Water-Related Impacts from Unconventional Oil and Gas Development (UOGD)

Nicole C. Deziel, PhD, MHS

Associate Professor

Department of Environmental Health Sciences, Yale School of Public Health

Yale School of the Environment

Yale School of Engineering & Applied Science

Workshop on Advancing the Science for Drinking Water Chemical Exposure Assessment and Health Research

September 16, 2022



@Deziellab_yale



Yale school of public health

UOGD is a Complex Process



Image from USEPA

Rapid Expansion of UOGD in the US

Monthly dry shale gas production

billion cubic feet per day



Data are through March 2021 and represent EIA's official tight gas estimates, but

- ~4 million people live within 1600 m (1 mile) of a UOG well
- ~9 million people in the US have drinking water sources
 <1600 m of a UOG well
- Limited and varied regulatory oversight
- High community concern

EPA 2016; Czolowski et al. 2017 EHP; Clark et al. 2021 ERSS

Yale school of public health

https://www.eia.gov/naturalgas/weekly/

are not survey data. State abbreviations indicate primary state(s).

Potential Stressors of UOGD



Shonkoff et al. 2014 EHP; Adgate et al. 2014

Figure modified from Garcia-Gonzales , 2019

Residential proximity to UOGD has been associated with adverse health outcomes in >40 studies





Cardiovascular disease, asthma, and hospitalizations (n = 12)

Other health outcomes (n = 6)





Proximity Models



Strengths

Provides aggregate metric of exposure when dominant hazard not known

Limitations

Cannot distinguish etiologic agents or routes of exposure

Interpretable and relevant to policy (e.g., setbacks) Assumes UOG exposure attenuates with distance in a predictable way

How do we assess exposure to UOG-related water contamination in population-based studies?

The challenges

- 1. Etiologic agents not necessarily known (Elliott et al. 2017 JESEE, 2017 STOTEN)
- 2. Limited groundwater well monitoring data (Elliott 2018 Envr Res; Clark 2021 ES&T)
- 3. Fate and transport modeling for drinking water may be computationally intensive (Soriano 2021 ERL, Soriano 2022 ES&T)
- 4. Contamination events stochastic/episodic and information on spills, leaks, violations not timely or readily publicly available

Collect new water measurements and compare to proximity models



- 255 homes in Pennsylvania & Ohio
- Samples analyzed for 64 organic and inorganic chemicals chosen for health relevance and association with UOGD
- GPS collection







Study area: Counties of Pennsylvania and Ohio



Grey diamonds represent sampling locations, red circles represent active UOG wells. Home locations randomly geo-dispersed (offset) by₈ 0.1 km for privacy.

Clark 2021 ES&T

Yale school of public health

- Compared detection frequencies of organics and concentrations of inorganics to several proximity metrics and a newly developed water-specific metric (varying buffer sizes)
- Aggregate proximity/density metric ID²W = inverse-distance squared weighted well count
- New water metric (Soriano et al. 2021 ERL; Soriano et al. ES&T 2022)

 $ID_{ups} = 1/u$ where u=the distance to nearest upgradient UOG well

Organic chemicals (PA n=89 homes, OH n=161)

		PA		ОН	
Chemical	>LOD (%)	Median (IQR) (μg/L)	>LOD (%)	Median (IQR) (μg/L)	USEPA MCL (μg/L)
Bromochloromethane	97	0.52 (0.42, 0.63)	46	<lod (<lod,="" 0.08)<="" td=""><td>NS</td></lod>	NS
Chloroform	76	<u>0 09 (0 009 0 19)</u>	22		NS
1, 2-Dichloroethane & Benzene	75	0.02 (<lod, 0.04)<="" td=""><td>24</td><td><lod (<lod,="" <lod)<="" td=""><td>5</td></lod></td></lod,>	24	<lod (<lod,="" <lod)<="" td=""><td>5</td></lod>	5
Trichloroethene	75	0.04 (0.008, 0.06)	-	-	5
Toluene	64	0.01 (<lod, 0.03)<="" td=""><td>20</td><td><lod (<lod,="" <lod)<="" td=""><td>1000</td></lod></td></lod,>	20	<lod (<lod,="" <lod)<="" td=""><td>1000</td></lod>	1000
Bromomethane	58	0.02 (<lod, 0.06)<="" td=""><td>67</td><td>0.012 (<lod, 0.04)<="" td=""><td>NS</td></lod,></td></lod,>	67	0.012 (<lod, 0.04)<="" td=""><td>NS</td></lod,>	NS
Dibromomethane	45	<lod (<lod,="" 0.12)<="" td=""><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>NS</td></lod>	-	-	NS
1,1-Dichloroethene & trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	42	<lod (<lod,="" 0.02)<="" td=""><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>100</td></lod>	-	-	100
Vinyl chloride	26	<lod (<lod,="" 0.0004)<="" td=""><td>57</td><td>0.003 (<lod, 0.023)<="" td=""><td>2</td></lod,></td></lod>	57	0.003 (<lod, 0.023)<="" td=""><td>2</td></lod,>	2
m-Xylene & p-Xylene	24	<lod (<lod,="" <lod)<="" td=""><td>_</td><td>_</td><td>10000</td></lod>	_	_	10000

