

U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management

---

# **BLM Water Support Document for Oil Development in New Mexico**

## **BLM WSD 2021**

---

**U.S. Department of the Interior**  
**Bureau of Land Management:**  
New Mexico State Office  
301 Dinosaur Trail  
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87508  
505-954-2000

The BLM's multiple-use mission is to sustain the health and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations. The Bureau accomplishes this by managing such activities as outdoor recreation, livestock grazing, mineral development, and energy production, and by conserving natural, historical, cultural, and other resources on public lands.

# Table of Contents

<b>CHAPTER 1. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. Purpose and Scope	1
1.2. Report Organization	2
1.3. Data Sources	2
1.3.1. State and County Water Use by Category	2
1.3.2. FracFocus Data	2
1.3.3. Spill Data	3
1.4. Updating the Report	3
<b>CHAPTER 2. State of New Mexico</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1. Water Quantity	6
2.2. Water Quality	6
<b>CHAPTER 3. Pecos District</b>	<b>12</b>
3.1. Water Quantity	14
3.1.1. Existing Surface and Groundwater Use	14
3.1.2. Water Use Trends and Planned Actions	17
3.1.3. Potential Sources of Water for Project Development	21
3.2. Water Quality	23
3.2.1. Groundwater	23
3.2.2. Surface Water	25
3.2.3. Potential Sources of Surface Water or Groundwater Contamination	26
<b>CHAPTER 4. Farmington Field Office</b>	<b>30</b>
4.1. Water Quantity	32
4.1.1. Existing Surface and Groundwater Use	32
4.1.2. Water Use Trends and Planned Actions	36
4.1.3. Potential Sources of Water for Project Development	43
4.1.4. Water Use Mitigations	45
4.2. Water Quality	45
4.2.1. Groundwater	45
4.2.2. Surface Water	46
4.2.3. Potential Sources of Surface Water or Groundwater Contamination	47
<b>CHAPTER 5. Rio Puerco Field Office</b>	<b>51</b>
5.1. Water Quantity	53
5.1.1. Existing Surface and Groundwater Use	53
5.1.2. Water Use Associated with Reasonably Foreseeable Oil and Gas Development	58
5.1.3. Water Use Trends and Planned Actions	59
5.1.4. Water Use Associated with Reasonably Foreseeable Oil and Gas Development	60
5.1.5. Potential Sources of Water for Project Development	61
5.1.6. Water Use Mitigations	62

5.2.	Water Quality .....	62
5.2.1.	Groundwater .....	62
5.2.2.	Surface Water .....	63
5.2.3.	Potential Sources of Surface Water or Groundwater Contamination .....	64
<b>CHAPTER 6. Literature Cited.....</b>		<b>66</b>

## Appendices

- Appendix A. Data Processing Information (FracFocus, USGS, and spill data)
- Appendix B. Farmington Field Office Slickwater Stimulation Water Use Update

## Figures

Figure 2-1.	New Mexico BLM field offices and basin boundaries.....	5
Figure 3-1.	BLM Pecos District Office.....	13
Figure 3-2.	Pecos tri-county area (Chaves, Eddy, and Lea Counties) water use by category in 2015 (Dieter et al. 2018). .....	17
Figure 3-3.	Cumulative water use associated with reasonably foreseeable oil and gas development in the New Mexico portion of the Permian Basin (Chaves, Eddy, and Lea Counties) from 2014 through 2020 with projections through 2034. ....	20
Figure 3-4.	Idealized geologic cross section of potential water sources in the Pecos District (Summers 1972).....	21
Figure 4-1.	BLM FFO and Mancos-Gallup Planning Area boundaries.....	31
Figure 4-2.	FFO (McKinley, Rio Arriba, Sandoval, and San Juan Counties) water use by category in 2015 (Dieter et al. 2018). .....	36
Figure 4-3.	Proportion of oil and gas well stimulation techniques in the FFO from 2014 through 2020 (FracFocus 2021). .....	38
Figure 4-4.	Cumulative water use estimates for four well development scenarios within the New Mexico portion of the San Juan Basin (McKinley, Rio Arriba, Sandoval, and San Juan Counties) based on a predicted 2,300 horizontal and 900 vertical wells. ....	43
Figure 4-5.	Geologic cross section showing the distribution of saline aquifers in the San Juan Basin (Kelley et al. 2014).....	46
Figure 5-1.	Map of BLM Rio Puerco Field Office boundaries.....	52
Figure 5-2.	RPFO (Bernalillo, Cibola, Torrance, Valencia, Sandoval, McKinley, and Santa Fe Counties) water use by category in 2015 (Dieter et al. 2018).....	58
Figure 5-3.	Water use associated with reasonably foreseeable oil and gas development in the RPFO from 2020 through 2039. ....	60
Figure 5-4.	Geologic cross section showing the distribution of saline aquifers in the San Juan Basin (Kelley et al. 2014).....	63

## Tables

Table 2-1. State of New Mexico water use by category in 2015. ....	8
Table 2-2. Water use by oil and gas wells for hydraulic fracturing in the state of New Mexico from 2014 through 2020. ....	8
Table 2-3. Twenty-five most frequently disclosed constituents reported to FracFocus within New Mexico from 2014 through 2020. ....	9
Table 2-4. Summary of 2020 spills in the state of New Mexico.* .....	10
Table 3-1. Lea County water use by category in 2015. ....	15
Table 3-2. Eddy County water use by category in 2015. ....	15
Table 3-3. Chavez County water use by category in 2015. ....	16
Table 3-4. Pecos tri-county area (Chaves, Eddy, and Lea Counties) water use by category in 2015.....	16
Table 3-5. Water use by oil and gas wells for hydraulic fracturing in the New Mexico portion of the Permian Basin (Chaves, Eddy, and Lea Counties) for 2014 through 2020.....	18
Table 3-6. Planning factors used to estimate water use associated with the RFD in the Pecos District.....	18
Table 3-7. Potential sources of groundwater in the Pecos tri-county area (Chaves, Eddy, and Lea Counties). ....	21
Table 3-8. Typical TDS ranges found in the main aquifers of the Pecos District. ....	23
Table 3-9. Sampled water quality parameters compared with NMWQCC drinking water standards. ....	24
Table 3-10. Summary of 2020 spills from all wells in the New Mexico portion of the Permian Basin (Eddy, Lea, and Chaves Counties). ....	27
Table 3-11. Twenty-five most frequently disclosed chemicals in horizontal wells within the New Mexico portion of the Permian Basin (Chaves, Eddy, and Lea Counties) from 2014 through 2020. ....	27
Table 4-1. McKinley County water use by category in 2015. ....	33
Table 4-2. Rio Arriba County water use by category in 2015. ....	33
Table 4-3. San Juan County water use by category in 2015. ....	34
Table 4-4. Sandoval County water use by category in 2015.....	34
Table 4-5. Water use by category in 2015 within the FFO (McKinley, Rio Arriba, Sandoval, and San Juan Counties).....	35
Table 4-6. Water use by oil and gas wells for hydraulic fracturing in the New Mexico portion of the San Juan Basin (McKinley, Rio Arriba, Sandoval, and San Juan Counties) from 2014 through 2020. ....	37
Table 4-7. Water use of oil and gas wells for three stimulation technologies from 2014 through 2020 within the FFO. ....	37
Table 4-8. Water use statistics by well type for the FFO from 2014 through 2020.....	38
Table 4-9. Projected water use in the New Mexico portion of the San Juan Basin (FFO). ....	40
Table 4-10. Estimated well counts and associated water use for the 3% annual slickwater increase scenario. ....	42
Table 4-11. Potential sources of groundwater in the FFO. ....	45
Table 4-12. Summary of 2020 spills in the New Mexico portion of the San Juan Basin (McKinley, Rio Arriba, Sandoval, and San Juan Counties). ....	48
Table 4-13. Twenty-five most frequently disclosed chemicals in horizontal wells within the San Juan Basin (McKinley, Rio Arriba, Sandoval, and San Juan Counties) from 2014 through 2020. ....	48
Table 5-1. McKinley County water use by category in 2015. ....	54
Table 5-2. Bernalillo County water use by category in 2015. ....	54
Table 5-3. Sandoval County water use by category in 2015.....	55
Table 5-4. Valencia County water use by category in 2015. ....	55
Table 5-5. Torrance County water use by category in 2015. ....	56

Table 5-6. Santa Fe County water use by category in 2015.....	56
Table 5-7. Cibola County water use by category in 2015.....	57
Table 5-8. RPFO counties water use by category in 2015.....	57
Table 5-9. Annual projections for oil and gas well development and water use for federal and non-federal well development within the RPFO from 2020 to 2039. ....	59
Table 5-10. Descriptive statistics of water use of oil and gas wells in the FFO portion of Sandoval County for three stimulation technologies from 2014 to 2019. ....	60
Table 5-11. General description of the major rock units in the San Juan Basin. ....	62
Table 5-12. Summary of 2020 spills in the New Mexico portion of the RPFO (Sandoval County).*	64

## LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AF	acre-feet
APD	Application for Permit to Drill
bbl	barrel
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
CAS	Chemical Abstracts Service
CFO	Carlsbad Field Office
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
COA	condition of approval
CWA	Clean Water Act
EIS	environmental impact statement
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FFO	Farmington Field Office
gpm	gallons per minute
GWPC	Ground Water Protection Council
HPA	high potential area
IOGCC	Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission
mcf	thousand cubic feet
mg/L	milligrams per liter
MOU	memorandum of understanding
MSDS	material safety data sheet
N/A	not applicable
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act of 1969
NMAC	New Mexico Administrative Code
NMED	New Mexico Environment Department
NMOCD	New Mexico Oil Conservation Division

NMOSE	New Mexico Office of the State Engineer
NMSO	New Mexico State Office
NMWQCC	New Mexico Water Quality Control Commission
PET	petroleum engineer technician
ppm	parts per million
RFD	reasonably foreseeable development
RFFA	reasonably foreseeable future action
RFO	Roswell Field Office
RMP	resource management plan
RMPA	resource management plan amendment
RPFO	Rio Puerco Field Office
TDS	total dissolved solids
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
WIPP	Waste Isolation Pond Plant
WU	combined water use



# CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1. PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The intent of this Water Support Document is to collect and present the data and information needed for water resources analysis to be incorporated by reference into National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents, most specifically NEPA analysis related to federal oil and gas leasing and development under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) New Mexico State Office (NMSO). This includes federally managed oil and gas within the Pecos District Office (PDO), the Farmington Field Office (FFO), and the Rio Puerco Field Office (RPFO).

The content of this report is focused on existing water uses and projections of future water use based on past use as well as planned use. The report also provides information regarding existing water quality and potential causes of water contamination related to oil and gas leasing and development.

