters listed in Table 5.9, Table 5.10 and Table 5.11 are based on analytical results of flowback from operations in Pennsylvania or West Virginia. All information is for operations in the Marcellus Shale, however it is not from a single comprehensive study. The data are based on analyses performed by different laboratories; most operators provided only one sample/analysis per well, a few operators provided time-series samples for a single well; the different samples were analyzed for various parameters with some overlap of parameters. Even though the data are not strictly comparable, they provide valuable insight on the likely composition of flowback at New York operations.

Table 5.10 - Typical concentrations of flowback constituents based on limited samples from PA and WV, and regulated in NY^{104,105} (Revised July 2011)

CAS #	Parameter Name	Total Number of Samples	Number of Detects	Min	Median	Max	Units
00067-64-1	Acetone	3	1	681	681	681	µg/L
	Acidity, Total	4	4	101	240	874	mg/L
	Alkalinity ¹⁰⁶	155	155	0	153	384	mg/L
	Alkalinity, Carbonate, as CaCO ₃	164	163	0	9485	48336	mg/L
	Total Alkalinity	5	5	28	91	94	mg/L
07439-90-5	Aluminum	43	12	0.02	0.07	1.2	mg/L
	Aluminum, Dissolved	22	1	1.37	1.37	1.37	mg/L
07440-36-0	Antimony	34	1	0.26	0.26	0.26	mg/L
07664-41-7	Aqueous ammonia	48	45	11.3	44.8	382	mg/L
07440-38-2	Arsenic	43	7	0.015	0.09	0.123	mg/L
07440-39-3	Barium	48	47	0.553	1450	15700	mg/L
	Barium, Dissolved	22	22	0.313	212	19200	mg/L
00071-43-2	Benzene	35	14	15.7	479.5	1950	µg/L
07440-41-7	Beryllium	43	1	422	422	422	mg/L
	Bicarbonates	150	150	0	183	1708	mg/L
	Biochemical Oxygen Demand	38	37	3	200	4450	mg/L
00117-81-7	Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	20	2	10.3	15.9	21.5	µg/L
07440-42-8	Boron	23	9	0.539	2.06	26.8	mg/L
24959-67-9	Bromide	15	15	11.3	607	3070	mg/L
00075-25-2	Bromoform	26	2	34.8	36.65	38.5	µg/L
07440-43-9	Cadmium	43	6	0.007	0.025	1.2	mg/L
	Cadmium, Dissolved	22	2	0.017	0.026	0.035	mg/L
07440-70-2	Calcium	187	186	29.9	4241	123000	mg/L
	Calcium, Dissolved	3	3	2360	22300	31500	mg/L
	Cesium 137 ¹⁰⁷	16	2	9.9	10.2	10.5	pCi/L
	Chemical Oxygen Demand	38	38	223	5645	33300	mg/L
	Chloride	193	193	287	56900	228000	mg/L
00124-48-1	Chlorodibromomethane	26	2	3.28	3.67	4.06	µg/L
07440-47-3	Chromium	43	9	0.009	0.082	760	mg/L
	Chromium (VI), dissolved	19	10	0.0126	0.539	7.81	mg/L

¹⁰⁴ Table 5.9 was provided by URS Corporation (based on data submitted to the Department) with the following note: Information presented is based on limited data from Pennsylvania and West Virginia. Characteristics of flowback from the Marcellus Shale in New York are expected to be similar to flowback from Pennsylvania and West Virginia, but not identical. In addition, the raw data for these tables came from several sources, with likely varying degrees of reliability. Also, the analytical methods used were not all the same for given parameters. Sometimes laboratories need to use different analytical methods depending on the consistency and quality of the sample; sometimes the laboratories are only required to provide a certain level of accuracy. Therefore, the method detection limits may be different. The quality and composition of flowback from a single well can also change within a few days soon after the well is fractured. This data does not control for any of these variables. Additionally, it should be noted that several of these compounds could be traced back to potential laboratory contamination. Further comparisons of analytical results with those results from associated laboratory method blanks may be required to further assess the extent of actual concentrations found in field samples versus elevated concentrations found in field samples due to blank contamination.

¹⁰⁵ This table does not include results from the Marcellus Shale Coalition Study.

¹⁰⁶ Different data sources reported alkalinity in different and valid forms. Total alkalinity reported here is smaller than carbonate alkalinity because the data came from different sources.

¹⁰⁷ Regulated under beta particles [19].

CAS #	Parameter Name	Total Number of Samples	Number of Detects	Min	Median	Max	Units
	Chromium, Dissolved	22	2	0.058	0.075	0.092	mg/L
07440-48-4	Cobalt	30	6	0.03	0.3975	0.62	mg/L
	Cobalt, dissolved	19	1	0.489	0.489	0.489	mg/L
	Coliform, Total	5	2	1	42	83	Col/100mL
	Color	3	3	200	1000	1250	PCU
07440-50-8	Copper	43	8	0.01	0.0245	0.157	mg/L
00057-12-5	Cyanide	7	2	0.006	0.0125	0.019	mg/L
00075-27-4	Dichlorobromomethane	29	1	2.24	2.24	2.24	µg/L
00100-41-4	Ethyl Benzene	38	14	3.3	53.6	164	µg/L
16984-48-8	Fluoride	4	2	5.23	392.615	780	mg/L
	Heterotrophic plate count	5	3	25	50	565	CFU/mL
07439-89-6	Iron	193	168	0	29.2	810	mg/L
	Iron, Dissolved	34	26	6.75	63.25	196	mg/L
07439-92-1	Lead	43	6	0.008	0.035	27.4	mg/L
	Lithium	13	13	34.4	90.4	297	mg/L
	Lithium, Dissolved	4	4	24.5	61.35	144	mg/L
07439-95-4	Magnesium	193	180	9	177	3190	mg/L
	Magnesium, Dissolved	3	3	218	2170	3160	mg/L
	Mg as CaCO ₃	145	145	36	547	8208	mg/L
07439-96-5	Manganese	43	29	0.15	1.89	97.6	mg/L
	Manganese, Dissolved	22	12	0.401	2.975	18	mg/L
07439-97-6	Mercury	30	2	0.0006	0.295	0.59	mg/L
00074-83-9	Methyl Bromide	26	1	2.04	2.04	2.04	µg/L
00074-87-3	Methyl Chloride	26	1	15.6	15.6	15.6	µg/L
07439-98-7	Molybdenum	34	12	0.16	0.44	1.08	mg/L
00091-20-3	Naphthalene	23	1	11.3	11.3	11.3	µg/L
07440-02-0	Nickel	43	15	0.01	0.03	0.137	mg/L
	Nickel, Dissolved	22	2	0.03	0.0715	0.113	mg/L
	Nitrate, as N	1	1	0.025	0.025	0.025	mg/L
	Nitrogen, Total as N	1	1	13.4	13.4	13.4	mg/L
	Oil and Grease	39	9	5	17	1470	mg/L
	Petroleum hydrocarbons	1	1	0.21	0.21	0.21	mg/L
	pH	191	191	0	6.6	8.58	S.U.
00108-95-2	Phenol	20	1	459	459	459	µg/L
	Phenols	35	5	0.05	0.191	0.44	mg/L
57723-14-0	Phosphorus, as P	3	3	0.89	1.85	4.46	mg/L
07440-09-7	Potassium	33	17	15.5	125	7810	mg/L
	Potassium, Dissolved	3	3	84.2	327	7080	mg/L
	Scale Inhibitor	145	145	315	744	1346	mg/L
07782-49-2	Selenium	34	1	0.058	0.058	0.058	mg/L
	Selenium, Dissolved	22	1	1.06	1.06	1.06	mg/L
07440-22-4	Silver	43	3	0.129	0.204	6.3	mg/L
	Silver, Dissolved	22	2	0.056	0.0825	0.109	mg/L
07440-23-5	Sodium	42	41	83.1	23500	96700	mg/L
	Sodium, Dissolved	3	3	9290	54800	77400	mg/L
07440-24-6	Strontium	36	36	0.501	1115	5841	mg/L
	Strontium, Dissolved	22	21	8.47	629	7290	mg/L
14808-79-8	Sulfate (as SO ₄)	193	169	0	1	1270	mg/L
	Sulfide (as S)	8	1	29.5	29.5	29.5	mg/L
14265-45-3	Sulfite (as SO ₃)	3	3	2.56	64	64	mg/L
	Surfactants ¹⁰⁸	12	12	0.1	0.21	0.61	mg/L

¹⁰⁸ Regulated under foaming agents.

CAS #	Parameter Name	Total Number of Samples	Number of Detects	Min	Median	Max	Units
00127-18-4	Tetrachloroethylene	26	1	5.01	5.01	5.01	µg/L
07440-28-0	Thallium	34	2	0.1	0.18	0.26	mg/L
07440-32-6	Titanium	25	1	0.06	0.06	0.06	mg/L
00108-88-3	Toluene	38	15	2.3	833	3190	µg/L
	Total Dissolved Solids	193	193	1530	63800	337000	mg/L
07440-62-2	Vanadium	24	1	40.4	40.4	40.4	mg/L
	Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen	25	25	37.5	122	585	mg/L
	Total Organic Carbon ¹⁰⁹	28	23	69.2	449	1080	mg/L
	Total Suspended Solids	43	43	16	129	2080	mg/L
	Xylenes	38	15	15.3	444	2670	µg/L
07440-66-6	Zinc	43	18	0.011	0.036	8570	mg/L
	Zinc, Dissolved	22	1	0.07	0.07	0.07	mg/L
	Fluid Density	145	145	8.39004	8.7	9.2	lb/gal
	Hardness by Calculation	170	170	203	11354	98000	mg CaCO ₃ /L
	Salt %	145	145	0.9	5.8	13.9	%
	Specific Conductivity	15	15	1030	110000	165000	pmhos/cm
	Specific Gravity	150	154	0	1.04	1.201	
	Temperature	31	31	0	15.3	32	°C
	Temperature	145	145	24.9	68	76.1	°F

Table 5.11 - Typical concentrations of flowback constituents based on limited samples from PA and WV, not regulated in NY¹¹⁰ (Revised July 2011)

Parameter Name	Total Number of Samples	Detects	Min	Median	Max	Units
Barium Strontium P.S.	145	145	17	1320	6400	mg/L
Carbon Dioxide	5	5	193	232	294	mg/L
Zirconium	19	1	0.054	0.054	0.054	mg/L

¹⁰⁹ Regulated via BOD, COD and the different classes/compounds of organic carbon.

¹¹⁰ Table 5-10.

Recognizing the dearth of comparable flowback information that existed at that time within the Marcellus Shale, the Marcellus Shale Coalition (MSC) facilitated a more rigorous study in 2009.

The study:

- Gathered and analyzed flowback samples from 19 gas well sites (names A through S) in Pennsylvania or West Virginia;
- Took samples at different points in time, typically of the influent water stream, and flowback water streams 1, 5, 14, and 90 days after stimulating the well. In addition, the water supply and the fracturing fluid (referred to as Day 0) were also sampled at a few locations;
- Included both vertical and horizontal wells;
- All samples were collected by a single contractor;
- All analyses were performed by a single laboratory;
- Sought input from regulatory agencies in Pennsylvania and West Virginia; and
- Most samples were analyzed for conventional parameters, Metals, VOCs, Semi-Volatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs), Organochlorine Pesticides, Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs), an Organophosphorus Pesticide, Alcohols, Glycols, and Acids. The specific parameters analyzed in the MSC report are listed by class as follows:
 - 29 conventional parameters (presented in Table 5.12);
 - 59 total or dissolved metals (presented in Table 5.13);
 - 70 VOCs (presented in Table 5.14);
 - 107 SVOCs (presented in Table 5.15);
 - 20 Organochlorine Pesticides (presented in Table 5.16);
 - 7 PCB Arochlors (presented in Table 5.17);
 - 1 Organophosphorus Pesticide (presented in Table 5.18);
 - 5 Alcohols (presented in Table 5.19);
 - 2 Glycols (presented in Table 5.20); and
 - 4 Acids (presented in Table 5.21).