IQR: inter-quartile range; LOD: Limit of detection; MCL: Maximum Contaminant Level; NS: No Standard.

Associations between detections of organic chemicals and metrics

	ID _{ups} 1 km*	ID _{ups} 2 km*	ID ² W 2 km*
Chemical	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)
PA			
Vinyl chloride	1.87 (0.71, 4.91)	1.87 (0.71, 4.91)	1.47 (0.56, 3.82)
Bromomethane	2.55 (1.06, 6.13)	1.72 (0.73, 4.07)	0.81 (0.34, 1.89)
1,2-Dichloroethene & Benzene	1.66 (0.66, 4.14)	2.59 (1.01, 6.67)	3.29 (1.25, 8.66)
Toluene	2.63 (1.07, 6.45)	1.74 (0.73, 4.19)	2.13 (0.88, 5.18)
Chloroform	2.63 (0.32, 2.28)	0.67 (0.25, 1.79)	0.86 (0.32, 2.28)
M-xylene & p-xylene	3.36 (1.16, 9.72)	1.50 (0.56, 4.02)	2.53 (0.91, 7.07)
1,1-Dichloroethene & trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	2.05 (0.75, 5.63)	2.05 (0.75, 5.63)	1.58 (0.58, 4.30)
Bromochloromethane	1.09 (0.49, 2.45)	1.09 (0.49, 2.45)	1.29 (0.57, 2.91)
Trichloroethene	0.76 (0.29, 2.00)	0.60 (0.23, 1.58)	0.60 (0.23, 1.58)
Dibromomethane	1.80 (0.78, 4.20)	1.25 (0.54, 2.88)	1.25 (0.54, 2.88)
ОН			
Vinyl chloride	0.88 (0.44, 1.77)	0.67 (0.34, 1.33)	0.66 (0.34, 1.28)
Bromomethane	1.99 (0.89, 4.41)	1.48 (0.70, 3.11)	1.16 (0.57, 2.35)
1,2-Dichloroethene & Benzene	0.90 (0.40, 2.04)	0.91 (0.41, 2.03)	0.67 (0.30, 1.50)
Toluene	0.64 (0.26, 1.60)	0.44 (0.17, 1.15)	0.30 (0.11, 0.82)
Chloroform	0.71 (0.30, 1.71)	0.61 (0.26, 1.47)	0.92 (0.41, 2.05)
Bromochloromethane	0.89 (0.44, 1.78)	1.02 (0.52, 2.00)	1.45 (0.75, 2.81)

*Exposure is defined as a value above the median

Inorganic chemicals (PA n=94 homes, OH n=161)

	PA		ОН		
Chemical	>LOD (%)	Median (IQR) (µg/L)	>LOD (%)	OH Median (IQR) (μg/L)	USEPA MCL (µg/L)
Arsenic	81	0.99 (0.36, 2.44)	8	<lod (<lod,="" <lod)<="" td=""><td>10</td></lod>	10
Barium	100	166.03 (76.99, 399.46)	99	88.48 (50.74, 142.80)	2000
Bromide	34	<lod (<lod,="" 71.29)<="" td=""><td>53</td><td>27.00 (<lod, 54.00)<="" td=""><td>NS</td></lod,></td></lod>	53	27.00 (<lod, 54.00)<="" td=""><td>NS</td></lod,>	NS
Calcium	99	34961 (20968, 42863)	100	72101 (51144, 101596)	NS
Chloride	100	5831 (3035, 16128)	99	6758 (3018, 19785)	250000°
Fluoride	80	82.37 (44.42, 114.2)	100	110.00 (82.00, 156.00)	4000
Iron	70	60.37 (<lod, 139.02)<="" td=""><td>51</td><td>10.74 (<lod, 32.70)<="" td=""><td>300^c</td></lod,></td></lod,>	51	10.74 (<lod, 32.70)<="" td=""><td>300^c</td></lod,>	300 ^c
Lead	96	1.27 (0.72, 2.05)	12	<lod (<lod,="" <lod)<="" td=""><td>15</td></lod>	15
Lithium	100	23.33 (8.27, 51.95)	99	10.24 (6.79, 15.22)	NS
Magnesium	99	6767 (3526, 9845)	100	16116 (8870, 27149)	NS
Manganese	91	17.1 (0.94, 127.51)	58	1.84 (<lod, 19.25)<="" td=""><td>50°</td></lod,>	50°
Nitrate	67	334.35 (<lod, 1009.63)<="" td=""><td>99</td><td>560.00 (100.00, 1754.00)</td><td>10000</td></lod,>	99	560.00 (100.00, 1754.00)	10000
Potassium	100	1467.52 (1050.14, 1830.6)	100	1489.75 (1148.41, 2038.67)	NS
Sodium	100	16130 (7282, 46386)	100	23819 (16740, 52714)	NS
Strontium	100	472.04 (179.83, 1037.06)	100	526.48 (288.57, 967.63)	NS
Sulfate	100	10063 (6847, 15648)	96	30813 (20117, 50587)	250000°
Uranitiłm	85	0.87 (0.24, 2.56)	16	<lod (<lod,="" <lod)<="" td=""><td><u>30</u></td></lod>	<u>30</u>