This document does not include analysis of the following data types and sources:

- Surface water impacts from leasing and development: Surface water that is used in oil and gas production comes from a previously approved water source. Surface water quality impacts are analyzed at the lease level with consideration of the site-specific conditions and stipulations that are applied to protect them. Surface water quality impacts are again analyzed during site-specific development when specific facility placement details are known.
- Surface water quality assessment information: In the State of New Mexico, the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) administers Clean Water Act (CWA) Sections 303(d), 305(b), and 314 related to surface water quality assessment and reporting. The NMED defines surface water quality beneficial uses and water quality criteria to evaluate if these uses are being attained. The BLM does not have responsibility to make use attainment evaluations based on water chemistry data.
- Water quality information for other areas mandated by the NMSO: The NMSO also manages federal oil and gas leasing and development within the Oklahoma Field Office (which includes Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas). Due to the scattered nature of leases, the lack of defined focal areas where leasing regularly occurs (such as the three field offices described in this report), and the number of counties within each state for which data would need to be compiled (254 counties in Texas, 77 in Oklahoma, and 105 in Kansas), the BLM determined that water quality and quantity information for the Oklahoma Field Office will be gathered and evaluated on an as-needed basis during the leasing NEPA process. The NMSO also manages federal oil and gas leasing and development for other field offices and districts within New Mexico; however, these are not areas in which leasing and subsequent development typically occurs.
- Water uses related to oil and gas development beyond hydraulic fracturing: Although this Water Support Document focuses on water usage during the hydraulic fracturing process, water is also used for drilling fluid preparation, completion fluids, rig wash water, coolant for internal combustion engines, dust suppression on roads/well pads, and equipment testing. The majority of water use is associated with stimulation activities (including hydraulic fracturing), and data are currently unavailable for the previously mentioned uses. It is expected that operators will provide information regarding estimated water use at the project-specific NEPA level.
- Environmental impacts of hydraulic fracturing: While the environmental impacts of hydraulic fracturing are relevant to the focus of this report, the fate and transport of chemicals used during hydraulic fracturing are complicated and have been the subject of human health and environmental concerns as oil and gas development continues throughout the United States. As such, the complexity of this subject would require substantial discussion that exceeds the scope of this report. Readers interested in understanding the environmental impacts of hydraulic fracturing should review the comprehensive U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) report *Hydraulic Fracturing for Oil and Gas: Impacts from the Hydraulic Fracturing Water Cycle on*

*Drinking Water Resources in the United States (Final Report)* (EPA 2016). In summary, this report presents scientific evidence that drinking water resources can be impacted by hydraulic fracturing under six conditions: 1) water withdrawals during periods of low water availability; 2) spills of hydraulic fracturing fluids/chemicals and/or produced water; 3) release of hydraulic fracturing fluids from wells with inadequate casing; 4) direct injection of hydraulic fracturing fluids into groundwater; 5) discharge of insufficiently treated wastewater to surface water; and 6) contamination of groundwater from unlined storage/disposal pits. The BLM, the NMED, and the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division (NMOCD) have put in place numerous requirements for oil and gas producers to prevent the contamination of surface water and groundwater resources in New Mexico.

## **1.2. REPORT ORGANIZATION**

Chapter 2 contains a summary of water use data for the state of New Mexico, including water use by industry or use category as well as water use by oil and gas wells. Chapter 2 also summarizes the most frequently disclosed chemical constituents used in hydraulic fracturing operations in the state of New Mexico. Chapter 3 summarizes water quantity and quality data for the PDO, which comprises the Carlsbad Field Office (CFO) and the Roswell Field Office (RFO). Chapters 4 and 5 summarize water quantity and quality data for the FFO and the RFFO. Each chapter contains the references pertinent to the analysis. This report is organized so that authors and data analysts may use field office chapters as stand-alone reports when evaluating impacts to water resources associated with proposed future federal oil and gas leasing and development.

## **1.3. DATA SOURCES**

This section describes the primary data sources that are used throughout this report to evaluate impacts to water resources from oil and gas leasing and development activities in New Mexico.

### **1.3.1. State and County Water Use by Category**

Since 1950, the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) has published a comprehensive report every 5 years that compiles water use data across the United States. The most recent report (Dieter et al. 2018), is the fourteenth circular report published as part of the National Water Census and contains the average daily withdrawals for all 50 states by source (groundwater and surface water), quality (fresh and saline), and category (public supply, domestic, irrigation, livestock, aquaculture, industrial, mining, and thermoelectric power). Domestic water use includes self-supplied water and deliveries from the public supply; industrial and thermoelectric power are both self-supplied. Saline water is defined in Dieter et al. (2018:4) as “water containing dissolved solids of 1,000 milligrams per liter or more.”

See Appendix A for details regarding how USGS water use data are obtained, organized, and analyzed for use in this report.

### **1.3.2. FracFocus Data**

FracFocus is a national hydraulic fracturing chemical registry managed by the Ground Water Protection Council (GWPC) and Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission (IOGCC) (FracFocus 2021). FracFocus was initially created to provide a place for publicly available information on chemicals used during hydraulic fracturing. Currently, 25 states require oil and gas operators to disclose information to FracFocus for any hydraulically fractured well. In the state of New Mexico, 19.15.16.19 of the New Mexico Administrative Code (NMAC) states that “for a hydraulically fractured well, the operator shall complete and file with the FracFocus chemical disclosure registry a completed hydraulic fracturing disclosure within 45 days after completion, recompletion or other hydraulic fracturing treatment of the well.” See Appendix A for details regarding how FracFocus data were obtained, organized, and analyzed for use in this report.

### **1.3.3. Spill Data**

NMOCD regulates oil and gas activity in New Mexico and enforces its rules and the state's oil and gas statutes. NMOCD manages data and information related to oil and gas development, including well production, abandoned wells, and oil and gas spills.

In each field office or district section of this report, 2020 spill data from the NMOCD database (NMOCD 2021a) are used to evaluate potential impacts to surface water quality from oil and gas development. Spills associated with oil and gas development may reach surface water directly during a spill event. Spills may also reach surface waters indirectly when a rain event moves contaminants into nearby surface waterbodies through surface water flow or even subsurface groundwater flow into springs that discharge into a surface waterbody. In the NMOCD database, many attributes of spill incidents are tracked, including the location, spill material, volume, and amount recovered, and information on whether the spill reached a watercourse or not.

To update the spill data in the Water Support Document, data for the previous year are downloaded in January of the publication year. For example, the 2021 Water Support Document discussed calendar year 2020 spill data downloaded from the NMOCD database in January (or later) 2021. Appendix A contains specific details on how NMOCD spill data are obtained, organized, and analyzed for use in this report.

## **1.4. UPDATING THE REPORT**

As new data become available throughout the state of New Mexico, it will be necessary to update water use (water use by category data from the USGS, the New Mexico Office of the State Engineer [NMOSE], and FracFocus) and water quality (data from the NMOCD database) information included in this report. The water use by category data from the USGS and NMOSE are updated every 5 years. As updated water use data are released, they will be included in the annual report updates.

New data are input into the FracFocus registry throughout the year. The 2021 Water Support Document considers FracFocus data from 2014 through 2020. To maintain consistency in data included in annual Water Support Document updates, FracFocus data will be pulled on January 1 every year. For example, data for the 2021 Water Support Document will include all data from January 1, 2014, through December 31, 2020.

It is expected that operators will provide information regarding estimated water use at the project-specific NEPA level.

## CHAPTER 2. STATE OF NEW MEXICO

This chapter contains an analysis and summary of the available water use and water quality data in the state of New Mexico that support the evaluation of water resource impacts from oil and gas leasing and development (as described in Chapter 1). Water use estimates for all categories of consumptive water use (e.g., public drinking water supply, irrigation, thermoelectric power, etc.) are presented in Section 2.1. Additionally, Section 2.1 contains the summarized FracFocus water use data so that a comparison can be made of water use from hydraulic fracturing against statewide water use. Section 2.2 contains a summary of the chemicals used in hydraulic fracturing that are disclosed to FracFocus.

Oil and gas leasing and development in the state of New Mexico occurs mostly in the San Juan Basin and the Permian Basin. The BLM field offices that intersect these oil-producing areas are the FFO and RPFO, which intersect the San Juan Basin, and the PDO, which intersects the Permian Basin (Figure 2-1).

New Mexico ranks third in the United States in the production of oil (World Population Review 2021). In 2020, the state of New Mexico produced 373,597,976 barrels of oil (NMOCD 2021b). The Permian Basin, a sedimentary rock formation spanning from west Texas into New Mexico, has been a producing oil and natural gas field since the early 1900s. Of the approximately 20 million acres in the total PDO planning area boundary, about 2.3 million acres have already been leased for oil and gas development (Purcell 2020). The RFO, CFO, and the Las Cruces Field Office overlap the Permian Basin (see Figure 2-1).

The San Juan Basin, a circular geologic formation that covers northwestern New Mexico and southwestern Colorado, is the second-largest gas-producing basin in the nation and supports about 21,000 active oil and gas wells (NMOCD 2021c). In 2020, 8,014,296 barrels of oil were produced from the San Juan Basin (NMOCD 2021b). Most of the hydrocarbons that have formed in the San Juan Basin are a result of stratigraphic traps within the geologic structure (BLM 2003a). The FFO, RPFO, and the Taos Field Office overlap the San Juan Basin (see Figure 2-1).




Figure 2-1. New Mexico BLM field offices and basin boundaries.

## 2.1. WATER QUANTITY

In 2015, the combined fresh and saline water withdrawals for all water use categories across the state of New Mexico totaled 3,249,667 acre-feet (AF) (Table 2-1) (Dieter et al. 2018). Irrigation withdrawals accounted for the greatest water use within the state of New Mexico at 82% (2,660,424 AF) in 2015. Public water supply and mining accounted for 9% and 5% of total water use (293,467 and 163,901 AF), respectively. Water withdrawals within the state were equally split between surface water and groundwater. Thermoelectric power and irrigation used proportionally more surface water than groundwater (82% and 56%, respectively), whereas the remaining sectors primarily consumed groundwater.

Total annual water use by oil and gas wells throughout New Mexico increased in all but 2 years, and totals ranged from 3,899 AF in 2014 to 140,453 AF in 2020. In the same time frame, average water use per well increased from 6.0 AF in 2014 to 50.2 AF in 2020 (Table 2-2) (FracFocus 2021). The 7-year average (2014–2020) water use was 26.1 AF per well. Water use for federal wells as a percentage of water use for all wells varies and ranged from 13.2% in 2016 to 48.1% in 2015. From 2014 through 2020, cumulative water use within New Mexico totaled 140,453 AF, with federal wells comprising 28.3% (39,813 AF). From 2014 through 2020, 5,008 total wells (includes all ownership/management jurisdictions) were reported to FracFocus, with an average of 715 wells per year (FracFocus 2021).

