

Energy production and chemical emissions

Annemarie van Wezel





Chemicals; we use them all, day by day





UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM Faculty of Science

More and more...growth in numbers and volumes of synthetic chemicals used outpace other factors of global change



Bernhardt et al 2017 Front Ecol Environ

Global Understanding of Chemical Pollution

Number (#) of chemicals registered

- Over 350 000 chemicals and mixtures registered for production and use worldwide
- Identities of many chemicals publicly unknown, claimed as confidential (over 50 000) or ambiguously described (up to 70 000)



Emission sources of chemicals



UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM Faculty of Science

Dec 2019: EU Green Deal with Zero pollution ambition





Chemicals Strategy for Sustainability (CSS, October '20)

- First regional framework addressing chemical pollution in a holistic manner
- Covers complete life-cycle of a chemical, including design and remediation options



Chemical pressures related to hydraulic fracturing



UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM Faculty of Science

×XX×

What are the chemical risks of unconventional oil and gas (UO&G) activities in relation to water resources?

1. How should chemical risk assessment for UO&G activities be carried out? 1.1 1.1 2 How does chemical risk Literature review on what Chapter assessment need to be is known on UO&G adapted for UO&G related risk assessment. activities? 1.2 1.2 ŝ What chemicals are used Chemical and bioassay Chapter in UO&G activities in the assessment of UO&G European context and related samples from a how harmful are they? Dutch tight gas hydraulic fracturing site. 1.3 1.3 Can current environmental Study on the effects of 4 Chapter *i* fate models be used to high pressure and evaluate environmental temperature on chemical fate of UO&G related fate of UO&G related chemicals? chemicals. 2. How can chemical risks related to UO&G activities be mitigated? 2.1 2.1 S What are the best Investigation of of removal Chapter wastewater treatment efficiencies of DOC by practices for UO&G ozonation, sorption to related waters? granular activated carbon and aerobic degradation. 2.2 2.2 Chapter 6 Can the use of green Chemical and bioassay chemicals in fracturing fluid assessment of fracturing mitigate potential risks of fluids marketed as UO&G activities on the conventional and green and water system? the comparisons thereof.

Composition of hydraulic fracturing related suspect list



Overview of fracturing fluid additive purposes





Spill/leak probabilities and spill volume estimates based on US publicly available databases (2010-2015)

Contamination pathway	Fluid released	Frequency (%/well/ year)	Average spill volume (m ³)		
Surface spill	Drilling mud	0.005–2.8	294 ± 185.7		
	Fracturing fluid	0.02-0.1	24 ± 28		
	Produced water	0.02–4.4	12 ± 29.1		
	Oil-based fluid	0.05–2.8	1 ± 6		
Blowout	Drilling mud	0.004	185 ± 256		
	Produced water	0.0002-0.01	3,206 ± 7,843		
	Oil-based fluid	0.002-0.01	49 ± 243		
Leaking connectivity	Drilling mud	0.01	43 ± 50		
	Produced water	0.2	12 ± 26		
	Oil-based fluid	0.1	6 ± 14		
Corroding well	Oil-based fluid	0.05–0.7	9 ± 20		
casing	Drilling mud	0.001-0.004	4 ± 4		
	Produced water	0.002–1	11 ± 41		
Insufficient cementing	Not specified	1.6	Not specified		

Chemical and bioassay assessment of waters related to hydraulic fracturing at a tight gas production site



High number of peaks in FF and FW samples.

No clear differences in chemical composition were shown in the groundwater samples before and after hydraulic fracturing.

Preliminary environmental fate data of the tentatively identified chemicals points towards persistence in water.

Clear genotoxic and oxidative stress responses were found in the fracturing fluid and flowback samples.

Effects of high pressure (450 bar) and temperature conditions (100 C) on the chemical fate of flowback water related chemicals





solid samples (pos)

HP/ATM ratio distribution of all detected features



HPT/ATM ratio distribution of all detected feature



Environmental fate models based on surface conditions may be used for an approximation of chemical fate under downhole conditions by applying an additional factor of five to account for these uncertainties.