IQR: inter-quartile range; LOD: Limit of detection; MCL: Maximum Contaminant Level; NS: No Standard.

Associations between concentrations of inorganic chemicals and metrics

- Most inorganic species not correlated or weakly correlated with metrics (Spearman ρ range: $\pm 0.00-0.28$)
- Direction of correlations mixed and inconsistent
- Concentrations of inorganics generally unrelated to UOGD exposure potential
 - Many inorganics have alternative natural and anthropogenic sources (e.g., arsenic is naturally occurring)
 - This analysis did not include source apportionment

- Organic chemicals detected infrequently and at low concentrations, though a few were positively associated with increasing UOGD exposure potential
- Several inorganic chemicals exceeded health-based standards, but were generally unrelated to UOGD exposure potential
- Limited correlations between measurements and metrics may be in part because:
 - Temporal factors
 - Contamination potential depends on many factors including occurrence of a spill, leak, violation

Application of Water-Specific Metric to Health Studies

- We applied $\mathrm{ID}_{\mathrm{ups}}$ in a recent case-control study of childhood acute lymphoblastic leukemia

	Odds Ratio (95% CI)*				
Buffer Around Maternal Residence at Birth	Presence of Any UOG Well	Presence of Upgradient UOG Well			
3 mo pre-conception to 1 yr pre-diagnosis					
2 km	1.98 (1.06, 3.69)	1.94 (0.75, 4.99)			
5 km	1.33 (0.88, 2.00)	1.45 (0.76, 2.77)			
10 km	1.14 (0.84, 1.55)	1.26 (0.75, 2.14)			
3 mo pre-conception to birth					
2 km	2.80 (1.11, 7.05)	3.10 (0.74, 13.01)			
5 km	1.54 (0.90, 2.63)	1.48 (0.59, 3.68)			
10 km	1.42 (0.99, 2.04)	1.60 (0.83, 3.08)			

¹⁵ *Adjusted for birth year

Clark et al. 2022 EHP

Yale school of public health

Future Directions: World Shale Gas Basins



https://www.eia.gov/analysis/studies/worldshalegas/

Future directions: UOGD in the news

BAY JOURNAL

About

The Washington Post Democracy Dies in Darkness

Ukraine war triggers push for more fracking in Pennsylvania March 27, 2022

The New York Times

Biden Plans to Open More Public Land to Drilling

The president is under pressure to bring down gas prices, but any new drilling would be years away. The fees that companies pay would rise sharply. April 15, 2022

ENERGY

Why Fracking Won't Solve the Global Oil and Gas Squeeze September 12, 2022

The Washington Post Democracy Dies in Darkness

EUROP

Earthquakes for Ukraine: Dutch gas drilling tests what countries will accept

September 1, 2022

Fracking ban in England lifted in bid to boost UK gas supply September 8, 2022



Acknowledgments

Yale School of Public Health

Cassandra Clark

- Xiaomei Ma
- Joshua Warren

Nicholaus Johnson

Yale School of the Environment

Jim Saiers

Michelle Bell

Mario Soriano, Jr.

Helen Siegel

MIT

Desirée Plata

Boya Xiong

Yunpo Li

Nicolette Bugher

Study Staff

Keli Sorrentino Julie Plano Livia Nock



Cassandra Clark







YALE WATER STUDY



We also thank all WATER Study participants.

Yale school of public health

This presentation was developed under Assistance Agreement No. CR839249 awarded by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to Yale University. It has not been formally reviewed by EPA. The views expressed in this document are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Agency.