## 2.2. WATER QUALITY

The chemical composition of water used during the hydraulic fracturing process varies due to differences in fracturing techniques used by oil and gas companies. A typical oil/gas well uses approximately 20 to 25 unique chemicals during the hydraulic fracturing process, but in some cases, more than 60 distinct chemicals can be used. The most disclosed chemical used in New Mexico wells from 2014 through 2020 was water, with 13,103 disclosures (Table 2-3). Other frequent disclosures were methanol ( $n = 4,495$ ) and hydrochloric acid ( $n = 3,191$ ). There were 14,214 records of non-disclosed chemicals that are entered in the FracFocus database as “listed below” (FracFocus 2021). Ingredient names and Chemical Abstracts Service (CAS) numbers are not standardized in FracFocus, leading to widespread differences and discrepancies in CAS numbers, number of disclosures, and ingredient names. For this reason, the values and ingredients presented in Table 2-3 are for general information only. Appendix A contains information on how FracFocus data are analyzed and summarized.

Spills associated with oil and gas development may reach surface water directly during the spill event. Spills may also reach surface waters indirectly, when the spill has occurred, and when a rain event moves contaminants into nearby surface waterbodies through surface water flow or even subsurface groundwater flow into springs that discharge into a surface waterbody. According to 19.15.29.10 NMAC, major releases must be reported to NMOCD within 24 hours of the discovery of the release. A major release is defined in 19.15.29.7 NMAC as an unauthorized release of a volume, excluding gases, of 25 barrels or more; or an unauthorized release of a volume that results in a fire, may reach a watercourse, may endanger public health, property, or the environment, or may be detrimental to fresh water. Minor releases (less than 25 barrels and greater than five barrels) must be reported to NMOCD within 15 days (19.15.29.10 NMAC). All major and minor release reports (spills) are archived in the NMOCD spills database.

Spill data from NMOCD were retrieved from the NMOCD database and further reviewed and summarized (NMOCD 2021a); (see Appendix A). In 2020, there were a total of 1,368 spills across the state associated with federal and non-federal oil and gas wells and facilities (federal and non-federal) (Table 2-4) (NMOCD 2021a). The average percent of the spill volume that was lost (volume lost divided by volume released) varies by spill type, but the average percent of spill volume that was lost (not recovered) for all state spill types was 43% (NMOCD 2021a).

The BLM works with NMOCD to remediate spills associated with federal oil and gas wells on BLM-managed lands or on private or state surface. Title 19, Chapter 15 of the NMAC pertains to oil and gas releases. According to 19.15.29.11 NMAC, the responsible person shall complete division-approved

corrective action for releases that endanger public health or the environment in accordance with a remediation plan submitted to and approved by NMOCD or with an abatement plan submitted in accordance with 19.15.30 NMAC. The remaining contaminants from unrecovered spills are remediated in accordance with federal and state standards. Some remediation consists of removing contaminated soil and replacing it with uncontaminated soil and performing corresponding chemical testing.



**Table 2-1. State of New Mexico water use by category in 2015.**

Category	Surface Water				Groundwater				Total Withdrawals				Total	Total Use (%)
	Fresh	Saline*	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Saline*	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Total Use (%)	Saline*	Total Use (%)		
Aquaculture	6,109	0	6,109	<1%	20,929	0	20,929	1%	27,039	1%	0	0%	27,039	1%
Domestic	0	-	0	0%	27,621	-	27,621	1%	27,621	1%	-	-	27,621	1%
Industrial	0	0	0	0%	3,811	0	3,811	<1%	3,811	<1%	0	0%	3,811	<1%
Irrigation	1,485,112	-	1,485,112	56%	1,175,312	-	1,175,312	36%	2,660,424	82%	-	-	2,660,424	82%
Livestock	2,522	-	2,522	0%	33,372	-	33,372	1%	35,894	1%	-	-	35,894	1%
Mining	19,550	0	19,550	1%	44,111	100,240	144,351	4%	63,662	2%	100,240	3%	163,901	5%
Public Water Supply	87,752	0	87,752	3%	205,715	0.00	205,715	6%	293,467	9%	0	0%	293,467	9%
Thermoelectric Power	30,637	0	30,637	1%	6,872	0	6,872	<1%	37,509	1%	0	0%	37,509	1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,631,683</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,631,683</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>1,517,744</b>	<b>100,240</b>	<b>1,617,984</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>3,149,427</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>100,240</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3,249,667</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Dieter et al. (2018)

Note: Values may not sum to totals because of independent rounding (Dieter et al. 2018). Water use data are in acre-feet/year unless otherwise indicated.

\* Saline water withdrawals are not reported for domestic, irrigation, or livestock water use (Dieter et al. 2018).

**Table 2-2. Water use by oil and gas wells for hydraulic fracturing in the state of New Mexico from 2014 through 2020.**

Year	Federal Water Use	Non-Federal Water Use	Total Water Use	Federal Water Use (%)	Federal Cumulative Water Use	Total Cumulative Water Use	Average Water Use per Well*	Total No. of Wells	Produced Water
2014	1,404	2,495	3,899	36.0%	1,468	3,899	6.0	653	115,050
2015	4,042	4,357	8,398	48.1%	5,446	12,297	14.5	581	116,696
2016	897	5,924	6,821	13.2%	6,343	19,118	20.2	337	110,337
2017	3,332	10,953	14,286	23.3%	9,675	33,404	24.7	578	114,487
2018	9,272	22,276	31,547	29.4%	18,947	64,951	28.9	1092	135,347



Year	Federal Water Use	Non-Federal Water Use	Total Water Use	Federal Water Use (%)	Federal Cumulative Water Use	Total Cumulative Water Use	Average Water Use per Well*	Total No. of Wells	Produced Water
2019	10,404	31,107	41,511	25%	29,351	106,462	38.1	1090	159,539
2020	10,492	23,499	33,991	31%	39,843	140,453	50.2	677	171,355
<b>Total</b>	<b>39,843</b>	<b>100,635</b>				<b>140,453</b>	<b>26.1<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>5,008</b>	<b>922,811</b>

Source: FracFocus (2021). Data only for those wells that reported water usage to FracFocus are presented; produced water data are from NMOCD (2021b).

Note: All water use data are presented in acre-feet. Produced water is naturally occurring water that exists in a formation that is being targeted for mineral extraction and is produced as a byproduct.

\* Includes both federal and non-federal wells.

<sup>†</sup> 7-year average (2014–2020).

**Table 2-3. Twenty-five most frequently disclosed constituents reported to FracFocus within New Mexico from 2014 through 2020.**

Ingredient Name	CAS Registry Number	Number of Disclosures	Percentage of Hydraulic Fracturing Job*	Percentage of Total Number of FracFocus Disclosures <sup>†</sup>
Not disclosed	NA	14,214	<1%	<1%
Water	7732-18-5	13,103	26%	7%
Methanol	67-56-1	4,495	<1%	2%
Hydrochloric acid	7647-01-0	3,191	<1%	2%
Proprietary	Proprietary	2,844	<1%	<2%
Crystalline silica, quartz	14808-60-7	2,593	10%	1%
Sodium chloride	7647-14-5	2,400	<1%	1%
Glutaraldehyde	111-30-8	2,106	<1%	1%
Ammonium chloride	12125-02-9	2,006	<1%	1%
Sodium hydroxide	1310-73-2	1,997	<1%	1%
Guar gum	9000-30-0	1,989	<1%	1%
Ethylene glycol	107-21-1	1,976	<1%	1%
Propargyl alcohol	107-19-7	1,624	<1%	1%
Ethanol	64-17-5	1,433	<1%	1%
Acetic acid	64-19-7	1,403	<1%	1%
Ammonium persulfate	7727-54-0	1,389	<1%	1%
Alcohols, C12-16, ethoxylated	68551-12-2	1,252	<1%	1%
Isopropanol	67-63-0	1,242	<1%	1%
Crystalline silica	14808-60-7	1,177	13%	1%

Ingredient Name	CAS Registry Number	Number of Disclosures	Percentage of Hydraulic Fracturing Job*	Percentage of Total Number of FracFocus Disclosures†
Quaternary amine	Confidential	1,161	<1%	1%
Distillates (petroleum), hydrotreated light	64742-47-8	1,108	<1%	1%
Sodium perborate tetrahydrate	10486-00-7	1,045	<1%	1%
Amine salts	Confidential	974	<1%	1%
Citric acid	77-92-9	965	<1%	1%
Ethoxylated alcohols	Proprietary	946	<1%	0%

Source: FracFocus (2021)

Note: Ingredient names and CAS numbers are not standardized in FracFocus, leading to widespread differences and discrepancies in CAS numbers, number of disclosures, and ingredient names. For this reason, the values and ingredients presented in this table are for general information only.

\* The amount of the ingredient in the total hydraulic fracturing volume by percent mass (definition from FracFocus [2021] data dictionary).

† The total number of FracFocus ingredient disclosures in the state of New Mexico is 189,494.

**Table 2-4. Summary of 2020 spills in the state of New Mexico.\***

Material Type	Spill Count	Volume Spilled	Volume Lost	Units	Average Spill Volume	Percent Lost	Waterway Affected	Groundwater Affected
Brine water	3	100,549	506	bbl	169	8%	0	0
Condensate	34	1,224	996	bbl	29	79%	1	0
Crude oil	356	13,416	4,321	bbl	12	42%	0	0
Drilling mud/fluid	1	128	0	bbl	0	0%	0	0
Gelled brine (frac fluid)	3	21	0	bbl	0	0%	0	0
Lube oil	2	1	1	bbl	1	51%		
Other (specify)	25	4,676	2,099	bbl	93	53%	0	0
Produced water	714	65,176	25,131	bbl	35	42%	0	0
Sulfuric acid	1	12	0	bbl	0	0%	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,139</b>	<b>185,640</b>	<b>33,091</b>		<b>29</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

<b>Material Type</b>	<b>Spill Count</b>	<b>Volume Spilled</b>	<b>Volume Lost</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Average Spill Volume</b>	<b>Percent Lost</b>	<b>Waterway Affected</b>	<b>Groundwater Affected</b>
Natural gas (methane)	228	1,734,772	1,734,772	mcf	7,608	100%	1	0
Natural gas liquids <sup>†</sup>	1	345	345	mcf	345	100%	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>1,735,067</b>	<b>1,735,067</b>	<b>mcf</b>	<b>3,977</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total spill count</b>	<b>1,368</b>				<b>Average percent lost</b>	<b>46%</b>		

Source: NMOCD (2021a)

Note: bbl = barrels; mcf = thousand cubic feet.

\* No spills were reported in Bernalillo, Cibola, Torrance, Valencia, or Santa Fe Counties in 2020. No spills of chemicals or glycol were reported during 2020.

† Natural gas liquids material types include natural gas flared, natural gas liquids, and natural gas vented materials.