Table 5.12 - Conventional Analytes In MSC Study (New July 2011)

Acidity	Nitrate as N	Total phosphorus
Amenable cyanide	Nitrate-nitrite	Total suspended solids
Ammonia nitrogen	Nitrite as N	Turbidity
Biochemical oxygen demand	Oil & grease (HEM)	Total cyanide
Bromide	Specific conductance	Total sulfide
Chemical oxygen demand (COD)	Sulfate	pH
Chloride	TOC	Total recoverable phenolics
Dissolved organic carbon	Total alkalinity	Sulfite
Fluoride	Total dissolved solids	MBAS (mol.wt 320)
Hardness, as CaCO ₃	Total Kjeldahl nitrogen	

Table 5.13 - Total and Dissolved Metals Analyzed In MSC Study (New July 2011)

	Copper	Silver
Aluminum-dissolved	Copper-dissolved	Silver-dissolved
Antimony	Iron	Sodium
Antimony-dissolved	Iron-dissolved	Sodium-dissolved
Arsenic	Lead	Strontium
Arsenic-dissolved	Lead-dissolved	Strontium-dissolved
Barium	Lithium	Thallium
Barium-dissolved	Lithium-dissolved	Thallium-dissolved
Beryllium	Magnesium	Tin
Beryllium-dissolved	Magnesium-dissolved	Tin-dissolved
Boron	Manganese	Titanium
Boron-dissolved	Manganese-dissolved	Titanium-dissolved
Cadmium	Molybdenum	Trivalent chromium
Cadmium-dissolved	Molybdenum-dissolved	Zinc
Calcium	Nickel	Zinc-dissolved
Calcium-dissolved	Nickel-dissolved	Hexavalent chromium-dissolved
Chromium	Potassium	Hexavalent chromium
Chromium-dissolved	Potassium-dissolved	Mercury
Cobalt	Selenium	Mercury-dissolved
Cobalt-dissolved	Selenium-dissolved	

Table 5.14 - Volatile Organic Compounds Analyzed in MSC Study (New July 2011)

	2-Chloroethyl vinyl ether	Ethylbenzene
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	2-Hexanone	Isopropylbenzene
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	4-Chlorotoluene	Methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE)
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	4-Methyl-2-pentanone (MIBK)	Methylene chloride
1,1-Dichloroethane	Acetone	Naphthalene
1,1-Dichloroethene	Acrolein	n-Butylbenzene
1,1-Dichloropropene	Acrylonitrile	n-Propylbenzene
1,2,3-Trichlorobenzene	Benzene	p-Isopropyltoluene
1,2,3-Trichloropropane	Benzyl chloride	sec-Butylbenzene
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	Bromobenzene	Styrene
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	Bromodichloromethane	tert-butyl acetate
1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane	Bromoform	tert-Butylbenzene
1,2-Dibromoethane (EDB)	Bromomethane	Tetrachloroethene
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	Carbon disulfide	tetrahydrofuran
1,2-Dichloroethane	Carbon tetrachloride	Toluene
1,2-Dichloropropane	Chlorobenzene	trans-1,2-Dichloroethene
1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene	Chloroethane	trans-1,3-Dichloropropene
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	Chloroform	Trichloroethene
1,3-Dichloropropane	Chloromethane	Trichlorofluoromethane
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	Vinyl acetate
1,4-Dioxane	cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	Vinyl chloride
1-chloro-4-trifluoromethylbenzene	Dibromochloromethane	Xylenes (total)
2,2-Dichloropropane	Dibromomethane	
2-Butanone	Dichlorodifluoromethane	

Table 5.15_- Semi-Volatile Organics Analyzed in MSC Study (New July 2011)

1,2,4,5-Tetrachlorobenzene	7,12-Dimethylbenz(a)anthracene	Hexachlorocyclopentadiene
1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	Acenaphthene	Hexachloroethane
1,3-Dinitrobenzene	Acenaphthylene	Hexachloropropene
1,4-Naphthoquinone	Acetophenone	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene
1-Naphthylamine	Aniline	Isodrin
2,3,4,6-Tetrachlorophenol	Aramite	Isophorone
2,3,7,8-TCDD	Benzidine	Isosafrole
2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	Benzo(a)anthracene	Methyl methanesulfonate
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	Benzo(a)pyrene	Nitrobenzene
2,4-Dimethylphenol	Benzo(b)fluoranthene	N-Nitrosodiethylamine
2,4-Dinitrophenol	Benzo(ghi)perylene	N-Nitrosodimethylamine
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	Benzo(k)fluoranthene	N-Nitrosodi-n-butylamine
2,6-Dichlorophenol	Benzyl alcohol	N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine
2,6-Dinitrotoluene	bis(2-Chloroethoxy)methane	N-Nitrosodiphenylamine
2-Acetylaminofluorene	bis(2-Chloroethyl) ether	N-Nitrosomethylethylamine
2-Chloronaphthalene	bis(2-Chloroisopropyl) ether	N-Nitrosomorpholine
2-Chlorophenol	bis(2-Ethylhexyl) phthalate	N-Nitrosopiperidine
2-Methylnaphthalene	Butyl benzyl phthalate	N-Nitrosopyrrolidine
2-Methylphenol	Chlorobenzilate	O,O,O-Triethyl phosphorothioate
2-Naphthylamine	Chrysene	o-Toluidine
2-Nitroaniline	Diallate	Parathion
2-Nitrophenol	Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	p-Dimethylaminoazobenzene
2-Picoline	Dibenzofuran	Pentachlorobenzene
3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	Diethyl phthalate	Pentachloroethane
3-Methylcholanthrene	Dimethoate	Pentachloronitrobenzene
3-Methylphenol & 4-Methylphenol	Dimethyl phthalate	Pentachlorophenol
3-Nitroaniline	Di-n-butyl phthalate	Phenanthrene
4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	Di-n-octyl phthalate	Phenol
4-Aminobiphenyl	Dinoseb	Phorate
4-Bromophenyl phenyl ether	Diphenylamine	Pronamide
4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	Disulfoton	Pyrene
4-Chloroaniline	Ethyl methanesulfonate	Pyridine
4-Chlorophenyl phenyl ether	Fluoranthene	Safrole
4-Nitroaniline	Fluorene	Thionazin
4-Nitrophenol	Hexachlorobenzene	Tetraethyldithiopyrophosphate
5-Nitro-o-toluidine	Hexachlorobutadiene	

Table 5.16_- Organochlorine Pesticides Analyzed in MSC Study (New July 2011)

4,4'-DDD	delta-BHC	Endrin ketone
4,4'-DDE	Dieldrin	gamma-BHC (Lindane)
4,4'-DDT	Endosulfan I	Heptachlor
Aldrin	Endosulfan II	Heptachlor epoxide
alpha-BHC	Endosulfan sulfate	Methoxychlor
beta-BHC	Endrin	Toxaphene
Chlordane	Endrin aldehyde	

Table 5.17.- PCBs Analyzed in MSC Study (New July 2011)

Aroclor 1016	Aroclor 1242	Aroclor 1260
Aroclor 1221	Aroclor 1248	
Aroclor 1232	Aroclor 1254	

Table 5.18.- Organophosphorus Pesticides Analyzed in MSC Study (New July 2011)

Ethyl parathion

Table 5.19.- Alcohols Analyzed in MSC Study (New July 2011)

2-Propanol	Ethanol	n-Propanol
Butyl alcohol	Methanol	

Table 5.20.- Glycols Analyzed in MSC Study (New July 2011)

Ethylene glycol
Propylene glycol

Table 5.21.- Acids Analyzed in MSC Study (New July 2011)

Acetic acid	Propionic acid
Butyric acid	Volatile acids

Table 5.22 is a summary of parameter classes analyzed for (shown with a “•”) at each well site. Table 5.23 is a summary of parameters detected at quantifiable levels. The check mark (√) indicates that several samples detected many parameters within a class. The MSC Study Report lists the following qualifiers associated with analytical results:

The sample was diluted (from 1X, which means no dilution, to up to 1000X) due to concentrations of analytes exceeding calibration ranges of the instrumentation or due to potential matrix effect. Laboratories use best judgment when analyzing samples at the lowest dilution factors allowable without causing potential damage to the instrumentation;

The analyte was detected in the associated lab method blank for the sample. Sample results would be flagged with a laboratory-generated single letter qualifier (i.e., “B”):

The estimated concentration of the analyte was detected between the method detection limit and the reporting limit. Sample results would be flagged with a laboratory-generated single letter qualifier (i.e., “J”). These results should be considered as estimated concentrations; and

The observed value was less than the method detection limit. These results will be flagged with a “U.”

Table 5.22 - Parameter Classes Analyzed for in the MSC Study (New July 2011)

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S
Conventional Analyses	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Metals	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
VOCs	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
SVOC	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Organochlorine Pesticides	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
PCBs	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Organophosphorus Pesticides	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Alcohols	NA	•	NA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Glycols	NA	•	NA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Acids	NA	NA	NA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•

Table 5.23 - Parameter Classes Detected in Flowback Analyticals in MSC Study (New July 2011)

	# parameters analyzed for	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S
Conventional Analyses	29	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Metals	59	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
VOCs	70	7	6	1	2	2	6	1	5	2	2	3	7	2	1	2	7	1	5	5
SVOC	107	3	6	1	5	3	6	2	2	9	8	6	2	1	1	1	6	1	7	6
Organochlorine Pesticides	20	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	2	1	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	3	2
PCBs	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Organophosphorus Pesticides	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alcohols	5	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Glycols	2	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Acids	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	2

Metals and conventional parameters were detected and quantified in many of the samples and these observations are consistent with parameters listed in Table 5.9. However, the frequency of occurrence of other parameter classes was much lower. Table 5.23 summarizes the number of VOCs, SVOCs, PCBs, Pesticides, Alcohols, Glycols, and Acids observed in samples taken from each well. For the purposes of Table 5.23, if a particular parameter was detected in any sample from a single well, whether detected in one or all five (Day 0, 1, 5, 14 or 90) samples, it was considered to be one parameter.

- Between 1 and 7 of the 70 VOCs were detected in samples from well sites A through S. VOCs detected include:

1,2,3-Trichlorobenzene	Benzene	Isopropylbenzene
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	Bromoform	Naphthalene
1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene	Carbondisulfide	Toluene
2-Butanone	Chloroform	Xylenes
Acetone	Chloromethane	
Acrylonitrile	Ethylbenzene	

- Between 1 and 9 of the 107 SVOCs were detected in samples from well sites A through S. SVOCs detected include:

2,4-Dimethylphenol	Benzo(b)fluoranthene	Fluoranthene
2,6-Dichlorophenol	Benzo(ghi)perylene	Fluorene
2-Methylnaphthalene	Benzo(k)fluoranthene	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene
2-Methylphenol	Benzyl alcohol	N-Nitrosodiphenylamine
2-Picoline	bis(2-Chloroethyl) ether	Phenanthrene
3-Methylphenol & 4-Methylphenol	bis(2-Ethylhexyl) phthalate	Phenol
7,12-Dimethylbenz(a)anthracene	Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	Pyridine
Acetophenone	Di-n-butyl phthalate	Safrole
Benzo(a)pyrene	Diphenylamine	

- At most, 3 of the 20 Organochlorine Pesticides were detected. Organochlorine Pesticides detected include:

4,4 DDE	cyclohexane (gamma BHC)	endrin aldehyde
Aldrin	endosulfan I	Heptachlor
cyclohexane (beta BHC)	endosulfan II	heptachlor epoxide

- Only 1 (Aroclor 1248) of the 7 PCBs was detected, and that was only from one well site;
- Only 1 Organophosphorus Pesticide was analyzed for, but it was not detected in any sample;
- Of the 5 Alcohols analyzed for, 2 were detected at one well site and 1 each was detected at two well sites. Alcohols that were detected include 2-propanol and methanol;
- Of the 2 Glycols (Ethylene glycol and Propylene glycol) analyzed for, 1 each was detected at three well sites; and
- Of the 4 Acids analyzed for, 1 or 2 Acids (Acetic acid and Volatile Acids) were detected at several well sites.