Removal of organic compounds from flowback water

Combination of aerobic degradation with adsorption to activated carbon is proposed to be implemented between pre-treatment (dissolved air floatation) and desalination (thermal or membrane desalination) steps

The fraction of the organic compounds detected in positive (A) and negative (B) ionisation mode (Ct/CO), which was left after DAF, ozonation, biodegradation and adsorption to GA



Comparing conventional and green fracturing fluids by chemical characterisation and effect-based screening



No clear indication that the selected green fluids contain chemicals present at lower concentrations than the selected conventional fluids.

UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

Faculty of Science

Ames fluctuation test results indicate that the green fluids have a similar genotoxic potential than the conventional fluids. Results of the CALUX reporter gene assays add to the evidence that there is no difference clear between the green and conventional fluids.

The results do not support the claim that currently available and tested green-labelled fracturing fluids are environmentally more friendly alternatives to conventional fracturing fluids.

Sampl														
es Chemical analyses results				Bioassay test results										
	Positive ionisation		Negative ionisation		Ames test [₫]			CALUX test						
	# feat.	<u>b</u> Σ feat. int. ^c	# feat.	Σ feat. int.	TA98 -S9	TA98 + S9	TA100 -S9) TA10(+ S9) anti- AR	ERα	nrf2	PAH	p53 +/-S9	cytoto x
Tap water 1	1.06E +02	8.92E +05	3.40E +01	6.92E +05	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
Tap water 2	8.10E +01	3.96E +05	3.00E +01	1.75E +05	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
Conv. 1 (WAF	1.65E +04	1.29E +09	1.24E +03	5.65E +07	no data	+ 1:100	_	_	+	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	+
Conv. 2 (WAF)	2.22E) ⁺⁰⁴	1.61E +09	1.38E +03	4.47E +07	no data	no data	_	+ 1:1	_	_	_	_	_	_
Conv. 2 (suspe nsion)	/	/	/	/	_	+ 1:1	_	(+) 1:1	. —	_	_	_	_	_
Green 1 (WAF)	1.10E) ⁺⁰⁴	1.32E +09	1.02E +03	1.27E +09	_	_	+ 1:30	(+) 1:1		_	_	_	_	-
Green 2 (WAF)	1.72E) ⁺⁰⁴	3.09E +09	8.76E +02	1.99E +07	_	_	_	+ 1:10	_	_	_	_	_	_
Green 2 (suspe nsion)	/	/	/	/	(+) 1:1	+ 1:1	+ 1:1	(+) 1:1	. —	_	_	-	_	_



References and acknowlegdements

Butkovskyi A, Faber AH, Wang Y, Grolle K, Hofman-Caris C, Bruning H, Van Wezel A, Rijnaarts H (2018) Removal of organic contaminants from shale gas flowback water. Water Res. <u>138</u>:47–55

Faber AH, Annevelink M, Gilissen HK, Schot P, Van Rijswick M, De Voogt P, Van Wezel A (2019) How to adapt chemical risk assessment for unconventional hydrocarbon extraction related to the water system. Rev. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. 246:1-32

Faber A, Annevelink M, Schot P, Baken K, Schriks M, Emke E, De Voogt P, Van Wezel A (2019) Chemical and bioassay assessment of waters related to hydraulic fracturing at a tight gas production site. Sci. Tot. Environ. 690:636-694.

Faber AH, Brunner AM, Dingemans MML, Baken KA, Kools SAE, Schot PP, De Voogt P, Van Wezel AP (2021) Comparing conventional and green fracturing fluids by chemical characterisation and effect-based screening. Sci. Tot. Environ. <u>794</u>, 148727.

Faber AH, Brunner AM, Schimmel M, Schot PP, De Voogt P, Van Wezel A (2023) Effects of high pressure and temperature conditions on the chemical fate of flowback water related chemicals. Sci. Tot. Environ. 163888.

Funded by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) and the water utilities Brabant Water, Oasen and Waterleiding Maatschappij Limburg. Additional funding by Energie Beheer Nederland (EBN).