## CHAPTER 3. PECOS DISTRICT

The BLM Pecos District, which oversees the CFO and RFO, encompasses over 3.6 million surface acres and over 7.6 million federal mineral acres. The Pecos District includes the New Mexico portion of the Permian Basin, a sedimentary depositional basin (Figure 3-1). The Permian Basin is one of the premier oil and gas producing regions in the United States, and prolific producing horizons occur in the New Mexico portion of the basin in Chaves, Eddy, and Lea Counties. The Permian Basin has been a producing oil and natural gas field since the early 1900s.

Some data analyzed (e.g., FracFocus and USGS water use) are available at the county level only; as such, the term *Pecos tri-county area* may be used interchangeably with Pecos District (which denotes BLM administrative boundaries) in this report. The portion of the Pecos District that is underlain by the Permian Basin encompasses Eddy and Lea Counties and the majority of Chaves County (which is analogous to the New Mexico portion of the Permian Basin). The Pecos District tri-county area contains approximately 3.4 million acres of federal minerals. In this report, water use for all of Chaves County will be reported.

This chapter presents information on existing and projected water quantity and water quality data for the Pecos District, as summarized from information from the following sources:

- *Reasonable Foreseeable Development (RFD) Scenario for the B.L.M. New Mexico Pecos District* (Engler and Cather 2012) and *Update to the Reasonable Foreseeable Development for the BLM Pecos District, SENM* (Engler and Cather 2014)
- Data compiled from the USGS report *Estimated Use of Water in the United States in 2015* (Dieter et al. 2018)
- FracFocus, a national hydraulic fracturing chemical registry managed by the GWPC and IOGCC (FracFocus 2021)
- *Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement Carlsbad Field Office, Pecos District, New Mexico* (BLM 2018)
- Sandia National Laboratories report *Water Resource Assessment in the New Mexico Permian Basin* (Lowry et al. 2018)
- *Addendum to Water Resource Assessment in the New Mexico Permian Basin* (Reardon et al. 2021)
- Spill data from the NMOCD database (NMOCD 2021a)




Figure 3-1. BLM Pecos District Office.

## **3.1. WATER QUANTITY**

### **3.1.1. Existing Surface and Groundwater Use**

In the Pecos tri-county area, Dieter et al. (2018) lists total water withdrawals across eight water use categories: aquaculture, domestic, industrial, irrigation, livestock, mining, public water supply, and thermoelectric power. Water usage data for Leah, Eddy, and Chaves Counties are presented in Tables 3-1, 3-2, and 3-3, respectively. Total water usage in the Pecos tri-county area in 2015 was 619,375 AF (Table 3-4; Figure 3-2). Irrigation and mining activities consumed the greatest amount of water, accounting for 75% (466,784 AF) and 15% (94,758 AF), respectively, of all water use within the Pecos tri-county area. Approximately 88% of all water used within this region originated from groundwater. Of that total, 17% of withdrawals were from saline sources.

**Table 3-1. Lea County water use by category in 2015.**

Category	Surface Water				Groundwater				Total Withdrawals				Total	Total Use
	Fresh	Saline*	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Saline*	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Total Use (%)	Saline*	Total Use (%)		
Aquaculture	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	-	0%	0	0%
Domestic	0	-	0	0	1,513	-	1,513	<1%	1,513	<1%	-	0%	1,513	<1%
Industrial	0	0	0	0	78	0	78	<1%	78	<1%	0	0%	78	<1%
Irrigation	0	-	0	0	166,099	-	166,099	62%	166,099	62%	-	0%	166,099	62%
Livestock	56	-	56	<1%	2,870	-	2,870	1%	2,926	1%	-	0%	2,926	1%
Mining	0	0	0	0	325	81,642	81,968	31%	325	<1%	81,642	31%	81,968	31%
Public Water Supply	0	0	0	0	11,423	0	11,423	4%	11,423	4%	0	0%	11,423	4%
Thermoelectric Power	0	0	0	0	1,827	0	1,827	<1%	1,827	1%	0	0%	1,827	<1%
<b>County Totals</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>&lt;1%</b>	<b>184,135</b>	<b>81,642</b>	<b>265,778</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>184,192</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>81,639</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>265,834</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Dieter et al. (2018)

Note: Values may not sum to totals because of independent rounding (Dieter et al. 2018). Water use data are in acre-feet/year unless otherwise indicated.

\* Saline water withdrawals are not reported for domestic, irrigation, or livestock water use (Dieter et al. 2018).

**Table 3-2. Eddy County water use by category in 2015.**

Category	Surface Water				Groundwater				Total Withdrawals				Total	Total Use (%)
	Fresh	Saline*	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Saline*	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Total Use (%)	Saline*	Total Use (%)		
Aquaculture	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Domestic	0	-	0	0%	258	-	258	<1%	258	<1%	-	0%	258	<1%
Industrial	0	0	0	0%	1,043	0	1,043	<1%	1,043	<1%	0	0%	1,043	<1%
Irrigation	64,054	-	64,054	35%	89,994	-	89,994	49%	154,048	84%	-	0%	154,048	84%
Livestock	34	-	34	<1%	1,289	-	1,289	<1%	1,323	<1%	-	0%	1,323	<1%
Mining	0	0	0	0%	975	10,145	11,120	6%	975	<1%	10,145	6%	11,120	6%
Public Water Supply	0	0	0	0%	15,077	0	15,077	8%	15,077	8%	0	0%	15,077	8%
Thermoelectric Power	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>County Totals</b>	<b>64,088</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>64,088</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>108,636</b>	<b>10,145</b>	<b>118,781</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>172,724</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>10,145</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>182,869</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Dieter et al. (2018)

Note: Values may not sum to totals because of independent rounding (Dieter et al. 2018). Water use data are in acre-feet/year unless otherwise indicated.

\* Saline water withdrawals are not reported for domestic, irrigation, or livestock water use (Dieter et al. 2018).

**Table 3-3. Chavez County water use by category in 2015.**

Category	Surface Water				Groundwater				Total Withdrawals				Total	Total Use (%)
	Fresh	Saline*	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Saline*	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Total Use (%)	Saline*	Total Use (%)		
Aquaculture	0	0	0	0%	1,782	0	1,782	1%	1,782	1%	0	0%	1,782	1%
Domestic	0	-	0	0%	1,009	-	1,009	<1%	1,009	<1%	-	0%	1009	<1%
Industrial	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Irrigation	9,854	-	9,854	6%	136,784	-	136,784	80%	146,638	86%	-	0%	146,638	86%
Livestock	224	-	224	<1%	6,378	-	6,378	4%	6,603	4%	-	0%	6,603	4%
Mining	0	0	0	0%	78	1,592	1,670	<1%	78	<1%	1,592	<1%	1,670	<1%
Public Water Supply	0	0	0	0%	12,970	0	12,970	8%	12,970	8%	0	0%	12970	8%
Thermoelectric Power	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>County Totals</b>	<b>10,078</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10,078</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>159,003</b>	<b>1,592</b>	<b>160,594</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>169,080</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>1,592</b>	<b>&lt;1%</b>	<b>170,672</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Dieter et al. (2018)

Note: Values may not sum to totals because of independent rounding (Dieter et al. 2018). Water use data are in acre-feet/year unless otherwise indicated.

\* Saline water withdrawals are not reported for domestic, irrigation, or livestock water use (Dieter et al. 2018).

**Table 3-4. Pecos tri-county area (Chaves, Eddy, and Lea Counties) water use by category in 2015.**


Category	Surface Water				Groundwater				Total Withdrawals				Total	Total Use (%)
	Fresh	Saline*	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Saline*	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Total Use (%)	Saline*	Total Use (%)		
Aquaculture	0	0	0	0%	1,782	0	1,782	<1%	1,782	<1%	0	0%	1,782	<1%
Domestic	0	-	0	0%	2,780	-	2,780	<1%	2,780	<1%	-	0%	2,780	<1%
Industrial	0	0	0	0%	1,121	0	1,121	<1%	1,121	<1%	0	0%	1,121	<1%
Irrigation	73,908	-	73,908	12%	392,877	-	392,877	63%	466,784	75%	-	0%	466,784	75%
Livestock	314	-	313.88	<1%	10,537	-	10,537	2%	10,851	2%	-	0%	10,851	2%
Mining	0	0	0	0%	1,379	93,379	94,758	15%	1,379	<1%	93,379	15%	94,758	15%
Public Water Supply	0	0	0	0%	39,470	0	39,470	6%	39,470	6%	0	0%	39,470	6%
Thermoelectric Power	0	0	0	0%	1,827	0	1,827	<1%	1,827	<1%	0	0%	1,827	<1%
<b>County Totals</b>	<b>74,221</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>74,221</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>451,774</b>	<b>93,379</b>	<b>545,154</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>525,996</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>93,379</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>619,375</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Dieter et al. (2018)

Note: Values may not sum to totals because of independent rounding (Dieter et al. 2018). Water use data are in acre-feet/year unless otherwise indicated.

\* Saline water withdrawals are not reported for domestic, irrigation, or livestock water use (Dieter et al. 2018).





**Figure 3-2. Pecos tri-county area (Chaves, Eddy, and Lea Counties) water use by category in 2015 (Dieter et al. 2018).**

### 3.1.2. Water Use Trends and Planned Actions

#### 3.1.2.1 Past and Present Actions

The Pecos tri-county area total water usage in 2015 was 619,375 AF (see Table 3-4) and accounted for approximately 19% of total state withdrawals (Dieter et al. 2018). Water use in 2015 associated with mining, which includes oil and gas development, in the Pecos tri-county area was 94,758 AF (see Table 3-4) and represented approximately 57% of statewide mining water use (163,901 AF) and 15% of the Pecos District total water use (619,375 AF). Within the Pecos tri-county area, the largest amount of water is used for irrigation (see Figure 3-2), which represents 75% of all water use within the Pecos tri-county area (619,375 AF) and 14% of all water use within the state (3,249,667 AF).

Data from FracFocus were evaluated to provide objective information on the amount of water used by hydraulic fracturing activities in the Pecos tri-county area. Annual water use associated with hydraulic fracturing in federal wells has generally increased over time, ranging between 1,239 AF in 2014 to 10,441 AF in 2020 (Table 3-5) (FracFocus 2021). Water use for hydraulic fracturing of all wells within the Pecos tri-county area increased from 3,580 to 33,940 AF from 2014 to 2020 (see Table 3-5), corresponding with an increase in average water use per well from 7.0 to 50.8 AF. At the time this report was written, data were not available to distinguish between the type of well (e.g., nitrogen, recompletion, or slickwater). Additionally, distinguishing between completion types in the PDO is not necessary because of the relatively low number of recompletions, with the majority of new wells being slickwater completions (Murray 2021). An increase in the amount of water used per well is associated with changes in production stimulation techniques.