Some parameters found in analytical results may be due to additives or supply water used in fracturing or drilling; some may be due to reactions between different additives; while others may have been mobilized from within the formation; still other parameters may have been contributed from multiple sources. Some of the volatile and semi-volatile analytical results may be traced back to potential laboratory contamination due to improper ventilation; due to chromatography column breakdown; or due to chemical breakdown of compounds during injection onto the instrumentation. Further study would be required to identify the specific origin of each parameter.

Nine pesticides and one PCB were identified by the MSC Study that were not identified by the flowback analytical results previously received from industry; all other parameters identified in the MSC study were already identified in the additives and/or flowback information received from industry.

Pesticides and PCBs do not originate within the shale play. If pesticides or PCBs were present in limited flowback samples in Pennsylvania or West Virginia, pesticides or PCBs would likely have been introduced to the shale or water during drilling or fracturing operations. Whether the pesticides or PCBs were introduced via additives or source water could not be evaluated with available information.

5.11.3.1 *Temporal Trends in Flowback Water Composition*

The composition of flowback water changes with time over the course of the flowback process, depending on a variety of factors. Limited time-series field data from Marcellus Shale flowback water, including data from the MSC Study Report, indicate that:

- The concentrations of total dissolved solids (TDS), chloride, and barium increase;
- The levels of radioactivity increase,¹¹¹ and sometimes exceed MCLs;
- Calcium and magnesium hardness increases;
- Iron concentrations increase, unless iron-controlling additives are used;
- Sulfate levels decrease;
- Alkalinity levels decrease, likely due to use of acid; and
- Concentrations of metals increase.¹¹²

Available literature cited by URS corroborates the above summary regarding the changes in composition with time for TDS, chlorides, and barium. Fracturing fluids pumped into the well, and mobilization of materials within the shale may be contributing to the changes seen in hardness, sulfate, and metals. The specific changes would likely depend on the shale formation, fracturing fluids used and fracture operations control.

5.11.3.2 *NORM in Flowback Water*

Several radiological parameters were detected in flowback samples, as shown in Table 5.24.

¹¹¹ Limited data from vertical well operations in NY have reported the following ranges of radioactivity: alpha 22.41 – 18950 pCi/L; beta 9.68 – 7445 pCi/L; Radium²²⁶ 2.58 - 33 pCi/L.

¹¹² Metals such as aluminum, antimony, arsenic, barium, boron, cadmium, calcium, cobalt, copper, iron, lead, lithium, magnesium, manganese, molybdenum, nickel, potassium, radium, selenium, silver, sodium, strontium, thallium, titanium, and zinc have been reported in flowback analyses. It is important to note that each well did not report the presence of all these metals.

Table 5.24 - Concentrations of NORM constituents based on limited samples from PA and WV (Revised July 2011)

CAS #	Parameter Name	Total Number of Samples	Number of Detects	Min	Median	Max	Units
--	Gross Alpha	15	15	22.41	--	18,950	pCi/L
--	Gross Beta	15	15	62	--	7,445	pCi/L
7440-14-4	Total Alpha Radium	6	6	3.8	--	1,810	pCi/L
7440-14-4	Radium-226	3	3	2.58	--	33	pCi/L
7440-14-4	Radium-228	3	3	1.15	--	18.41	pCi/L

5.12 Flowback Water Treatment, Recycling and Reuse

Operators have expressed the objective of maximizing their re-use of flowback water for subsequent fracturing operations at the same well pad or other well pads; this practice is increasing and continuing to evolve in the Marcellus Shale.¹¹³ Reuse involves either straight dilution of the flowback water with fresh water or the introduction on-site of more sophisticated treatment options prior to flowback reuse. Originally operators focused on treating flowback water using polymers and flocculants to precipitate out and remove metals, but more recently operators have begun using filtration technologies to achieve the same goal.¹¹⁴ As stated above, various on-site treatment technologies may be employed prior to reuse of flowback water.

Regardless of the treatment objective, whether for reuse or direct discharge, the three basic issues that need consideration when developing water treatment technologies are:¹¹⁵

1. Influent (i.e., flowback water) parameters and their concentrations;
2. Parameters and their concentrations allowable in the effluent (i.e., in the reuse water); and
3. Disposal of residuals.

Untreated flowback water composition is discussed in Section 5.11.3. Table 5.25 summarizes allowable concentrations after treatment (and prior to potential additional dilution with fresh water).¹¹⁶

¹¹³ ALL Consulting, 2010, p. 73.

¹¹⁴ ALL Consulting, 2010, p. 73.

¹¹⁵ URS, 2009, p. 5-2.

¹¹⁶ URS, 2009, p. 5-3.

Table 5.25 - Maximum allowable water quality requirements for fracturing fluids, based on input from one expert panel on Barnett Shale (Revised July 2011)

Constituent	Concentration
Chlorides	3,000 - 90,000 mg/L
Calcium	350 - 1,000 mg/L
Suspended Solids	< 50 mg/L
Entrained oil and soluble organics	< 25 mg/L
Bacteria	< 100 cells/100 ml
Barium	Low levels

The following factors influence the decision to utilize on-site treatment and the selection of specific treatment options:¹¹⁷

Operational

- Flowback fluid characteristics, including scaling and fouling tendencies;
- On-site space availability;
- Processing capacity needed;
- Solids concentration in flowback fluid, and solids reduction required;
- Concentrations of hydrocarbons in flowback fluid, and targeted reduction in hydrocarbons;¹¹⁸
- Species and levels of radioactivity in flowback;
- Access to freshwater sources;
- Targeted recovery rate;
- Impact of treated water on efficacy of additives; and
- Availability of residuals disposal options.

¹¹⁷ URS, 2009, p. 5-3.

¹¹⁸ Liquid hydrocarbons have not been detected in all Marcellus Shale gas analyses.

Cost

- Capital costs associated with treatment system;
- Transportation costs associated with freshwater; and
- Increase or decrease in fluid additives from using treated flowback fluid.

Environmental

- On-site topography;
- Density of neighboring population;
- Proximity to freshwater sources;
- Other demands on freshwater in the vicinity; and
- Regulatory environment.

5.12.1 Physical and Chemical Separation¹¹⁹

Some form of physical and/or chemical separation will be required as a part of on-site treatment. Physical and chemical separation technologies typically focus on the removal of oil and grease¹²⁰ and suspended matter from flowback. Modular physical and chemical separation units have been used in the Barnett Shale and Powder River Basin plays.

Physical separation technologies include hydrocyclones, filters, and centrifuges; however, filtration appears to be the preferred physical separation technology. The efficiency of filtration technologies is controlled by the size and quantity of constituents within the flowback fluid as well as the pore size and total contact area of the membrane. To increase filtration efficiency, one vendor provides a vibrating filtration unit (several different pore sizes are available) for approximately \$300,000; this unit can filter 25,000 gpd.

Microfiltration has been shown to be effective in lab-scale research, nanofiltration has been used to treat production brine from off-shore oil rigs, and modular filtration units have been used in

¹¹⁹ URS, 2009, p. 5-6.

¹²⁰ Oil and grease are not expected in the Marcellus.

the Barnett Shale and Powder River Basin.¹²¹ Nanofiltration has also been used in Marcellus development in Pennsylvania, though early experience there indicates that the fouling of filter packs has been a limiting constraint on its use.¹²²

Chemical separation utilizes coagulants and flocculants to break emulsions (dissolved oil) and to remove suspended particles. The companion process of precipitation is accomplished by manipulating flowback chemistry such that constituents within the flowback (in particular, metals) will precipitate out of solution. This can also be performed sequentially, so that several chemicals will precipitate, resulting in cleaner flowback.

Separation and precipitation are used as pre-treatment steps within multi-step on-site treatment processes. Chemical separation units have been used in the Barnett Shale and Powder River Basin plays, and some vendors have proprietary designs for sequential precipitation of metals for potential use in the Marcellus Shale play.¹²³

If flowback is to be treated solely for blending and re-use as fracturing fluid, chemical precipitation may be one of the only steps needed. By precipitation of scale-forming metals (e.g., barium, strontium, calcium, magnesium), minimal excess treatment may be required. Prices for chemical precipitation systems are dependent upon the cost of the treatment chemicals; one vendor quoted a 15 gpm system for \$450,000 or a 500 gpm system for approximately \$1 million, with costs ranging from \$0.50 to \$3.00 per barrel.

5.12.2 Dilution

The dilution option involves blending flowback water with freshwater to make it usable for future fracturing operations. Because high concentrations of different parameters in flowback water may adversely affect the desired fracturing fluid properties, 100% recycling is not always possible without employing some form of treatment.^{124,125} Concentrations of chlorides, calcium, magnesium, barium, carbonates, sulfates, solids and microbes in flowback water may be too high

¹²¹ URS 2011, p 5-6.

¹²² Yoxtheimer, 2011 (personal communication).

¹²³ URS 2011, p 5-7.

¹²⁴ URS, 2009, p. 5-1.

¹²⁵ ALL Consulting, 2010, p. 73.

to use as-is, meaning that some form of physical and/or chemical separation is typically needed prior to recycling flowback.¹²⁶ In addition, the practice of blending flowback with freshwater involves balancing the additional freshwater water needs with the additional additive needs.¹²⁷ For example, the demand for friction reducers increases when the chloride concentration increases; the demand for scale inhibitors increases when concentrations of calcium, magnesium, barium, carbonates, or sulfates increase; biocide requirements increase when the concentration of microbes increases. These considerations do not constrain reuse because both the dilution ratio and the additive concentrations can be adjusted to achieve the desired properties of the fracturing fluid.¹²⁸ In addition, service companies and chemical suppliers may develop additive products that are more compatible with the aforementioned flowback water parameters.

5.12.2.1 Reuse

The SRBC's reporting system for water usage within the Susquehanna River Basin (SRB) has provided a partial snapshot of flowback water reuse specific to Marcellus development. For the period June 1, 2008 to June 1, 2011, operators in the SRB in Pennsylvania reused approximately 311 million gallons of the approximately 2.14 billion gallons withdrawn and delivered to Marcellus well pads. The SRBC data indicate that an average of 4.27 million gallons of water were used per well; this figure reflects an average of 3.84 million gallons of fresh water and 0.43 million gallons of reused flowback water per well.¹²⁹ The current limiting factors on flowback water reuse are the volume of flowback water recovered and the timing of upcoming fracture treatments.¹³⁰ Treatment and reuse of flowback water on the same well pad reduces the number of truck trips needed to haul flowback water to another destination.

Operators may propose to store flowback water prior to or after dilution in on-site tanks, which are discussed in Section 5.11.2. The tanks may be set up to segregate flowback based on estimated water quality. Water that is suitable for reuse with little or no treatment can be stored separately from water that requires some degree of treatment, and any water deemed unsuitable

¹²⁶ URS, 2009, p. 5-2.

