

# **Effects from the PRBRC's Proposed Effluent Limits for Barium, Sulfate, and TDS**

**EQC PRBRC Petition Hearing  
1/17/07 + added Big George Coal Extents Maps & Histograms**

**CBM Associates, Inc.**

# OBJECTIVE

- Contrast the current limits for total recoverable barium (Ba) 2000 ug/l, dissolved sulfate ( $SO_4$ ) 3,000 mg/l; and, TDS (5,000 mg/l), against those proposed in the PRBRC petition: Ba = 200 ug/l;  $SO_4$  = 500 mg/l; and, TDS = 2,000 mg/l; and
- Evaluate potential effects on oil and gas production and the availability of water due to the more restrictive proposed standards.

# Data Sources


The produced water data used for CBNB production was the average of the reported values for the constituents of concern in Powder River Basin (PRB) WYPDES DMRs for the period of 1999 to 2006.

The Conventional Oil & Gas produced water data was the average of the reported values for the constituents of concern from all WYPDES DMRs for the period of 2001 to 2006 and other studies from 2003 to 2006.


## **Barium: CBNB Produced Water**

An examination of the CBNB produced water from WYPDES DMRs for 2658 individual outfalls indicates that 99% (2625) outfalls had mean concentrations of total recoverable Ba that would exceed the proposed standard of 200 ug/l.

Under the current standard of 2000 ug/l, less than 1% of the outfalls exceed. Therefore, under the proposed effluent limit, virtually all CBNB production in the PRB would require treatment, injection, or shut-in due to barium limits.



**CBNG Produced Water  
Total Recoverable Barium ug/L (Mean DMR)**




# **Barium: CBNB Produced Water**

## **Big George Coal Extent**


An examination of the CBNB produced water from WYPDES DMRs for the 155 outfalls within the WDEQ Big George Coal Extent indicates that 98% (152) outfalls had mean concentrations of total recoverable Ba that would exceed the proposed standard of 200 ug/l.

Under the current standard of 2000 ug/l, less than 7% of the outfalls exceed. Therefore, under the proposed effluent limit, virtually all CBNB production in the PRB would require treatment, injection, or shut-in due to barium limits.





**CBNG Produced Water  
Big George Coal  
Total Recoverable Barium ug/L (Mean DMR)**



## **Barium: CBNG Produced Water**

Treating barium to the proposed limit at each outfall would require an individual ion exchange system similar to those currently used to treat CBNG. Conservative cost for such treatment currently ranges from \$0.35 to \$0.60 /BW (WOGCC: 2006 PRB CBNG produced water)

The conservative cumulative cost to treat PRB CBNG produced water for barium alone range from \$147 to \$252 million/year under the proposed standard.


## **Barium: CBNG Produced Water**

Barium treatment alone would result in an estimated cost increase that ranges from \$0.63 to \$1.08/MCF of CBNG gas produced (WOGCC: 2006 PRB CBNG production).


*This will make many producing CBNG wells and reserves uneconomic.*

## **Barium: Conventional Oil & Gas Produced Water**

An examination of the available Ba sample data from Conventional Oil & Gas produced water from WYPDES DMRs for 16 individual outfalls indicates that 38% (6) of all outfalls examined showed mean concentrations of total recoverable Ba that exceed the proposed limit of 200 ug/l.




Conventional Produced Water  
Total Recoverable Barium ug/L (Mean DMR)




## **Sulfates: CBNG Produced Water**

**An examination of the CBNG produced water from WYPDES DMRS for 1383 outfalls indicates that 2% (28) of the currently operating outfalls would not comply under the proposed dissolved sulfate limit of 500 mg/l.**






# CBNG Produced Water Dissolved Sulfate mg/L (Mean DMR)




# **Sulfates: CBNG Produced Water**

## **Big George Coal Extent**

**An examination of the CBNG produced water from WYPDES DMRS for the 111 outfalls within the WDEQ Big George Coal Extent indicates that 6% (7) outfalls would not comply under the proposed dissolved sulfate limit of 500 mg/l.**



**CBNG Produced Water  
Big George Coal  
Dissolved Sulfate mg/L (Mean DMR)**




# **Sulfates: Conventional Oil & Gas**


## **Produced Water**

Nearly 71% (20) of the 28 Conventional Oil & Gas outfalls would not meet the proposed dissolved sulfate limit of 500 mg/l. (WYPDES DMRs indicate exceedance of the proposed 500 mg/l limit for SO<sub>4</sub>)

***The imposition of the proposed limits would require treatment or reinjection, rendering the majority of the current oil production uneconomic.***



# Conventional Produced Water Dissolved Sulfate ug/L (Mean DMR)






# **TDS: CBNG Produced Water**

**An examination of the CBNG produced water from WYPDES DMRs for 1942 outfalls indicates that 6% (119) of the outfalls would not comply under the proposed TDS limit of 2000 mg/l.**






# CBNG Produced Water Total Dissolved Solids at 180° C mg/L (Mean DMR)




# **TDS: CBNG Produced Water** **Big George Coal Extent**

**An examination of the CBNG produced water from WYPDES DMRS for 102 outfalls within the WDEQ Big George Coal Extent indicates that 36% (37) of the outfalls would not comply under the proposed TDS limit of 2000 mg/l.**




CBM Associates  
10000 10th Street, Suite 100  
Denver, Colorado 80202  
Tel: 303.733.1000  
Fax: 303.733.1001  
www.cbma.com

# CBNG Produced Water Total Dissolved Solids at 180° C Big George Coal mg/L (Mean DMR)




## **TDS: Conventional Oil & Gas Produced Water**

- An examination of the Conventional Oil & Gas produced water from available WYPDES DMRs for 37 outfalls indicates that 89% (33) of the currently operating outfalls would not comply under the proposed TDS limit of 2000 mg/l.



# Conventional Produced Water Total Dissolved Solids @180° C ug/L (Mean DMR)





# Questions EQC Needs to

## Answer

***What is the risk of harm to livestock and wildlife from produced water under the existing limits?***

- ┆ Where is *credible* evidence that the existing limits are not protective of livestock or wildlife?

***What is the risk of harm to livestock and wildlife if produced water is removed from the State's water supply?***

- ┆ The EQC needs to determine if there is measurable benefit to livestock or wildlife from a reduction of produced water.
- ┆ The loss of the beneficial use of the produced water and the habitat it provides is significant to both ranchers and sportsmen in the State of Wyoming.

# Questions EQC Needs to

## Answer

***Where is the credible evidence of measurable benefits to livestock and wildlife from the proposed limits?***

***Are the losses of produced water to existing livestock and wildlife uses, and the loss of oil and gas reserves, offset and justified by a credible measurable benefit from adopting the new limits?***