Combined water use is the amount of water cumulatively used each year by hydraulic fracturing and consists the water use for any given year plus the water use for each previous year since 2014. For example, the combined water use in 2017 would be generated using the following formula:

$$2017 \text{ Combined Water Use (WU)} = 2017 \text{ WU} + 2016 \text{ WU} + 2015 \text{ WU} + 2014 \text{ WU}$$

The combined water use estimates for federal and total (both federal and non-federal) water use associated with hydraulic fracturing in the Pecos tri-county area are shown in Table 3-5.

**Table 3-5. Water use by oil and gas wells for hydraulic fracturing in the New Mexico portion of the Permian Basin (Chaves, Eddy, and Lea Counties) for 2014 through 2020.**

Year	Federal Water Use	Non-Federal Water Use	Total Water Use	Federal Water Use (%)	Federal Combined Water Use	Total Combined Water Use	Total Average Water Use	Total Well Count	Produced Water
2014	1,239	2,341	3,580	34.60%	1,239	3,580	7	510	107,301
2015	3,358	4,101	8,059	49.1	4,597	11,639	16.5	488	109,495
2016	812	5,898	6,710	12.1	5,409	18,349	22.7	296	103,951
2017	3,104	10,903	14,007	22.2	8,513	32,356	27.1	517	108,911
2018	8,892	21,994	30,887	28.8	17,405	63,243	32.4	953	130,771
2019	10,312	31,038	41,350	24.9	27,717	104,593	41.6	993	152,731
2020	10,441	23,499	33,940	30.8	38,158	138,533	50.8	668	165,191
<b>Total</b>	<b>38,158</b>	<b>99,774</b>	<b>138,533</b>	<b>27.5</b>			<b>31.3*</b>	<b>4,425</b>	<b>878,351</b>

Source: FracFocus (2021). Data are presented only for those wells reporting water usage to FracFocus. Produced water data are from NMOCD (2021b).

Note: Water use data are in acre-feet/year unless otherwise indicated. See Appendix A for data methodology. Produced water is naturally occurring water that exists in a formation that is being targeted for mineral extraction and is produced as a byproduct.

\* 7-year average (2014–2020).

### 3.1.2.2 Water Use Associated with Reasonably Foreseeable Oil and Gas Development

The RFD scenario for the Pecos District (Engler and Cather 2012) projects approximately 800 new oil and gas wells per year (40% federal and 60% non-federal) over a 20-year period, for a total of 16,000 new wells. The RFD scenario for the Pecos District was developed as a reasonable estimate of development associated with oil and gas production in the New Mexico portion of the Permian Basin from 2015 to 2035. The RFD is a comprehensive study of all existing plays and an analysis of recent activity, historical production, emerging plays for future potential, and completion trends. Since the initial RFD was released in 2012, there has been significant activity and development throughout the area of the Pecos District underlain by the Permian Basin. An update to the RFD (Engler and Cather 2014) includes revised estimates for several plays in the Permian Basin, especially the Bone Spring and Leonard/Yeso plays.

Planning factor assumptions used in the RFD include time frame, estimated well count, average water use, and proportion of horizontal wells drilled in the Bone Spring and Leonard Formations (Table 3-6). These planning factors are used for the estimation of water usage within the region for the duration of the RFD.

**Table 3-6. Planning factors used to estimate water use associated with the RFD in the Pecos District.**

Factor	RFD Assumed Values (Engler and Cather 2012, 2014)	Revised Estimate	Rationale for Change
Time frame	2015–2035	No change	N/A
Number of wells	16,000 (approximately 800 per year)	No change	N/A
Average water use, horizontal well	7.3 AF	31.2 AF*	Reflects actual water use reported in FracFocus*
Average water use, vertical well	1.53 AF†	Assumed 100% horizontal wells for the RFD	Reflects actual water use reported in FracFocus*

<b>Factor</b>	<b>RFD Assumed Values (Engler and Cather 2012, 2014)</b>	<b>Revised Estimate</b>	<b>Rationale for Change</b>
Number of wells needed for resource development in emerging plays <sup>‡</sup>	4 wells per section per play (horizontal wells)	No change	N/A
Percentage of horizontal wells in Bone Spring Formation	82% horizontal	Assumed 100% horizontal wells for the RFD	Reflects actual water use reported in FracFocus <sup>‡</sup>
Percentage of horizontal wells in Leonard Formation	14% horizontal	Assumed 100% horizontal wells for the RFD	Reflects actual water use reported in FracFocus <sup>‡</sup>

Note: N/A=not applicable.


\* The water use estimate of 31.2 AF per well reflects water use per well as reported to FracFocus data at the time the CFO draft RMP/EIS was released (BLM 2018).

<sup>†</sup> BLM calculation developed during preparation of the CFO draft RMP/EIS (BLM 2018), Appendix P.

<sup>‡</sup> Resource development in emerging plays refers to the development of unconventional resource regions within the Woodford shale in southeastern New Mexico (Engler and Cather 2012).

The RFD estimate of an average water use per well of 7.3 AF was based on a study of the Bone Spring Formation using data from 2013 (Engler and Cather 2014), where the majority of wells are horizontal. Assuming an average water use of 7.3 AF per well (assuming all horizontal wells) and 800 wells per year, the RFD estimated a total water use of 116,800 AF and an annual water use of 5,840 AF/year. Since that time, the average water use per well within the Permian Basin (see Table 3-5) has increased substantially (FracFocus 2021). In 2018, during preparation of the draft Carlsbad Field Office RMP/EIS (BLM 2018), the BLM updated estimated cumulative water use assuming an average of 31.2 AF per well (based on FracFocus data available at the time of the update) and development of the 16,000 wells projected in the RFD. This increased the estimated water use to 499,200 AF, or 24,960 AF of water in any given year (Figure 3-3).

In 2020, 668 wells used an estimated 33,940 AF, for an average of 50.8 AF per well (FracFocus 2021) (see Table 3-5). With an average annual water use rate of 31.3 AF per well and an average development rate of 632 wells per year since 2014, the average annual water use for the last 6 years was 19,786 AF/year. The water use reported to FracFocus over the previous 6 years (FracFocus 2021) indicates that the revised planning factors associated with the RFD (31.2 AF per well and 24,960 AF/year) are within a reasonable range of current water use trends (see Figure 3-3).



Note: Original water use planning factors of 7.3 AF/well and 5,840 AF/year come from the RFD (Engler and Cather 2012, 2014). Revised water use planning factors are 31.2 AF/well and 24,960 AF/year. Revised water use planning factors are based on analysis of FracFocus data at the time the CFO draft RMP/EIS (BLM 2018) was released in 2018. The FracFocus data presented are actual water use estimates between 2014 and 2020 (FracFocus 2021).

**Figure 3-3. Cumulative water use associated with reasonably foreseeable oil and gas development in the New Mexico portion of the Permian Basin (Chaves, Eddy, and Lea Counties) from 2014 through 2020 with projections through 2034.**

### Other Development

The BLM has not identified any additional reasonably foreseeable future actions (RFFAs) that would substantially contribute to water use impacts within the Pecos District beyond existing water use trends (BLM 2018). Some water use would be required during construction and operation of transmission lines and pipelines as part of RFD in the area; however, water use varies greatly by project, and these uses are not quantified in this analysis.

### Water Use Associated with Planned Actions

The total water use associated with development of all RFFAs in the Pecos tri-county area is the same as the total water use estimate associated with reasonably foreseeable oil and gas development. This is because 1) there are no RFFAs related to mining apart from oil and gas development that would contribute to water use impacts from planned actions within the Pecos District (BLM 2018); and 2) water use estimates for other development such as construction and development of transmission lines and pipelines vary greatly by project, and specific water use estimates for these projects are not included in this analysis.

Development of all RFFAs within the RFD scenario using the revised planning factors in Table 3-6 would require approximately 24,960 AF of water in any given year. This is about 4% of Pecos tri-county area 2015 total water withdrawals (619,375 AF), which already include past and present actions). Irrigation would remain by far the largest water use (currently 75% of all water use within the Pecos District and 82% of all water use within the state).

### 3.1.3. Potential Sources of Water for Project Development


The Pecos District contains a variety of surface waters, including springs, seeps, lakes, playas, rivers, and ephemeral drainages (Table 3-7; Figure 3-4), that interact with the groundwater system as locations of recharge or discharge. Waters from spring developments, reservoirs or streams, and stream diversions within the Pecos tri-county area are used primarily for irrigation, livestock, and wildlife. Surface water is not used for domestic water supply in the Pecos tri-county area (Dieter et al. 2018). Diversions on BLM-managed land support crop irrigation and stock water needs on private lands.

Because approximately 88% of all water use and 100% of all mining water use (including oil and gas) in the Pecos District is currently from groundwater, it is reasonable to assume that water used for development of the RFD would likely be groundwater. Water used for oil and gas drilling and completion would be purchased legally from those who hold water rights in or around the Permian Basin. The transaction would be handled by NMOCD as well as NMOSE. Potential sources of groundwater for use in oil and gas development in the Pecos District are outlined in Table 3-7.

**Table 3-7. Potential sources of groundwater in the Pecos tri-county area (Chaves, Eddy, and Lea Counties).**

Aquifer Name	Description
Pecos Valley Alluvium	Surficial deposits along the Pecos River. Recharged by precipitation and hydrologically losing sections of the Pecos River and its tributaries. Hydraulically connected with the Pecos River. Typical total dissolved solids (TDS) range of <200 to 10,000 milligrams per liter (mg/L).
Dockum Formation (includes Dewey Lake and Santa Rosa)	Redbed sandstones. Inconsistent water source. Recharge occurs closer to the surface from precipitation. Typical TDS range of <5,000 to >10,000 mg/L.
Rustler Formation (includes Culebra and Magenta)	Dolomite, fractured and dissolution zones. Local recharge is driven by precipitation. Typical TDS ranges from <1,000 to 4,600 mg/L.
Capitan Reef	Limestone, Karstic formation. Low salinity west of the Pecos River, brackish toward the east. TDS ranges from 300 to >5,000 mg/L. Recharge in the west occurs mainly in the vicinity of the Guadalupe Mountains. Recharge in the east occurs in the vicinity of the Glass Mountains (in Texas). The New Mexico portion of the eastern part of the Capitan Reef is recharging at a high rate.

Note: Data are adapted from Lowry et al. (2018).



**Figure 3-4. Idealized geologic cross section of potential water sources in the Pecos District (Summers 1972).**

*Water Resource Assessment in the New Mexico Permian Basin* (Lowry et al. 2018) is a study conducted by Sandia National Laboratories for portions of Eddy and Lea Counties that were identified as having high potential for oil and gas development in the RFD. Four high-potential areas (HPAs) were studied. The HPAs were associated with the extent of the BLM-managed mineral estate in the Alto Platform, Bone Spring, and Delaware Mountain Group plays.