¹²⁷ URS, 2009, p. 5-2.


¹²⁸ ALLConsulting, 2010, p. 74.

¹²⁹ SRBC, 2011.

¹³⁰ ALL Consulting, 2010, p. 74.

for reuse can then be separated for appropriate disposal.¹³¹ An example of the composition of a fracturing solution that includes recycled flowback water is shown in Figure 5.6.

Figure 5.6 - Example Fracturing Fluid Composition Including Recycled Flowback Water (New July 2011)




¹³¹ ALL Consulting, 2010, p. 74.

5.12.3 Other On-Site Treatment Technologies¹³²

One example of an on-site treatment technology configuration is illustrated in Figure 5.7. The parameters treated are listed at the bottom of the figure. The next few sections present several on-site treatment technologies that have been used to some extent in other U.S. gas-shale plays.

Figure 5.7 - One configuration of potential on-site treatment technologies.



5.12.3.1 Membranes / Reverse Osmosis

Membranes are an advanced form of filtration, and may be used to treat TDS in flowback. The technology allows water - the permeate - to pass through the membrane, but the membrane blocks passage of suspended or dissolved particles larger than the membrane pore size. This method may be able to treat TDS concentrations up to approximately 45,000 mg/L, and produce an effluent with TDS concentrations between 200 and 500 mg/L. This technology generates a

¹³² URS, 2009, p. 5-4.

residual - the concentrate - that would need proper disposal. The flowback water recovery rate for most membrane technologies is typically between 50-75 percent. Membrane performance may be impacted by scaling and/or microbiological fouling; therefore, flowback water would likely require extensive pre-treatment before it is sent through a membrane.

Reverse osmosis (RO) is a membrane technology that uses osmotic pressure on the membrane to provide passage of high-quality water, producing a concentrated brine effluent that will require further treatment and disposal. Reverse osmosis is a well-proven technology and is frequently used in desalination projects, in both modular and permanent configurations, though it is less efficient under high TDS concentrations. High TDS concentrations, such as in Marcellus flowback,¹³³ will likely result in large quantities of concentrated brine (also referred to as “reject”) that will require further treatment or disposal. When designing treatment processes, several vendors use RO as a primary treatment (with appropriate pre-treatment prior to RO); and then use a secondary treatment method for the concentrated brine. The secondary treatment can be completed on-site, or the concentrated brine can be trucked to a centralized brine treatment facility.

Modular membrane technology units have been used in different regions for many different projects, including the Barnett Shale. Some firms have developed modular RO treatment units, which could potentially be used in the Marcellus.¹³⁴

5.12.3.2 *Thermal Distillation*

Thermal distillation utilizes evaporation and crystallization techniques that integrate a multi-effect distillation column, and this technology may be used to treat flowback water with a large range of parameter concentrations. For example, thermal distillation may be able to treat TDS concentrations from 5,000 to over 150,000 mg/L, and produce water with TDS concentrations between 50 and 150 mg/L. The resulting residual salt would need appropriate disposal. This technology is resilient to fouling and scaling, but is energy intensive and has a large footprint.

Modular thermal distillation units have been used in the Barnett Shale, and have begun to be

¹³³ URS, 2011, p. 4-37.

¹³⁴ URS, 2011, p. 5-7.

used in the Marcellus Shale in Pennsylvania. In addition to the units that are already in use, several vendors have designs ready for testing, potentially further decreasing costs in the near future.¹³⁵

5.12.3.3 *Ion Exchange*

Ion exchange units utilize different resins to preferentially remove certain ions. When treating flowback, the resin would be selected to preferentially remove sodium ions. The required resin volume and size of the ion exchange vessel would depend on the salt concentration and flowback volume treated.

The Higgins Loop is one version of ion exchange that has been successfully used in Midwest coal bed methane applications. The Higgins Loop uses a continuous countercurrent flow of flowback fluid and ion exchange resin. High sodium flowback fluid can be fed into the absorption chamber to exchange for hydrogen ions. The strong acid-cation resin is advanced to the absorption chamber through a unique resin pulsing system.

Modular ion exchange units have been used in the Barnett Shale.

5.12.3.4 *Electrodialysis/Electrodialysis Reversal*

These treatment units are configured with alternating stacks of cation and anion membranes that allow passage of flowback fluid. Electric current applied to the stacks forces anions and cations to migrate in different directions.

Electrodialysis Reversal (EDR) is similar to electrodialysis, but its electric current polarity may be reversed as needed. This current reversal acts as a backwash cycle for the stacks which reduces scaling on membranes. EDR offers lower electricity usage than standard reverse osmosis systems and can potentially reduce salt concentrations in the treated water to less than 200 mg/L. Modular electrodialysis units have been used in the Barnett Shale and Powder River Basin plants.

Table 5.26 compares EDR and RO by outlining key characteristics of both technologies.

¹³⁵ URS, 2011 p. 5-8.

Table 5.26 - Treatment capabilities of EDR and RO Systems

Criteria	EDR	RO
Acceptable influent TDS (mg/L)	400-3,000	100-15,000
Salt removal capacity	50-95%	90-99%
Water recovery rate	85-94%	50-75%
Allowable Influent Turbidity	Silt Density Index (SDI) < 12	SDI < 5
Operating Pressure	<50 psi	> 100 psi
Power Consumption	Lower for <2,500 mg/L TDS	Lower for >2,500 mg/L TDS
Typical Membrane Life	7-10 years	3-5 years

5.12.3.5 *Ozone/Ultrasonic/Ultraviolet*

These technologies are designed to oxidize and separate hydrocarbons and heavy metals, and to oxidize biological films and bacteria from flowback water. The microscopic air bubbles in supersaturated ozonated water and/or ultrasonic transducers cause oils and suspended solids to float. Some vendors have field-tested the companion process of hydrodynamic cavitation, in which microscopic ozone bubbles implode, resulting in very high temperatures and pressures at the liquid-gas interface, converting the ozone to hydroxyl radicals and oxygen gas. The high temperatures and the newly-formed hydroxyl radicals quickly oxidize organic compounds.¹³⁶ Hydrodynamic cavitation has been used in field tests in the Fayetteville and Woodford Shale plays, but its use has not gained traction in the Marcellus play.¹³⁷

Some vendors include ozone treatment technologies as one step in their flowback treatment process, including treatment for blending and re-use of water in drilling new wells. Systems incorporating ozone technology have been successfully used and analyzed in the Barnett Shale.¹³⁸

¹³⁶ NETL, 2010.

¹³⁷ Yoxtheimer, 2011.

¹³⁸ URS, 2011 p. 5-9.

5.12.3.6 Crystallization/Zero Liquid Discharge

Zero liquid discharge (ZLD) follows the same principles as physical and chemical separation (precipitation, centrifuges, etc.) and evaporation, however a ZLD process ensures that all liquid effluent is of reusable or dischargeable quality. Additionally, any concentrate from the treatment process will be crystallized and will either be used in some capacity on site, will be offered for sale as a secondary product, or will be treated in such a way that it will meet regulations for disposal within a landfill. ZLD treatment is a relatively rare, expensive treatment process, and while some vendors suggest that the unit can be setup on the well pad, a more cost-effective use of ZLD treatment will be at a centralized treatment plant located near users of the systems' byproducts. In addition to the crystallized salts produced by ZLD, treated effluent water and/or steam will also be a product that can be used by a third party in some industrial or agricultural setting.

ZLD treatment systems are in use in a variety of industries, but none have been implemented in a natural gas production setting yet. Numerous technology vendors have advertized ZLD as a treatment option in the Marcellus, but the economical feasibility of such a system has not yet been demonstrated.¹³⁹

5.12.4 Comparison of Potential On-Site Treatment Technologies

A comparison of performance characteristics associated with on-site treatment technologies is provided in Table 5.27¹⁴⁰

¹³⁹ URS, 2011 p. 5-9.

¹⁴⁰ URS, 2009, p. 5-8.

Table 5.27 - Summary of Characteristics of On-Site Flowback Water Treatment Technologies (Updated July 2011)¹⁴¹

Characteristic	Filtration	Ion Exchange	Reverse Osmosis	EDR	Thermal Distillation	Ozone / Ultrasonic / Ultraviolet
Energy Cost	Low	Low	Moderate	High	High	Low
Energy Usage vs. TDS	N/A	Low	Increase	High Increase	Independent	Increase
Applicable to	All Water types	All Water types	Moderate TDS	High TDS	High TDS	All Water types
Plant / Unit size	Small / Modular	Small / Modular	Modular	Modular	Large	Small / Modular
Microbiological Fouling	Possible	Possible	Possible	Low	N/A	Possible
Complexity of Technology	Low	Low	Moderate / High Maintenance	Regular Maintenance	Complex	Low
Scaling Potential	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low
Theoretical TDS Feed Limit (mg/L)	N/A	N/A	32,000	40,000	100,000+	Depends on turbidity
Pretreatment Requirement	N/A	Filtration	Extensive	Filtration	Minimal	Filtration
Final Water TDS	No impact	200-500 ppm	200-500 ppm	200-1000 ppm	< 10 mg/L	Variable
Recovery Rate (Feed TDS >20,000 mg/L)	N/A	N/A	30-50%	60-80%	75-85%	Variable

5.13 Waste Disposal

5.13.1 Cuttings from Mud Drilling

The 1992 GEIS discusses on-site burial of cuttings generated during compressed air drilling. This option is also viable for cuttings generated during drilling with fresh water as the drilling fluid. However, cuttings that are generated during drilling with polymer- or oil-based muds are considered industrial non-hazardous waste and therefore must be removed from the site by a permitted Part 364 Waste Transporter and properly disposed in a solid waste landfill. In New York State the NORM in cuttings is not precluded by regulation from disposal in a solid waste

¹⁴¹ URS, 2011, p. 5-9

landfill, though well operators should consult with the operators of any landfills they are considering using for disposal regarding the acceptance of Marcellus Shale drill cuttings by that facility.

5.13.2 Reserve Pit Liner from Mud Drilling

The 1992 GEIS discusses on-site burial, with the landowner's permission, of the plastic liner used for the reserve pit for air-drilled wells. This option is also viable for wells where fresh-water is the drilling fluid. However, pit liners for reserve pits where polymer- or oil-based drilling muds are used must be removed from the site by a permitted Part 364 Waste Transporter and properly disposed in a solid waste landfill.

5.13.3 Flowback Water

As discussed in Section 5.12, options exist or are being developed for treatment, recycling and reuse of flowback water. Nevertheless, proper disposal is required for flowback water that is not reused. Factors which could result in a need for disposal instead of reuse include lack of reuse opportunity (i.e., no other wells being fractured within reasonable time frames or a reasonable distance), prohibitively high contaminant concentrations which render the water untreatable to usable quality, or unavailability or infeasibility of treatment options for other reasons.

Flowback water requiring disposal is considered industrial wastewater, like many other water-use byproducts. The Department has an EPA-approved program for the control of wastewater discharges. Under New York State law, the program is called the State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (SPDES). The program controls point source discharges to ground waters and surface waters. SPDES permits are issued to wastewater dischargers, including POTWs, and include specific discharge limitations and monitoring requirements. The effluent limitations are the maximum allowable concentrations or ranges for various physical, chemical, and/or biological parameters to ensure that there are no impacts to the receiving water body.

Potential flowback water disposal options discussed in the 1992 GEIS include:

- injection wells, which are regulated under both the Department’s SPDES program and the federal Underground Injection Control (UIC) program;
- municipal sewage treatment facilities (POTWs); and
- out-of-state industrial treatment plants.