The study was undertaken to establish a water level and chemistry baseline and to develop a modeling tool to aid the BLM in understanding the regional water supply dynamics under different management, policy, and growth scenarios as well as to preemptively identify risks to water sustainability. *Addendum to Water Resource Assessment in the New Mexico Permian Basin* (Reardon et al. 2021) expands upon the 2018 report, discussing water level and quality in the HPAs.

Most of the water wells that were sampled in each HPA appeared to have a mixture of source waters, and establishing definitive signatures for each aquifer was not possible. However, evidence shows that the main water source for water wells in the North HPA (which includes Loco Hills and areas along the Pecos River) are from the Dewey Lake and Santa Rosa aquifers (the Dewey Lake/Santa Rosa Formation) or another perched source in the host Dockum Formation. For the Center North HPA (which encompasses a region known as Burton Flats), the main sources are from the Dewey Lake/Santa Rosa Formation and the Rustler Formation. For the South HPA (located near Malaga and Loving), the main water sources are the Dewey Lake/Santa Rosa Formation. The East HPA, which primarily represents the Ogallala Aquifer, was excluded from the study because only a small percentage of the land is managed by the BLM (Lowry et al. 2018). The study also sampled wells that access water from the Capitan Reef, located near the community of Carlsbad.

Select wells were monitored throughout the study using continuous and manual water level measurements (Reardon et al. 2021), the results of which appear below.

- Water levels in the two sampling water wells located in the North HPA (the Rustler Formation) fluctuated slightly over the monitoring period and have an overall downward trend. Based on available data, it is unclear if the drop in water level was a result of well operation or natural fluctuation in groundwater level.
- Water levels from five wells in the Center North HPA were examined as part of the report.
- Three wells completed in the Rustler Formation showed variable water level fluctuations. One showed low water level changes suggestive of barometric effects and seasonal change; the second well showed water levels typical of nearby pumping; and a third well showed an overall decrease in water level due to unknown causes.
- Two wells completed in the Dewey Lake/Santa Rosa Formation show increasing water levels due to recharge of the aquifer.
- Of the 13 wells monitored in the South HPA:
  - Eight are completed in the Rustler Formation, and three wells were monitored continuously as part of the study. Two wells have monitoring data to indicate a steady downward trend due to livestock watering and prospecting of a natural resource. One well exhibited erratic water levels consistent with pumping cycles associated with small community water supply wells.
  - Four wells are completed in the Dewey Lake/Santa Rosa Formation, and three are within a half mile of one another. All three wells show the same general trend indicative of pumping in 2017 followed by recovery. The wells are listed for commercial use, and reports of nearby pumping in 2017 explain the general overall decrease. The fourth well is permitted for livestock watering, and water levels show decreasing trends consistent with pumping, although pumping ceased at this well in 2018 and water levels are rebounding.
  - The final well in the South HPA is drilled to an unknown formation. Although based on water levels, it is assumed to be completed in the Dewey Lake/Santa Rosa Formation. It is located in close proximity to the three wells listed for commercial use in the Dewey Lake/Santa Rosa Formation and exhibits the same general pattern in water levels over the same monitoring period.

- The Capitan Reef aquifer is one of the primary sources of water used to enhance oil recovery in Eddy County and is also a primary source of domestic water supply in that county. Four wells drilled in the Capitan Reef aquifer were monitored. Two wells show a steady decline, with daily fluctuations indicative of nearby pumping. Two wells on the east side of the Capitan Reef aquifer show steadily increasing water levels and recovery, which could be due to natural recharge that could potentially be enhanced by injection wells.

A model has been developed as part of the Sandia National Laboratories study (Lowry et al. 2018) to simulate water availability over a range of different future scenarios, including drilling activity and water demand relative to areas that are most vulnerable, and to estimate the risk to water sustainability. The recently completed model may potentially allow the BLM to examine the balances between water demand and water availability to predict and track risks to each aquifer and to calculate well drawdown. While the model has been recently completed, it is still undergoing review by the BLM for accuracy, reliability, and useability in evaluating water supply and demand related to oil and gas development in the Pecos District.

### Water Use Mitigation Measures

Public concern about water use from hydraulic fracturing is especially high in semiarid regions. Overall, there have been calls to increase the use of alternative water sources such as brackish water or recycling produced water, minimizing the strain on local freshwater resources (Kondash et al. 2018). The BLM encourages the use of recycled water in hydraulic fracturing techniques, and in 2019, the State of New Mexico passed the Produced Water Act, which encourages oil and gas producers to reuse produced water for oil and gas extraction when possible rather than rely on freshwater sources. Recent studies indicate that the water used for hydraulic fracturing may be retained within the shale formation, with only a small fraction of the fresh water injected into the ground returning as flowback water; water returning to the surface is highly saline, difficult to treat, and often disposed of through deep injection wells (Kondash et al. 2018). The NMED recently signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with New Mexico State University to develop new technologies for treating produced water to inform future policies for produced water reuse.

## 3.2. WATER QUALITY

### 3.2.1. Groundwater

Groundwater quality in Eddy and Lea Counties and in the Lower Pecos Valley varies considerably depending on the aquifer and location (Lowry et al. 2018). In general, groundwater on the west side of the Pecos River is fresher than that east of the Pecos River. East of the Pecos River, salinity is higher and can reach concentrations of 35,000 milligrams per liter (mg/L). Shallow groundwater quality can be very good in the alluvial aquifers but of poor quality in deeper geologic formations due to the presence of salt, gypsum, and other evaporite deposits. Groundwater tends to be mineralized or “hard” west of the Ogallala Aquifer (Lowry et al. 2018). Total dissolved solids (TDS) typically range from 200 to 10,000 mg/L depending on aquifer material (Table 3-8).

**Table 3-8. Typical TDS ranges found in the main aquifers of the Pecos District.**

Aquifers	Aquifer Material	Typical TDS Range (mg/L)
Pecos	Alluvium	<200 to 10,000
Rustler (includes Culebra and Magenta)	Carbonates and evaporites	<1,000 to 4,600
Dockum (includes Dewey Lake and Santa Rosa)	Sandstone and conglomerates	<5,000 to >10,000
Capitan Reef	Dolomite and limestone	300 to >5,000

Note: Data are adapted from Lowry et al. (2018).

Overall, 30 wells in the South HPA, 11 wells in the Center North HPA, and 19 wells in the North HPA were selected for water quality analysis. The predominant water types for each of the HPAs and the Capitan Reef are listed below.

1. North HPA: calcium and magnesium dominant
2. Center North HPA: sodium and calcium dominant
3. South HPA: sodium and calcium dominant
4. Waste Isolation Pond Plant (WIPP): sodium and chloride dominant
5. Capitan Reef: sodium dominant

Water quality data collected at wells in the HPAs in 2018 (Lowry et al. 2018) and 2020 (Reardon et al. 2021) were also compared with the New Mexico Water Quality Control Commission (NMWQCC) human health, domestic water supply, and irrigation use standards for groundwater with a TDS concentration of 10,000 mg/L or less (20.6.2.3103 NMAC). All wells in the Center North and South HPAs reported exceedances of sulfate in 2020. Most wells in the Center North and South HPAs reported exceedances of TDS and chloride. One well in the South HPA reported an exceedance of fluoride. Two wells in the South HPA reported exceedances of the pH NMWQCC standards. Table 3-9 lists the sampled water quality parameters by HPA compared with the NMWQCC standards for drinking water (Lowry et al. 2018; Reardon et al. 2021).

**Table 3-9. Sampled water quality parameters compared with NMWQCC drinking water standards.**

Parameter	NMWQCC Standard	North HPA*	Central North HPA*	South HPA and WIPP*	Capitan Reef†
pH (pH units)	6–9	7.64	7.51–7.61	7.25– <b>9.29</b>	8.08–8.86
Specific conductance (µmhos/cm)	--	1,000	7,700–95,000	860–21,000	2,770–174,500
TDS	1,000	773	<b>3,800–51,800</b>	<b>395–11,100</b>	1,951–141,875
Calcium (Ca <sup>2+</sup> )	--	130	580–680	3–970	1.4–5,902
Magnesium (Mg <sup>2+</sup> )	--	45	95–1,700	5–360	82.26–1,420
Sodium (Na <sup>+</sup> )	--	21	440–14,000	110–2,000	225–46,700
Potassium (K <sup>+</sup> )	--	1.6	26–550	4–28	6.58–3,352
Chloride (Cl <sup>-</sup> )	250	18	<b>820–28,000</b>	<b>32–3,800</b>	388.80–82,602.1
Alkalinity (CaCO <sub>3</sub> )	--	166.7	93–200	146–292	18.53–250.10
Bicarbonate (HCO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> )	--	166.7	93–200	146–247	18.74–249.27
Carbonate (CO <sub>3</sub> <sup>2-</sup> )	--	<2.0	<2.0	7–110	0–0.83
Sulfate (SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> )	600	360	<b>16,000–8,800</b>	<b>900–2,800</b>	0–1,975.67
Fluoride (F <sup>-</sup> )	1.6	0.67	0–1.5	<1–2	0.09–0.52
Nitrate/Nitrite (NO <sub>3</sub> /NO <sub>2</sub> )	10	<RL	<RL	1.8–8.2	0.05–7.60
Silver (Ag)	0.05	--	--	--	0
Aluminum (Al)	5	--	0.18	0–4.06	--
Arsenic (As)	0.1	0.02–0.06	0.03–0.32	0–0.29	0.10
Barium (Ba)	1	0.01–0.13	0.01–0.03	0–0.1	0.02–0.25
Bromide (Br)	--	0–7.8	0.28–12.00	0–1,400	0.3–12.73
Cadmium (Cd)	0.01	--	--	--	--



Parameter	NMWQCC Standard	North HPA*	Central North HPA*	South HPA and WIPP*	Capitan Reef†
Copper (Cu)	1	0.02	0.03	0.06–0.37	--
Iron (Fe)	1	3.34	0.04	0.01–1.62	3.41
Lithium (Li)	--	0.14–1.70	0.140–1.695	0.05–0.85	0.04–4.49
Manganese (Mn)	0.2	0–0.06	0–0.20	0–0.06	0–7.61
Nickel (Ni)	0.2	--	0–0.02	0–0.01	0.01
Lead (Pb)	0.05	0.04	--	0.02–0.06	--
Silicon (Si)	--	2.67–18.38	1.9–23.4	4.91–47.0	0–7.10
Strontium (Sr <sup>2+</sup> )	--	0.63 - 8.47	2.73–13.75	0.05–32.0	2.52–104.8
Vanadium (V)	--	--	0.01–0.03	0–0.1	--

Source: Lowry et al. (2018); Reardon et al. (2021)

Note:  $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$  = millimhos per centimeter; this is a unit of measure for electrical conductivity. -- = not applicable or not detected. RL = reporting limit. Units are mg/L unless otherwise noted. **Bold** = exceeds NMWQCC standard for groundwater <10,000 mg/L.