Road spreading for dust control and de-icing (by a Part 364 Transporter with local government approval) is also discussed in the 1992 GEIS as a general disposition method used in New York for well-related fluids, primarily production brine (not an option for flowback water). Use of existing or new private in-state waste water treatment plants and injection for enhanced resource recovery in oil fields have also been suggested. More information about each of these options is presented below and a more detailed discussion of the potential environmental impacts and how they are mitigated is presented in Chapters 6 and 7.

5.13.3.1 Injection Wells

Discussed in Chapter 15 of the 1992 GEIS, injection wells for disposal of brine associated with oil and gas operations are classified as Class IID in EPA’s UIC program and require federal permits. Under the Department’s SPDES program, the use of these wells has been categorized and regulated as industrial discharge. The primary objective of both programs is protection of underground sources of drinking water, and neither the EPA nor the Department issues a permit without a demonstration that injected fluids will remain confined in the disposal zone and isolated from fresh water aquifers. As noted in the 1992 Findings Statement, the permitting process for brine disposal wells “require[s] an extensive surface and subsurface evaluation which is in effect a SEIS addressing technical issues. An additional site-specific environmental assessment and SEQRA determination are required.”

UIC permit requirements will be included by reference in the SPDES permit, and the Department may propose additional monitoring requirements and/or discharge limits for inclusion in the SPDES permit. A well permit issued by DMN is also required to drill or convert a well deeper than 500 feet for brine disposal. This permit is not issued until the required UIC and SPDES permits have been approved. More information about the required analysis and mitigation

measures considered during this review is provided in Chapter 7. Because of the 1992 finding that brine disposal wells require site-specific SEQRA review, mitigation measures are discussed in Chapter 7 for informational purposes only and are not being proposed on a generic basis.

5.13.3.2 *Municipal Sewage Treatment Facilities*

Municipal sewage treatment facilities (also called POTWs) are regulated by the Department's DOW. POTWs typically discharge treated wastewater to surface water bodies, and operate under SPDES permits which include specific discharge limitations and monitoring requirements.

In general, POTWs must have a Department-approved pretreatment program for accepting any industrial waste. POTWs must also notify the Department of any new industrial waste they plan to receive at their facility. POTWs are required to perform certain analyses to ensure they can handle the waste without upsetting their system or causing a problem in the receiving water.

Ultimately, the Department needs to approve such analysis and modify SPDES permits as needed to insure water quality standards in receiving waters are maintained at all times. More detailed discussion of the potential environmental impacts and how they are mitigated is presented in Chapters 6 and 7.

5.13.3.3 *Out-of-State Treatment Plants*

The only regulatory role the Department has over disposal of flowback water (or production brine) at out-of-state municipal or industrial treatment plants is that transport of these fluids, which are considered industrial waste, must be by a licensed Part 364 Transporter.

For informational purposes, Table 5.28 lists out-of-state plants that were proposed in actual well permit applications for disposition of flowback water recovered in New York. The regulatory regimes in other states for treatment of this waste stream are evolving, and it is unknown whether disposal at the listed plants remains feasible.

Table 5.28 - Out-of-state treatment plants proposed for disposition of NY flowback water

Treatment Facility	Location	County
Advanced Waste Services	New Castle, PA	Lawrence
Eureka Resources	Williamsport, PA	Lycoming
Lehigh County Authority Pretreatment Plant	Fogelsville, PA	Lehigh
Liquid Assets Disposal	Wheeling, WV	Ohio
Municipal Authority of the City of McKeesport	McKeesport, PA	Allegheny
PA Brine Treatment, Inc.	Franklin, PA	Venango
Sunbury Generation	Shamokin Dam, PA	Snyder
Tri-County Waste Water Management	Waynesburg, PA	Greene
Tunnelton Liquids Co.	Saltsburg, PA	Indiana
Valley Joint Sewer Authority	Athens, PA	Bradford
Waste Treatment Corporation	Washington, PA	Washington

5.13.3.4 Road Spreading

Consistent with past practice regarding flowback water disposal, in January 2009, the Department's Division of Solid and Hazardous Materials (DSHM), which was then responsible for oversight of the Part 364 program, released a notification to haulers applying for, modifying, or renewing their Part 364 permit that flowback water from any formation including the Marcellus may not be spread on roads and must be disposed of at facilities authorized by the Department or transported for use or re-use at other gas or oil wells where acceptable to DMN. This notification also addressed production brine and is included as Appendix 12. (Because of organizational changes within the Department since 2009, the Part 364 program is now overseen by the Division of Environmental Remediation (DER). As discussed in Chapter 7, BUDs for reuse of production brine from Marcellus Shale will not be issued until additional data on NORM content is available and evaluated.)

5.13.3.5 Private In-State Industrial Treatment Plants

Industrial facilities could be constructed or converted in New York to treat flowback water (and production brine). Such facilities would require a SPDES permit for any discharge. Again, the SPDES permit for a dedicated treatment facility would include specific discharge limitations and monitoring requirements. The effluent limitations are the maximum allowable concentrations or ranges for various physical, chemical, and/or biological parameters to ensure that there are no impacts to the receiving water body.

5.13.3.6 *Enhanced Oil Recovery*

Waterflooding is an enhanced oil recovery technique whereby water is injected into partially depleted oil reservoirs to displace additional oil and increase recovery. Waterflood operations in New York are regulated under Part 557 of the Department's regulations and under the EPA's Underground Injection Control Program.

EPA reviews proposed waterflood injectate to determine the threat of endangerment to underground sources of drinking water. Operations that are authorized by rule are required to submit an analysis of the injectate anytime it changes, and operations under permit are required to modify their permits to inject water from a new source. At this time, no waterflood operations in New York have EPA approval to inject flowback water.

5.13.4 *Solid Residuals from Flowback Water Treatment*

URS Corporation reports that residuals disposal from the limited on-site treatment currently occurring generally consists of injection into disposal wells.¹⁴² Other options would be dependent upon the nature and composition of the residuals and would require site-specific consultation with the Department's Division of Materials Management (DMM). Transportation would require a Part 364 Waste Transporters' Permit.

5.14 Well Cleanup and Testing

Wells are typically tested after drilling and stimulation to determine their productivity, economic viability, and design criteria for a pipeline gathering system if one needs to be constructed. If no gathering line exists, well testing necessitates that produced gas be flared. However, operators have reported that for Marcellus Shale development in the northern tier of Pennsylvania, flaring is minimized by construction of the gathering system ahead of well completion. Flaring is necessary during the initial 12 to 24 hours of flowback operations while the well is producing a high ratio of flowback water to gas, but no flow testing that requires an extended period of flaring is conducted. Operators report that without a gathering line in place, initial cleanup or

¹⁴² URS, 2009, p. 5-3.

testing that require flaring could last for 3 days per well.¹⁴³ Under the SGEIS, permit conditions would prohibit flaring during completion operations if a gathering line is in place.

5.15 Summary of Operations Prior to Production

Table 5.29 summarizes the primary operations that may take place at a multi-well pad prior to the production phase, and their typical durations. This tabulation assumes that a smaller rig is used to drill the vertical wellbore and a larger rig is used for the horizontal wellbore. Rig availability and other parameters outside the operators' control may affect the listed time frames. As explained in Section 5.2, no more than two rigs would operate on the well pad concurrently.

Note that the early production phase at a pad may overlap with the activities summarized in Table 5.29, as some wells may be placed into production prior to drilling and completion of all the wells on a pad. All pre-production operations for an entire pad must be concluded within three years or less, in accordance with ECL §23-0501. Estimated duration of each operation may be shorter or longer depending on site specific circumstances.

Table 5.29 - Primary Pre-Production Well Pad Operations (Revised July 2011)

Operation	Materials and Equipment	Activities	Duration
Access Road and Well Pad Construction	Backhoes, bulldozers and other types of earth-moving equipment.	Clearing, grading, pit construction, placement of road materials such as geotextile and gravel.	Up to 4 weeks per well pad
Vertical Drilling with Smaller Rig	Drilling rig, fuel tank, pipe racks, well control equipment, personnel vehicles, associated outbuildings, delivery trucks.	Drilling, running and cementing surface casing, truck trips for delivery of equipment and cement. Delivery of equipment for horizontal drilling may commence during late stages of vertical drilling.	Up to 2 weeks per well; one to two wells at a time
Preparation for Horizontal Drilling with Larger Rig		Transport, assembly and setup, or repositioning on site of large rig and ancillary equipment.	5 – 30 days per well ¹⁴⁴

¹⁴³ ALL Consulting, 2010, pp. 10-11.

¹⁴⁴ The shorter end of the time frame for drilling preparations applies if the rig is already at the well pad and only needs to be repositioned. The longer end applies if the rig would be brought from off-site and is proportional to the distance which the rig would be moved. This time frame would occur prior to vertical drilling if the same rig is used for the vertical and horizontal portions of the wellbore.

Operation	Materials and Equipment	Activities	Duration
Horizontal Drilling	Drilling rig, mud system (pumps, tanks, solids control, gas separator), fuel tank, well control equipment, personnel vehicles, associated outbuildings, delivery trucks.	Drilling, running and cementing production casing, truck trips for delivery of equipment and cement. Deliveries associated with hydraulic fracturing may commence during late stages of horizontal drilling.	Up to 2 weeks per well; one to two wells at a time
Preparation for Hydraulic Fracturing		Rig down and removal or repositioning of drilling equipment including possible changeover to workover rig to clean out well and run tubing-conveyed perforating equipment. Wireline truck on site to run cement bond log (CBL). Truck trips for delivery of temporary tanks, water, sand, additives and other fracturing equipment. Deliveries may commence during late stages of horizontal drilling.	30 – 60 days per well, or per well pad if all wells treated during one mobilization
Hydraulic Fracturing Procedure	Temporary water tanks, generators, pumps, sand trucks, additive delivery trucks and containers (see Section 5.6.1), blending unit, personnel vehicles, associated outbuildings, including computerized monitoring equipment.	Fluid pumping, and use of wireline equipment between pumping stages to raise and lower tools used for downhole well preparation and measurements. Computerized monitoring. Continued water and additive delivery.	2 – 5 days per well, including approximately 40 to 100 hours of actual pumping
Fluid Return (Flowback) and Treatment	Gas/water separator, flare stack, temporary water tanks, mobile water treatment units, trucks for fluid removal if necessary, personnel vehicles.	Rig down and removal or repositioning of fracturing equipment; controlled fluid flow into treating equipment, tanks, lined pits, impoundments or pipelines; truck trips to remove fluid if not stored on site or removed by pipeline.	2 – 8 weeks per well, may occur concurrently for several wells
Waste Disposal	Earth-moving equipment, pump trucks, waste transport trucks.	Pumping and excavation to empty/reclaim reserve pit(s). Truck trips to transfer waste to disposal facility. Truck trips to remove temporary water storage tanks.	Up to 6 weeks per well pad
Well Cleanup and Testing	Well head, flare stack, brine tanks. Earth-moving equipment.	Well flaring and monitoring. Truck trips to empty brine tanks. Gathering line construction may commence if not done in advance.	½ - 30 days per well

5.16 Natural Gas Production

5.16.1 Partial Site Reclamation

Subsequent to drilling and fracturing operations, associated equipment is removed. Any pits used for those operations must be reclaimed and the site must be re-graded and seeded to the extent feasible to match it to the adjacent terrain. Department inspectors visit the site to confirm full restoration of areas not needed for production.

Well pad size during the production phase will be influenced on a site-specific basis by topography and generally by the space needed to support production activities and well servicing. According to operators, multi-well pads will average 1.5 acres in size during the long-term production phase, after partial reclamation.

5.16.2 Gas Composition

5.16.2.1 Hydrocarbons

As discussed in Chapter 4 and shown on the maps accompanying the discussion in that section, most of the Utica Shale and most of the Marcellus Shale “fairway” are in the dry gas window as defined by thermal maturity and vitrinite reflectance. In other words, the shales would not be expected to produce liquid hydrocarbons such as oil or condensate. This is corroborated by gas composition analyses provided by one operator for wells in the northern tier of Pennsylvania and shown in Table 5.30.

Table 5.30 - Marcellus Gas Composition from Bradford County, PA

Mole percent samples from Bradford Co., PA												
Sample Number	Nitrogen	Carbon Dioxide	Methane	Ethane	Propane	i-Butane	n-Butane	i-Pentane	n-Pentane	Hexanes +	Oxygen	sum
1	0.297	0.063	96.977	2.546	0.107		0.01					100
2	0.6	0.001	96.884	2.399	0.097	0.004	0.008	0.003	0.004			100
3	0.405	0.085	96.943	2.449	0.106	0.003	0.009					100
4	0.368	0.046	96.942	2.522	0.111	0.002	0.009					100
5	0.356	0.067	96.959	2.496	0.108	0.004	0.01					100
6	1.5366	0.1536	97.6134	0.612	0.0469					0.0375		100
7	2.5178	0.218	96.8193	0.4097	0.0352							100
8	1.2533	0.1498	97.7513	0.7956	0.0195		0.0011			0.0294		100
9	0.2632	0.0299	98.0834	1.5883	0.0269	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0083	100
10	0.4996	0.0551	96.9444	2.3334	0.0780	0.0157	0.0167	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0571	100
11	0.1910	0.0597	97.4895	2.1574	0.0690	0.0208	0.0126	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	100
12	0.2278	0.0233	97.3201	2.3448	0.0731	0.0000	0.0032	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0077	100

ICF International, reviewing the above data under contract to NYSERDA, notes that samples 1, 3, 4 had no detectable hydrocarbons greater than n-butane. Sample 2 had no detectable hydrocarbons greater than n-pentane. Based on the low VOC content of these compositions, pollutants such as BTEX are not expected.¹⁴⁵ BTEX would normally be trapped in liquid phase with other components like natural gas liquids, oil or water. Fortuna Energy reports that it has sampled for benzene, toluene, and xylene and has not detected it in its gas samples or water analyses.

5.16.2.2 *Hydrogen Sulfide*

As further reported by ICF, sample number 1 in Table 5.30 included a sulfur analysis and found less than 0.032 grams sulfur per 100 cubic feet. The other samples did not include sulfur analysis. Chesapeake Energy reported in 2009 that no hydrogen sulfide had been detected at any of its active interconnects in Pennsylvania. Also in 2009, Fortuna Energy (now Talisman Energy) reported testing for hydrogen sulfide regularly with readings of 2 to 4 ppm during a brief period on one occasion in its vertical Marcellus wells, and that its presence had not recurred since. More recently, it has been reported to the Department that, beyond minor detections with mudlogging equipment, there is no substantiated occurrence of H₂S in Marcellus wells in the northern tier of Pennsylvania.¹⁴⁶

5.16.3 *Production Rate*

Long-term production rates are difficult to predict accurately for a play that has not yet been developed or is in the very early stages of development. One operator has indicated that its Marcellus production facility design will have a maximum capacity of either 6 MMcf/d or 10 MMcf/d, whichever is appropriate. IOGA-NY provided production estimates based on current information regarding production experience in Pennsylvania, but also noted the following caveats:

- The production estimates are based on 640-acre pad development with horizontal wells in the Marcellus fairway. Vertical wells and off-fairway development will vary.

¹⁴⁵ ICF Task 2, 2009, pp. 29-30.

¹⁴⁶ ALL Consulting, 2010, p. 49.

- The Marcellus fairway in New York is expected to have less formation thickness, and because there has not been horizontal Marcellus drilling to date in New York the reservoir characteristics and production performance are unknown. IOGA-NY expects lower average production rates in New York than in Pennsylvania.

The per-well production estimates provided by IOGA-NY are as follows:

High Estimate

- Year 1 – initial rate of 8.72 MMcf/d declining to 3.49 MMcf/d.
- Years 2 to 4 – 3.49 MMcf/d declining to 1.25 MMcf/d.
- Years 5 to 10 – 1.25 MMcf/d declining to 0.55 MMcf/d.
- Years 11 and after – 0.55 MMcf/d declining at 5% per annum.
- The associated estimated ultimate recovery (EUR) is approximately 9.86 Bcf.

Low Estimate

- Year 1 – initial rate of 3.26 MMcf/d declining to 1.14 MMcf/d.
- Years 2 to 4 – 1.14 MMcf/d declining to 0.49 MMcf/d.
- Years 5 to 10 – 0.49 MMcf/d declining to 0.29 MMcf/d.
- Years 11 and after – 0.29 MMcf/d declining at 5% per annum.
- The associated EUR is approximately 2.28 Bcf.¹⁴⁷

5.16.4 Well Pad Production Equipment

In addition to the assembly of pressure-control devices and valves at the top of the well known as the “wellhead,” “production tree” or “Christmas tree,” equipment at the well pad during the production phase will likely include:

- A small inline heater that is in use for the first 6 to 8 months of production and during winter months to ensure freezing does not occur in the flow line due to Joule-Thompson effect (each well or shared);
- A two-phase gas/water separator;
- Gas metering devices (each well or shared);
- Water metering devices (each well or shared); and
- Brine storage tanks (shared by all wells).


¹⁴⁷ ALL Consulting, 2011, p. 2.

In addition:

- A well head compressor may be added during later years after gas production has declined; and
- A triethylene glycol (TEG) dehydrator may be located at some well sites, although typically the gas is sent to a gathering system for compression and dehydration at a compressor station.

Produced gas flows from the wellhead to the separator through a two- to three-inch diameter pipe (flow line). The operating pressure in the separator will typically be in the 100 to 200 psi range depending on the stage of the wells' life. At the separator, water will be removed from the gas stream via a dump valve and sent by pipe (water line) to the brine storage tanks. The gas continues through a meter and to the departing gathering line, which carries the gas to a centralized compression facility (see Figure 5.8).

Figure 5.8 – Simplified Illustration of Gas Production Process



5.16.5 Brine Storage

Based on experience to date in the northern tier of Pennsylvania, one operator reports that brine production has typically been less than 10 barrels per day after the initial flowback operation and once the well is producing gas. Another operator reports that the rate of brine production during the production phase is about to 5 - 20 barrels per MMcf of gas produced.

One or more brine tanks will be installed on-site, along with truck loading facilities. At least one operator has indicated the possibility of constructing pipelines to move brine from the site, in which case truck loading facilities would not be necessary. Operators monitor brine levels in the tanks at least daily, with some sites monitored remotely by telemetric devices capable of sending alarms or shutting wells in if the storage limit is approached.

The storage of production brine in on-site pits has been prohibited in New York since 1984.

5.16.6 Brine Disposal

Production brine disposal options discussed in the 1992 GEIS include injection wells, treatment plants and road spreading for dust control and de-icing, which are all discussed in the GEIS. If production brine is trucked off-site, it must be hauled by approved Part 364 Waste Transporters.

With respect to road spreading, in January 2009 the Department released a notification to haulers applying for, modifying, or renewing their Part 364 Waste Transporter Permits that any entity applying for a Part 364 permit or permit modification to use production brine for road spreading must submit a petition for a beneficial use determination (BUD) to the Department. The BUD and Part 364 permit must be issued by the Department prior to any production brine being removed from a well site for road spreading. See Appendix 12 for the notification. As discussed in Chapter 7, BUDs for reuse of production brine from Marcellus Shale will not be issued until additional data on NORM content is available and evaluated.

5.16.7 NORM in Marcellus Production Brine

Results of the Department's initial NORM analysis of Marcellus brine produced in New York are shown in Appendix 13. These samples were collected in late 2008 and 2009 from vertical gas wells in the Marcellus formation. The data indicate the need to collect additional samples of production brine to assess the need for mitigation and to require appropriate handling and

treatment options, including possible radioactive materials licensing. The NYSDOH will require the well operator to obtain a radioactive materials license for the facility when exposure rate measurements associated with scale accumulation in or on piping, drilling and brine storage equipment exceed 50 microR/hr ($\mu\text{R/hr}$). A license may be required for facilities that will concentrate NORM during pre-treatment or treatment of brine. Potential impacts and proposed mitigation measures related to NORM are discussed in Chapters 6 and 7.

5.16.8 Gas Gathering and Compression

Operators report a 0.55 psi/foot to 0.60 psi/foot pressure gradient for the Marcellus Shale in the northern tier of Pennsylvania. Bottom-hole pressure equals the true vertical depth of the well times the pressure gradient. Therefore, the bottom-hole pressure on a 6,000-foot deep well will be approximately between 3,300 and 3,600 psi. Wellhead pressures would be lower, depending on the makeup of the gas. One operator reported flowing tubing pressures in Bradford County, Pennsylvania, of 1,100 to 2,000 psi. Gas flowing at these pressures would not initially require compression to flow into a transmission line. Pressure decreases over time, however, and one operator stated an advantage of flowing the wells at as low a pressure as economically practical from the outset, to take advantage of the shale's gas desorption properties. In either case, the necessary compression to allow gas to flow into a large transmission line for sale would typically occur at a centralized site. Dehydration units, to remove water vapor from the gas before it flows into the sales line, would also be located at the centralized compression facilities.

Based on experience in the northern tier of Pennsylvania, operators estimate that a centralized facility will service well pads within a four to six mile radius. The gathering system from the well to a centralized compression facility consists of buried polyvinyl chloride (PVC) or steel pipe, and the buried lines leaving the compression facility consists of coated steel.

Siting of gas gathering and pipeline systems, including the centralized compressor stations described above, is not subject to SEQRA review. See 6 NYCRR 617.5(c)(35). Therefore, the above description of these facilities, and the description in Section 8.1.2.1 of the PSC's environmental review process, is presented for informational purposes only. This SGEIS will not result in SEQRA findings or new SEQRA procedures regarding the siting and approval of gas gathering and pipeline systems or centralized compression facilities. Environmental factors

associated with gas-gathering and pipeline systems will be considered as part of the PSC's permitting process.

Photo 5.28 shows an aerial view of a compression facility.



Photo 5.28 - Pipeline Compressor in New York. Source: Fortuna Energy

5.17 Well Plugging

As described in the 1992 GEIS, any unsuccessful well or well whose productive life is over must be properly plugged and abandoned, in accordance with Department-issued plugging permits and under the oversight of Department field inspectors. Proper plugging is critical for the continued protection of groundwater, surface water bodies and soil. Financial security to ensure funds for well plugging is required before the permit to drill is issued, and must be maintained for the life of the well.

When a well is plugged, downhole equipment is removed from the wellbore, uncemented casing in critical areas must be either pulled or perforated, and cement must be placed across or squeezed at these intervals to ensure seals between hydrocarbon and water-bearing zones. These downhole cement plugs supplement the cement seal that already exists at least behind the surface (i.e., fresh-water protection) casing and above the completion zone behind production casing.

Intervals between plugs must be filled with a heavy mud or other approved fluid. For gas wells, in addition to the downhole cement plugs, a minimum of 50 feet of cement must be placed in the top of the wellbore to prevent any release or escape of hydrocarbons or brine from the wellbore. This plug also serves to prevent wellbore access from the surface, eliminating it as a safety hazard or disposal site.