\* Values from 2020 samples, Reardon et al. (2021:Table 3). Range not reported for North HPA values because only one well was sampled.

† Values from Lowry et al. (2018:Table 16) because updated water quality values were not available in Reardon et al. (2021)

### 3.2.2. Surface Water

In the State of New Mexico, the NMED administers CWA Sections 303(d), 305(b), and 314 related to surface water quality assessment and reporting. The NMED defines surface water quality beneficial uses and water quality standards to evaluate if these uses are being attained. Water quality standards are comprised of designated uses for surface waters of the state and associated water quality criteria to protect those uses. The NMED prepares a report every 2 years (the Integrated Report), where waterbodies not attaining their designated beneficial uses are reported. The Integrated Report also contains information on surface water quality and water pollution control programs in the state of New Mexico (NMED 2021). The BLM does not have responsibility to make use attainment evaluations based on water chemistry data.

Designated uses in the Pecos District consist of industrial water supply, irrigation storage, livestock watering, recreation, warm water fishery, and wildlife habitat. Water quality in streams flowing on BLM-managed lands is influenced by both natural water quality with regard to salinity content and the intensity of human and industrial activities in the watershed. For example, water quality may be vastly different in a remote mountain spring creek than in waters with natural brine discharge or where there are human impacts due to urban, farming, ranching, or industrial activities. Stream and river conditions vary widely, from completely undisturbed river and vegetative communities in the mountainous highlands to deep, erodible soil banks at lower elevations where livestock, recreationists, and other public users have access to stream- and riverbanks.

The major perennial waterbody in the Pecos District is the Pecos River, which is segmented into smaller reaches for assessment purposes in the Integrated Report. The most common pollutants listed across segments of the Pecos River in the Pecos District are *Escherichia coli* (*E. coli*), dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT), and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), the latter in fish consumption advisories (NMED 2021). Other impairments in the region include nutrients and dissolved oxygen (NMED 2021).

### 3.2.3. Potential Sources of Surface Water or Groundwater Contamination

#### Spills

Spills associated with oil and gas development may reach surface water directly during the spill event. Spills may also reach surface waters indirectly when the spill has occurred and a rain event moves contaminants into nearby surface waterbodies through surface water flow or subsurface groundwater flow into springs that discharge into a surface waterbody.

Spill data were retrieved from the NMOCD spills database and further reviewed and summarized (NMOCD 2021a) (see Appendix A). In 2020, a total of 1,251 spills were associated with federal and non-federal oil and gas wells and facilities in the Pecos tri-county area (Table 3-10) (NMOCD 2021a). The percent loss (volume lost divided by volume released) varies by spill type, but the average loss for all 2020 records in the Pecos tri-county area was 53%. No 2020 spills occurring in Eddy, Lea, and Chaves Counties were reported as having affected surface water or groundwater (NMOCD 2021a).

The BLM works with NMOCD to remediate spills associated with federal oil and gas wells on BLM-managed lands or private or state surface. Title 19, Chapter 15 of the NMAC pertains to oil and gas releases. According to 19.15.29.11 NMAC, the responsible person shall complete NMOCD-approved corrective action for releases that endanger public health or the environment in accordance with a remediation plan submitted to and approved by NMOCD or with an abatement plan submitted in accordance with 19.15.30 NMAC. The remaining contaminants from unrecovered spills are remediated in accordance with federal and state standards. Some remediation consists of removing contaminated soil and replacing it with uncontaminated soil and performing corresponding chemical testing.

The chemical composition of water used during the hydraulic fracturing process varies due to differences in fracturing techniques used by oil and gas companies. The most commonly disclosed chemical used in wells in the New Mexico portion of the Permian Basin from 2014 through 2020 was water, with 6,635 disclosures (Table 3-11). Other frequent disclosures include quartz-alpha (n = 5,097), methanol (n = 3,162), and petroleum distillates (2,901). There were 14,924 records of non-disclosed chemicals, including chemicals listed as proprietary, confidential, and trade secrets. A typical oil/gas well uses approximately 20 to 25 unique chemicals during the hydraulic fracturing process, but in some cases, more than 60 distinct chemicals can be used.

**Table 3-10. Summary of 2020 spills from all wells in the New Mexico portion of the Permian Basin (Eddy, Lea, and Chaves Counties).**

Material Type*	Spill Count	Total Volume Spilled	Volume Lost	Units	Average Spill Volume	Percent Lost	Waterway Affected	Groundwater Affected
Brine water	3	100,549	506	BBL	169	8%	0	0
Condensate	17	531	444	BBL	26	80%	0	0
Crude oil	339	11,782	3,074	BBL	9	41%	0	0
Drilling mud/fluid	1	128	0	BBL	<1	0%	0	0
Gelled brine (frac fluid)	3	21	0	BBL	<1	0%	0	0
Other (specify)	21	5,054	2,077	BBL	99	49%	0	0
Produced water	663	62,600	23,370	BBL	35	40%	0	0
Sulfuric acid	1	12	0	BBL	<1	0%	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,048</b>	<b>180,677</b>	<b>29,471</b>		<b>42</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Natural gas (methane)	202	1,717,074	1,717,074	MCF	8,500	100%	0	0
Natural gas liquids†	1	345	345	MCF	345	100%	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>1,717,419</b>	<b>1,717,419</b>	<b>MCF</b>	<b>4,423</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total Spills</b>	<b>1,251</b>				<b>Average</b>	<b>42%</b>		
					<b>Percent Lost</b>			

Source: NMOCD (2021a)

Note: bbl = barrels; mcf = thousand cubic feet.

\* No spills of chemicals, glycol, or lube oil were documented in 2020.

† Natural gas liquids material types include natural gas flared, natural gas liquids, and natural gas vented materials.

**Table 3-11. Twenty-five most frequently disclosed chemicals in horizontal wells within the New Mexico portion of the Permian Basin (Chaves, Eddy, and Lea Counties) from 2014 through 2020.**

Ingredient Name	CAS Registry Number	Number of Disclosures	Percentage of Hydraulic Fracturing Job*	Percentage of Total Number of FracFocus Disclosures†
Water	7732-18-5	11,865	26	7%
Methanol	67-56-1	3,870	<1	2%
Hydrochloric acid	7647-01-0	2,853	<1	2%
Glutaraldehyde	111-30-8	2,005	<1	1%

Ingredient Name	CAS Registry Number	Number of Disclosures	Percentage of Hydraulic Fracturing Job*	Percentage of Total Number of FracFocus Disclosures†
Ammonium chloride	12125-02-9	1,996	<1	1%
Crystalline silica, quartz	14808-60-7	1,983	8	1%
Sodium hydroxide	1310-73-2	1,781	<1	1%
Sodium chloride	7647-14-5	1,779	<1	1%
Ethylene glycol	107-21-1	1,753	<1	1%
Proprietary	Proprietary	1,628	<1	1%
Guar gum	9000-30-0	1,600	<1	1%
Propargyl alcohol	107-19-7	1,435	<1	1%
Acetic acid	64-19-7	1,386	<1	1%
Ammonium persulfate	7727-54-0	1,319	<1	1%
Alcohols, C12-16, ethoxylated	68551-12-2	1,190	<1	1%
Crystalline silica	14808-60-7	1,167	13	1%
Distillates (petroleum), hydrotreated light	64742-47-8	1,101	<1	1%
Ethanol	64-17-5	998	<1	1%
Isopropanol	67-63-0	986	<1	1%
Citric acid	77-92-9	895	<1	1%
Cinnamaldehyde	104-55-2	892	<1	1%
Sodium perborate tetrahydrate	10486-00-7	884	<1	1%
Ethoxylated alcohols	Proprietary	842	<1	<1%
Ethoxylated alcohol	Trade Secret	815	<1	<1%
Potassium hydroxide	1310-58-3	803	<1	<1%

Source: FracFocus (2021)

Note: Ingredient names and CAS numbers are not standardized in FracFocus, leading to widespread differences and discrepancies in CAS numbers, number of disclosures, and ingredient names. For this reason, the number of disclosures and ingredients presented in this table are to be used for general information only.

\* The amount of the ingredient in the total hydraulic fracturing volume by percent mass (definition from FracFocus [2021] data dictionary).

† The total number of FracFocus ingredient disclosures in the Pecos tri-county area is 168,979.

## Drilling and Completion Activities

When wells are drilled, they most likely pass through usable groundwater aquifers currently or potentially supplying stock, residential, and/or irrigation water. If proper cementing and casing programs are not followed, there may be a loss of well integrity, surface spills, or loss of fluids in the drilling and completion process that could result in large volumes of highly concentrated chemicals reaching groundwater resources. If contamination of usable water aquifers (TDS less than 10,000 parts per million [ppm]) from any source occurs, changes in groundwater quality could impact springs and water wells that are sourced from the affected aquifers.

The BLM and NMOCD have casing, cementing, and inspection requirements in place to limit the potential for groundwater reservoirs and shallow aquifers to be impacted by hydraulic fracturing or the migration of hydrocarbons during oil and gas drilling and production activities. The BLM requires operators to comply with the regulations at 43 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 3160. In addition, these regulations require oil and gas development to comply with directives in the Onshore Oil and Gas Orders and the orders of the Authorized Officer. Onshore Order No. 2 and the regulations at 43 CFR 3162.3-3 provide regulatory requirements for hydraulic fracturing, including casing specifications, monitoring and recording, and management of recovered fluids. The State of New Mexico also has regulations for drilling, casing and cementing, completion, and plugging to protect freshwater zones (19.15.16 NMAC). Complying with the aforementioned regulations requires producers and regulators to verify the integrity of casing and cementing jobs. Casing specifications are designed and submitted to the BLM in a drilling plan as a component of an Application for Permit to Drill (APD). The BLM petroleum engineer independently reviews the drilling plan and, based on site-specific geologic and hydrologic information, ensures that proper drilling, casing, and cementing procedures are incorporated in the plan to protect usable groundwater. The aforementioned regulations and review practices surrounding proper casing and cementing procedures isolate usable water zones from drilling, completion/hydraulic fracturing fluids, and fluids from other mineral-bearing zones, including hydrocarbon-bearing zones. Conditions of approval (COAs) may be attached to the APD, if necessary, to ensure groundwater protection. These may include requirements for closed loop drilling systems, spill prevention plans, leak detection plans, and appropriate equipment (leak detection and automatic shutoff system) in sensitive groundwater recharge areas. Casing and cementing operations are witnessed by certified BLM petroleum engineering technicians (PETs). At the end of the well's economic life, the operator is required to submit a plugging plan to the BLM for approval. A BLM petroleum engineer will review the plan prior to commencement of plugging operations. The BLM PETs witness plugging operations to ensure the planned procedures are properly followed. The BLM's review, approval, and inspections ensure the permanent isolation of usable groundwater from hydrocarbon-bearing zones.