Removal of all surface equipment and full site restoration are required after the well is plugged. Proper disposal of surface equipment includes testing for NORM to determine the appropriate disposal site.

The plugging requirements summarized above are described in detail in Chapter 11 of the 1992 GEIS and are enforced as conditions on plugging permits. Issuance of plugging permits is classified as a Type II action under SEQRA. Proper well plugging is a beneficial action with the sole purpose of environmental protection, and constitutes a routine agency action. Horizontal drilling and high-volume hydraulic fracturing do not necessitate any new or different methods for well plugging that require further SEQRA review.



Chapter 6

Potential Environmental Impacts

This page intentionally left blank.

Chapter 6 – Potential Environmental Impacts

CHAPTER 6 POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS.....	6-1
6.1 WATER RESOURCES	6-1
6.1.1 Water Withdrawals	6-2
6.1.1.1 Reduced Stream Flow	6-2
6.1.1.2 Degradation of a Stream’s Best Use	6-2
6.1.1.3 Impacts to Aquatic Habitat	6-3
6.1.1.4 Impacts to Aquatic Ecosystems	6-3
6.1.1.5 Impacts to Wetlands	6-5
6.1.1.6 Aquifer Depletion.....	6-5
6.1.1.7 Cumulative Water Withdrawal Impacts	6-6
6.1.2 Stormwater Runoff	6-14
6.1.3 Surface Spills and Releases at the Well Pad	6-15
6.1.3.1 Drilling.....	6-16
6.1.3.2 Hydraulic Fracturing Additives.....	6-16
6.1.3.3 Flowback Water and Production Brine	6-17
6.1.3.4 Potential Impacts to Primary and Principal Aquifers	6-36
6.1.4 Groundwater Impacts Associated With Well Drilling and Construction	6-40
6.1.4.1 Turbidity.....	6-40
6.1.4.2 Fluids Pumped Into the Well.....	6-41
6.1.4.3 Natural Gas Migration	6-41
6.1.5 Unfiltered Surface Drinking Water Supplies: NYC and Syracuse	6-42
6.1.5.1 Pollutants of Critical Concern in Unfiltered Drinking Water Supplies	6-45
6.1.5.2 Regulatory and Programmatic Framework for Filtration Avoidance	6-48
6.1.5.3 Adverse Impacts to Unfiltered Drinking Waters from High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing.....	6-50
6.1.5.4 Conclusion.....	6-52
6.1.6 Hydraulic Fracturing Procedure.....	6-52
6.1.6.1 Wellbore Failure	6-53
6.1.6.2 Subsurface Pathways	6-53
6.1.7 Waste Transport.....	6-56
6.1.8 Fluid Discharges.....	6-57
6.1.8.1 POTWs	6-57
6.1.8.2 Private Off-site Wastewater Treatment and/or Reuse Facilities	6-63
6.1.8.3 Private On-site Wastewater Treatment and/or Reuse Facilities	6-64
6.1.8.4 Disposal Wells.....	6-64
6.1.8.5 Other Means of Wastewater Disposal.....	6-64
6.1.9 Solids Disposal	6-65
6.1.9.1 NORM Considerations - Cuttings	6-65
6.1.9.2 Cuttings Volume.....	6-65
6.1.9.3 Cuttings and Liner Associated With Mud-Drilling	6-66
6.2 FLOODPLAINS	6-66
6.3 FRESHWATER WETLANDS	6-66
6.4 ECOSYSTEMS AND WILDLIFE.....	6-66
6.4.1 Impacts of Fragmentation to Terrestrial Habitats and Wildlife.....	6-67
6.4.1.1 Impacts of Grassland Fragmentation.....	6-72
6.4.1.2 Impacts of Forest Fragmentation	6-74
6.4.2 Invasive Species	6-84

6.4.2.1	Terrestrial.....	6-84
6.4.2.2	Aquatic.....	6-86
6.4.3	Impacts to Endangered and Threatened Species	6-88
6.4.4	Impacts to State-Owned Lands.....	6-90
6.5	AIR QUALITY	6-93
6.5.1	Regulatory Overview	6-93
6.5.1.1	Emission Analysis NO _x - Internal Combustion Engine Emissions	6-99
6.5.1.2	Natural Gas Production Facilities NESHAP 40 CFR Part 63, Subpart HH (Glycol Dehydrators) ...	6-102
6.5.1.3	Flaring Versus Venting of Wellsite Air Emissions	6-103
6.5.1.4	Number of Wells Per Pad Site.....	6-104
6.5.1.5	Natural Gas Condensate Tanks	6-104
6.5.1.6	Emissions Tables	6-105
6.5.1.7	Offsite Gas Gathering Station Engine	6-107
6.5.1.8	Department Determinations on the Air Permitting Process Relative to Marcellus Shale High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing Development Activities.....	6-108
6.5.2	Air Quality Impact Assessment.....	6-110
6.5.2.1	Introduction	6-110
6.5.2.2	Sources of Air Emissions and Operational Scenarios	6-113
6.5.2.3	Modeling Procedures	6-117
6.5.2.4	Results of the Modeling Analysis	6-132
6.5.2.5	Supplemental Modeling Assessment for Short Term PM _{2.5} , SO ₂ and NO ₂ Impacts and Mitigation Measures Necessary to Meet NAAQS.....	6-140
6.5.2.6	The Practicality of Mitigation Measures on the Completion Equipment and Drilling Engines.....	6-153
6.5.2.7	Conclusions from the Modeling Analysis.....	6-157
6.5.3	Regional Emissions of O ₃ Precursors and Their Effects on Attainment Status in the SIP	6-168
6.5.4	Air Quality Monitoring Requirements for Marcellus Shale Activities.....	6-180
6.5.5	Permitting Approach to the Well Pad and Compressor Station Operations	6-185
6.6	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS	6-186
6.6.1	Greenhouse Gases.....	6-187
6.6.2	Emissions from Oil and Gas Operations	6-187
6.6.2.1	Vented Emissions.....	6-188
6.6.2.2	Combustion Emissions	6-188
6.6.2.3	Fugitive Emissions.....	6-189
6.6.3	Emissions Source Characterization.....	6-189
6.6.4	Emission Rates	6-193
6.6.5	Drilling Rig Mobilization, Site Preparation and Demobilization	6-194
6.6.6	Completion Rig Mobilization and Demobilization	6-195
6.6.7	Well Drilling	6-195
6.6.8	Well Completion	6-196
6.6.9	Well Production	6-198
6.6.10	Summary of GHG Emissions	6-200
6.7	NATURALLY OCCURRING RADIOACTIVE MATERIALS IN THE MARCELLUS SHALE.....	6-205
6.8	SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACTS	6-207
6.8.1	Economy, Employment, and Income.....	6-211
6.8.1.1	New York State	6-211
6.8.1.2	Representative Regions	6-217
6.8.2	Population	6-231
6.8.2.1	New York State	6-233
6.8.2.2	Representative Regions	6-238
6.8.3	Housing.....	6-242

6.8.3.1	New York State	6-242
6.8.3.2	Representative Regions	6-245
6.8.3.3	Cyclical Nature of the Natural Gas Industry.....	6-250
6.8.3.4	Property Values	6-250
6.8.4	Government Revenue and Expenditures.....	6-254
6.8.4.1	New York State	6-254
6.8.4.2	Representative Regions	6-257
6.8.5	Environmental Justice.....	6-263
6.9	VISUAL IMPACTS	6-263
6.9.1	Changes since Publication of the 1992 GEIS that Affect the Assessment of Visual Impacts	6-264
6.9.1.1	Equipment and Drilling Techniques	6-264
6.9.1.2	Changes in Well Pad Size and the Number of Water Storage Sites	6-265
6.9.1.3	Duration and Nature of Drilling and Hydraulic-Fracturing Activities	6-265
6.9.2	New Landscape Features Associated with the Different Phases of Horizontal Drilling and Hydraulic Fracturing	6-266
6.9.2.1	New Landscape Features Associated with the Construction of Well Pads.....	6-266
6.9.2.2	New Landscape Features Associated with Drilling Activities at Well Pads	6-270
6.9.2.3	New Landscape Features Associated with Hydraulic Fracturing Activities at Well Pads.....	6-270
6.9.2.4	New Landscape Features Associated with Production at Viable Well Sites	6-272
6.9.2.5	New Landscape Features Associated with the Reclamation of Well Sites.....	6-272
6.9.3	Visual Impacts Associated with the Different Phases of Horizontal Drilling and Hydraulic Fracturing	6-272
6.9.3.1	Visual Impacts Associated with Construction of Well Pads	6-273
6.9.3.2	Visual Impacts Associated with Drilling Activities on Well Pads	6-274
6.9.3.3	Visual Impacts Associated with Hydraulic Fracturing Activities at Well Sites.....	6-275
6.9.3.4	Visual Impacts Associated with Production at Well Sites	6-275
6.9.3.5	Visual Impacts Associated with the Reclamation of Well Sites	6-276
6.9.4	Visual Impacts of Off-site Activities Associated with Horizontal Drilling and Hydraulic Fracturing	6-277
6.9.5	Previous Evaluations of Visual Impacts from Horizontal Drilling and Hydraulic Fracturing	6-279
6.9.6	Assessment of Visual Impacts using NYSDEC Policy and Guidance	6-283
6.9.7	Summary of Visual Impacts	6-284
6.10	NOISE	6-289
6.10.1	Access Road Construction	6-291
6.10.2	Well Site Preparation.....	6-292
6.10.3	High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing – Drilling	6-293
6.10.4	High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing – Fracturing	6-296
6.10.5	Transportation.....	6-299
6.10.6	Gas Well Production	6-300
6.11	TRANSPORTATION IMPACTS	6-300
6.11.1	Estimated Truck Traffic.....	6-301
6.11.1.1	Total Number of Trucks per Well.....	6-301
6.11.1.2	Temporal Distribution of Truck Traffic per Well	6-304
6.11.1.3	Temporal Distribution of Truck Traffic for Multi-Well Pads	6-304
6.11.2	Increased Traffic on Roadways.....	6-307
6.11.3	Damage to Local Roads, Bridges, and other Infrastructure.....	6-310
6.11.4	Damage to State Roads, Bridges, and other Infrastructure.....	6-312
6.11.5	Operational and Safety Impacts on Road Systems	6-314
6.11.6	Transportation of Hazardous Materials.....	6-315
6.11.7	Impacts on Rail and Air Travel	6-316
6.12	COMMUNITY CHARACTER IMPACTS.....	6-316

6.13 SEISMICITY	6-319
6.13.1 Hydraulic Fracturing-Induced Seismicity	6-319
6.13.1.1 Background	6-320
6.13.1.2 Recent Investigations and Studies	6-323
6.13.1.3 Correlations between New York and Texas	6-325
6.13.1.4 Affects of Seismicity on Wellbore Integrity	6-326
6.13.2 Summary of Potential Seismicity Impacts	6-327

FIGURES

Figure 6.1 - Water Withdrawals in the United States	6-11
Figure 6.2 - Fresh Water Use in NY (millions of gallons per day) with Projected Peak Water Use for High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing (New July 2011)	6-12
Figure 6.3 - Daily Water Withdrawals, Exports, and Consumptive Uses in the Delaware River Basin	6-13
Figure 6.4- NYSDOH Regulated Groundwater Supplies within Mapped Primary and Principal Aquifers in NY, Where the Marcellus Shale is Greater than 2,000 Feet below Ground Surface	6-38
Figure 6.5 - Average Spatial Disturbance for Marcellus Shale Well Pads in Forested Context (New July 2011)	6-77
Figure 6.6 – Interior Forest Habitat Before & After Development of a Marcellus Gas Well Pad, Elk County PA (New July 2011)	6-80
Figure 6.7 - Total Forest Areas Converted (New July 2011)	6-81
Figure 6.8 - New York’s Forest Matrix Blocks and State Connectivity (New July 2011)	6-83
Figure 6.9-Areas of Concern for Endangered and Threatened Animal Species within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus Shale in New York, March 31, 2011 (New July 2011)	6-90
Figure 6.10 - Location of Well Pad Sources of Air Pollution Used in Modeling	6-167
Figure 6.11 - Barnett Shale Natural Gas Production Trend, 1998-2007	6-173
Figure 6.12 – Projected Direct Employment in New York State Resulting from Each Development Scenario (New August 2011)	6-214
Figure 6.13 - Projected Total Employment in New York State Resulting from Each Development Scenario (New August 2011)	6-215
Figure 6.14 - Projected Direct Employment in Region A Resulting from Each Development Scenario (New August 2011)	6-221
Figure 6.15 - Projected Direct Employment in Region B Resulting from Each Development Scenario (New August 2011)	6-222
Figure 6.16 - Projected Direct Employment in Region C Resulting from Each Development Scenario (New August 2011)	6-223
Figure 6.17 – Projected Total Employment in Region A Under Each Development Scenario (New August 2011)	6-225
Figure 6.18 - Projected Total Employment in Region B Under Each Development Scenario (New August 2011)	6-226
Figure 6.19 - Projected Total Employment in Region C Under Each Development Scenario (New August 2011)	6-227
Figure 6.20 - A-Weighted Noise Emissions: Cruise Throttle, Average Pavement (New August 2011)	6-299
Figure 6.21 - Estimated Round-Trip Daily Heavy and Light Truck Traffic, by Well Type - Single Well (New August 2011)	6-304
Figure 6.22 - Estimated Daily Round-Trips of Heavy and Light Truck Traffic - Multi Horizontal Wells (New August 2011)	6-306
Figure 6.23 - Estimated Round-Trip Daily Heavy and Light Truck Traffic - Multi Vertical Wells (New August 2011) ..	6-306

TABLES

Table 6.1 - Comparison of additives used or proposed for use in NY, parameters detected in analytical results of flowback from the Marcellus operations in PA and WV and parameters regulated via primary and secondary drinking water standards, SPDES or TOGS111 (Revised August 2011)	6-19
Table 6.2 - Grassland Bird Population Trends at Three Scales from 1966 to 2005. (New July 2011)	6-73

Table 6.3 - Terrestrial Invasive Plant Species In New York State (Interim List)'	6-85
Table 6.4 - Aquatic, Wetland & Littoral Invasive Plant Species in New York State (Interim List)'	6-87
Table 6.5 - Endangered & Threatened Animal Species within the Area Underlain by the Marcellus Shale (New July 2011)	6-89
Table 6.6 - EPA AP-42 Emissions Factors Tables	6-100
Table 6.7 - Estimated Wellsite Emissions (Dry Gas) - Flowback Gas Flaring (Tpy)(Updated July 2011)	6-106
Table 6.8 - Estimated Wellsite Emissions (Dry Gas) - Flowback Gas Venting (Tpy)(Updated July 2011)	6-106
Table 6.9 - Estimated Wellsite Emissions (Wet Gas) - Flowback Gas Flaring (Tpy) (Updated July 2011)	6-106
Table 6.10 - Estimated Wellsite Emissions (Wet Gas) - Flowback Gas Venting (Tpy) (Updated July 2011)	6-106
Table 6.11 - Estimated Off-Site Compressor Station Emissions (Tpy)	6-107
Table 6.12 - Sources and Pollutants Modeled for Short-Term Simultaneous Operations	6-159
Table 6.13 - National Weather Service Data Sites Used in the Modeling	6-159
Table 6.14 - National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), PSD Increments & Significant Impact Levels (SILs) for Criteria Pollutants ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	6-160
Table 6.15 - Maximum Background Concentration from Department Monitor Sites	6-161
Table 6.16 - Maximum Impacts of Criteria Pollutants for Each Meteorological Data Set	6-162
Table 6.17 - Maximum Project Impacts of Criteria Pollutants and Comparison to SILs, PSD Increments and Ambient Standards	6-163
Table 6.18 - Maximum Impacts of Non-Criteria Pollutants and Comparisons to SGC/AGC and New York State AAQS	6-164
Table 6.19 - Modeling Results for Short Term PM ₁₀ , PM _{2.5} and NO ₂ (New July 2011)	6-165
Table 6.20 - Engine Tiers and Use in New York with Recommended Mitigation Controls Based on the Modeling Analysis (New July 2011)	6-166
Table 6.21 - Predicted Ozone Precursor Emissions (Tpy)	6-174
Table 6.22 - Barnett Shale Annual Average Emissions from All Sources	6-178
Table 6.23 - Near-Field Pollutants of Concern for Inclusion in the Near-Field Monitoring Program (New July 2011)	6-182
Table 6.24 - Department Air Quality Monitoring Requirements for Marcellus Shale Activities (New July 2011)	6-184
Table 6.25 - Assumed Drilling & Completion Time Frames for Single Vertical Well (New July 2011)	6-192
Table 6.26 - Assumed Drilling & Completion Time Frames for Single Horizontal Well (Updated July 2011)	6-192
Table 6.27 - Global Warming Potential for Given Time Horizon	6-201
Table 6.28 - Summary of Estimated Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Revised July 2011)	6-201
Table 6.29 - Emission Estimation Approaches – General Considerations	6-204
Table 6.30 - Radionuclide Half-Lives	6-206
Table 6.31 - Major Development Scenario Assumptions (New August 2011)	6-209
Table 6.32 - Maximum Direct and Indirect Employment Impacts on New York State under Each Development Scenario (New August 2011)	6-213
Table 6.33 - Maximum Direct and Indirect Annual Employee Earnings Impacts on New York State under Each Development Scenario (New August 2011)	6-216
Table 6.34 - Major Development Scenario Assumptions for Each Representative Region (New August 2011)	6-218
Table 6.35 - Maximum Direct and Indirect Employment Impacts on Each Representative Region under Each Development Scenario (New August 2011)	6-220
Table 6.36 - Maximum Direct and Indirect Earnings Impacts on Each Representative Region under Each Development Scenario (New August 2011)	6-228
Table 6.37 - Transient, Permanent and Total Construction Employment Under Each Development Scenario for Select Years: New York State (New August 2011)	6-234
Table 6.38 - Estimated Population Associated with Construction and Production Employment for Select Years: New York State (New August 2011)	6-235
Table 6.39 - Maximum Temporary and Permanent Impacts Associated with Well Construction and Production: New York State (New August 2011)	6-237
Table 6.40 - Transient, Permanent, and Total Construction Employment Under Each Development Scenario for Select Years for Representative Region A (New August 2011)	6-238

Table 6.41 - Transient, Permanent, and Total Construction Employment Under Each Development Scenario for Select Years for Representative Region B (New August 2011)	6-238
Table 6.42 - Transient, Permanent, and Total Construction Employment Under Each Development Scenario for Select Years for Representative Region C (New August 2011)	6-239
Table 6.43 - Maximum Temporary and Permanent Impacts Associated with Well Construction and Production	6-240
Table 6.44 - Maximum ¹ Estimated Employment by Development Scenario for New York State (New August 2011)	6-243
Table 6.45 - New York State Rental Housing Stock (2010) (New August 2011).....	6-244
Table 6.46 - Availability of Owner-Occupied Housing Units (2010) (New August 2011).....	6-245
Table 6.47 - Maximum Transient and Permanent Employment by Development Scenario and Region (New August 2011).....	6-245
Table 6.48 - Availability of Rental Housing Units (New August 2011)	6-247
Table 6.49 - Availability of Housing Units (New August 2011)	6-249
Table 6.50 - Example of the Real Property Tax Payments From a Typical Horizontal Well (New August 2011) ...	6-259
Table 6.51 - Example of the Real Property Tax Payments from a Typical Vertical Well (New August 2011)	6-261
Table 6.52 - Projected Change in Total Assessed Value and Property Tax Receipts ¹ at Peak Production (Year 30), by Region (New August 2011)	6-261
Table 6.53 - Summary of Generic Visual Impacts Resulting from Horizontal Drilling and Hydraulic Fracturing in the Marcellus and Utica Shale Area of New York (New August 2011).....	6-285
Table 6.54 - Estimated Construction Noise Levels at Various Distances for Access Road Construction (New August 2011).....	6-292
Table 6.55 - Estimated Construction Noise Levels at Various Distances for Well Pad Preparation (New August 2011)	6-293
Table 6.56 - Estimated Construction Noise Levels at Various Distances for Rotary Air Well Drilling (New August 2011).....	6-295
Table 6.57 - Estimated Construction Noise Levels at Various Distances for Horizontal Drilling (New August 2011) ..	6-295
Table 6.58 - Estimated Construction Noise Levels at Various Distances for High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing (New August 2011).....	6-297
Table 6.59 - Assumed Construction and Development Times (New August 2011)	6-298
Table 6.60 - Estimated Number of One-Way (Loaded) Trips Per Well: Horizontal Well ¹ (New August 2011)	6-302
Table 6.61 - Estimated Number of One-Way (Loaded) Trips Per Well: Vertical Well (New August 2011).....	6-303
Table 6.62 - Estimated Truck Volumes for Horizontal Wells Compared to Vertical Wells (New August 2011).....	6-303
Table 6.63 - Estimated Annual Heavy Truck Trips (in thousands) (New August 2011).....	6-309
Table 6.64 - Illustrative AADT Range for State Roads (New August 2011)	6-310

PHOTOS

Photo 6.1 - A representative view of completion activities at a recently constructed well pad (New August 2011) .	6-267
Photo 6.2 - A representative view of completion activities at a recently constructed well pad, showing a newly created access road in foreground (New August 2011)	6-268
Photo 6.3 - A representative view of a newly constructed water impoundment area (New August 2011)	6-269
Photo 6.4 - A representative view of a water procurement site (New August 2011)	6-269
Photo 6.5 - A representative view of active high-volume hydraulic fracturing (New August 2011)	6-271
Photo 6.6 - Electric Generators, Active Drilling Site (New August 2011).....	6-296
Photo 6.7 - Truck-mounted Hydraulic Fracturing Pump (New August 2011)	6-297
Photo 6.8 - Hydraulic Fracturing of a Marcellus Shale Well Site (New August 2011).....	6-298
Photo 6.9 - Map Depicting Trenton-Black River Wells and Historical Wells Targeting Other Formations in Chemung County	6-329
Photo 6.10 - Map Depicting the Location of Trenton-Black River Wells in the Eastern-end of Quackenbush Hill Field	6-330
Photo 6.11 - Trenton-Black River Well Site (Rhodes)	6-330

Photo 6.12 - Trenton-Black River Well Site (Gregory) 6-331

Photo 6.13 - Trenton-Black River Well Site (Schwingel) 6-331

Photo 6.14 - Trenton-Black River Well Site (Soderblom)..... 6-332

Photo 6.15 - Map Depicting the Locations of Two Trenton Black River Wells in North-Central Chemung County 6-333

Photo 6.16 - Trenton-Black River Well Site (Little) 6-334

Photo 6.17 - Trenton-Black River Well Site (Hulett) 6-334

Photo 6.18 - Map Depicting the Location of Trenton-Black River Wells in Western Chemung County and Eastern Steuben County 6-335

Photo 6.19 - Trenton-Black River Well Site (Lovell) 6-336

Photo 6.20 - Trenton Black River Well Site (Henkel) 6-336

This page intentionally left blank.