In summary, the BLM, the NMED, and NMOCD have put in place numerous requirements for oil and gas producers so that drilling fluids, hydraulic fracturing fluids, and produced water and hydrocarbons remain within the well bore and do not enter groundwater or any other formations. These include BLM regulations covered under 43 CFR 3160; Onshore Orders Nos. 1, 2, and 7; 43 CFR 3162.3-3; 43 CFR 3162.3-5; Notice to Lessees and Operators of Onshore Federal and Indian Oil and Gas Leases (NTL)-3A; NMOCD regulations under 19.15.26 NMAC; and the state's primacy agreement under the Safe Water Drinking Act. With these requirements in place, including the use of casing and cementing measures, contamination of groundwater resources from development of the lease parcels is highly unlikely. In addition, the BLM has authority under standard terms and conditions to require additional measures to protect water quality if site-specific circumstances require them. Site-specific mitigation tools would be developed as appropriate for the individual circumstances, including groundwater-quality monitoring studies. The regulations at 43 CFR 3162.5-2(d) give the BLM the authority to require an operator to monitor water resources to ensure that the isolation procedures utilized to protect water and other resources are effective.

## CHAPTER 4. FARMINGTON FIELD OFFICE

The FFO encompasses over 1.4 million acres of public lands and over 2.4 million acres of federal minerals within McKinley, Rio Arriba, Sandoval and San Juan Counties. Portions of the FFO are within the San Juan Basin, an oil and gas basin that is in the northwestern portion of New Mexico and the southwestern portion of Colorado (BLM 2003a).

The Mancos-Gallup Planning Area was the analysis area used by the FFO to develop the Mancos-Gallup RFD scenario (2018 RFD) (Crocker and Glover 2018), which examines past, present, and reasonably foreseeable oil and gas development in support of the FFO's Mancos-Gallup draft RMP/EIS (BLM 2021). The Mancos-Gallup Planning Area comprises those portions of the New Mexico portion of the San Juan Basin that overlay the Mancos/Gallup formations in portions of McKinley, Rio Arriba, Sandoval, and San Juan Counties (Figure 4-1). The Mancos-Gallup Planning Area comprises 4.2 million acres of all mineral ownership types; federal oil and gas in the area covers 2.1 million acres (BLM 2003a; Crocker and Glover 2018). Of the federal minerals, 1.8 million acres (85%) are leased and 300,000 acres (15%) are currently unleased. Native American-owned oil and gas (allotted and tribal) covers 1.4 million acres. Most of the oil and gas development within the FFO occurs within the Mancos-Gallup Planning Area.

This chapter presents information on existing and projected water quantity and water quality data for the FFO as summarized from information gathered from the following sources:

- *Farmington Resource Management Plan with Record of Decision* (BLM 2003a)
- 2018 RFD (Crocker and Glover 2018)
- Data compiled from the USGS report *Estimated Use of Water in the United States in 2015* (Dieter et al. 2018)
- FracFocus, a national hydraulic fracturing chemical registry managed by the GWPC and IOGCC (FracFocus 2021)
- Spill data from the NMOCD database (NMOCD 2021a)






Figure 4-1. BLM FFO and Mancos-Gallup Planning Area boundaries.

## **4.1. WATER QUANTITY**

### **4.1.1. Existing Surface and Groundwater Use**

#### **Farmington Field Office (McKinley, Rio Arriba, Sandoval, and San Juan Counties)**

Dieter et al. (2018) lists total water withdrawals across eight water use categories: aquaculture, domestic, industrial, irrigation, livestock, mining (which includes oil and gas development), public water supply, and thermoelectric power (Table 4-1–Table 4-4). Water use totals for each of these industries are summarized by surface water and groundwater, which are further divided into fresh water and saline water for each category. Total water usage is 13,217 AF; 118,120 AF; 71,576 AF; and 283,748 AF for McKinley, Rio Arriba, Sandoval, and San Juan Counties, respectively (see Table 4-1–Table 4-4), for a combined total of 486,660 AF (Table 4-5). This is 14.7% of total water usage within the state of New Mexico in 2015. The largest use of water within the FFO was irrigation, comprising 79.07% (384,817 AF) of total water use.

Water use associated with mining (11,658 AF) comprises 2.4% of total water use within the FFO; over half of all mining-related water use in the FFO occurred in San Juan County (6,356 AF, or 54.52% of the total mining water use in the FFO). Water use for mining is sourced from both surface water and groundwater (23% and 77%, respectively) and includes both fresh water and saline water (55% and 45%, respectively). Fresh water is sourced from both surface water and groundwater (43% and 57%, respectively); all reported saline water use is from groundwater.



**Table 4-1. McKinley County water use by category in 2015.**

Category	Surface Water				Groundwater				Total Withdrawals				Total	Total Use (%)
	Fresh	Saline*	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Saline*	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Total Use (%)	Saline*	Total Use (%)		
Aquaculture	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Domestic	0	-	0	0%	3,195	-	3,195	24%	3,195	24%	-	0%	3,195	24%
Industrial	0	0	0	0%	34	0	34	<1%	34	<1%	0	0%	34	<1%
Irrigation	1,099	-	1,099	8%	0	-	0	0%	1,099	8%	-	0%	1,099	8%
Livestock	101	-	101	<1%	370	-	370	3%	471	4%	-	0%	471	4%
Mining	0	0	0	0%	1,625	684	2,309	17%	1,625	12%	684	5%	2,309	17%
Public Water Supply	0	0	0	0%	3,811	0	3,811	29%	3,811	29%	0	0%	3,811	29%
Thermoelectric Power	0	0	0	0%	2,298	0	2,298	17%	2,298	17%	0	0%	2,298	17%
<b>County Totals</b>	<b>1,199</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,199</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>11,333</b>	<b>684</b>	<b>12,017</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>12,533</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>684</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>13,217</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Dieter et al. (2018).

Note: Values may not sum to totals because of independent rounding (Dieter et al. 2018). Water use data are in acre-feet/year unless otherwise indicated.

\* Saline water withdrawals are not reported for domestic, irrigation, or livestock water use (Dieter et al. 2018).

**Table 4-2. Rio Arriba County water use by category in 2015.**

Category	Surface Water				Groundwater				Total Withdrawals				Total	Total Use (%)
	Fresh	Saline*	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Saline*	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Total Use (%)	Saline*	Total Use (%)		
Aquaculture	0	0	0	0%	3,554	0	3,554	3%	3,554	3%	0	0%	3,554	3%
Domestic	0	-	0	0%	1,345	-	1,345	1%	1,345	1%	-	0%	1,345	1%
Industrial	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Irrigation	107,874	-	107,874	91%	1,256	-	1,256	1%	109,129	92%	-	0%	109,129	92%
Livestock	168	-	168	<1%	191	-	191	<1%	359	<1%	-	0%	359	<1%
Mining	0	0	0	0%	437	1,244	1,682	1%	437	<1%	1,244	1%	1,682	1%
Public Water Supply	381	0	381	<1%	1,670	0	1,670	1%	2,051	2%	0	0%	2,051	2%
Thermoelectric Power	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>County Totals</b>	<b>108,423</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>108,423</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>8,452</b>	<b>1,244</b>	<b>9,697</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>116,875</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>1,244</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>118,120</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Dieter et al. (2018).

Note: Values may not sum to totals because of independent rounding (Dieter et al. 2018). Water use data are in acre-feet/year unless otherwise indicated.

\* Saline water withdrawals are not reported for domestic, irrigation, or livestock water use (Dieter et al. 2018).

**Table 4-3. San Juan County water use by category in 2015.**

Category	Surface Water				Groundwater				Total Withdrawals				Total	Total Use
	Fresh	Saline*	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Saline*	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Total Use (%)	Saline*	Total Use (%)		
Aquaculture	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Domestic	0	-	0	0%	1,312	-	1,312	<1%	1,312	<1%	-	0%	1,312	<1%
Industrial	0	0	0	0%	22	0	22	<1%	22	<1%	0	0%	22	<1%
Irrigation	223,942	-	223,942	79%	0	-	0	0%	223,942	79%	-	0%	223,942	79%
Livestock	67	-	67	<1%	303	-	303	<1%	370	<1%	-	0%	370	<1%
Mining	2,724	0	2,724	1%	549	3,083	3,632	1%	3,273	1%	3,083	1%	6,356	2%
Public Water Supply	21,097	0	21,097	7%	11	0	11	0%	21,108	7%	0	0%	21,108	7%
Thermoelectric Power	30,637	0	30,637	11%	0	0	0	0%	30,637	11%	0	0%	30,637	11%
<b>County Totals</b>	<b>278,468</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>278,468</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>2,197</b>	<b>3,083</b>	<b>5,280</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>280,665</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>3,083</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>283,748</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Dieter et al. (2019).

Note: Values may not sum to totals because of independent rounding (Dieter et al. 2018).

\* Saline water withdrawals are not reported for domestic, irrigation, or livestock water use (Dieter et al. 2018).

**Table 4-4. Sandoval County water use by category in 2015.**

Category	Surface Water				Groundwater				Total Withdrawals				Total	Total Use (%)
	Fresh	Saline*	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Saline*	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Total Use (%)	Saline*	Total Use (%)		
Aquaculture	0	0	0	0%	1,087	0	1,087	2%	1,087	2%	0	0%	1,087	2%
Domestic	0	-	0	0%	3,128	-	3,128	4%	3,128	4%	-	0%	3,128	4%
Industrial	0	0	0	0%	2,578	0	2,578	4%	2,578	4%	0	0%	2,578	4%
Irrigation	48,326	-	48,326	68%	2,320	-	2,320	3%	50,647	71%	-	0%	50,647	71%
Livestock	101	-	101	<1%	123	-	123	<1%	224	<1%	-	0%	224	<1%
Mining	0	0	0	0%	1,065	247	1,312	2%	1,065	1%	247	<1%	1,312	2%
Public Water Supply	135	0	135	<1%	12,466	0	12,466	17%	12,600	18%	0	0%	12,600	18%
Thermoelectric Power	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>County Totals</b>	<b>48,562</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>48,562</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>22,768</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>23,014</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>71,329</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>&lt;1%</b>	<b>71,576</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Dieter et al. (2018).

Note: Values may not sum to totals because of independent rounding (Dieter et al. 2018). Water use data are in acre-feet/year unless otherwise indicated.

\* Saline water withdrawals are not reported for domestic, irrigation, or livestock water use (Dieter et al. 2018).

**Table 4-5. Water use by category in 2015 within the FFO (McKinley, Rio Arriba, Sandoval, and San Juan Counties).**

Category	Surface Water				Groundwater				Total Withdrawals				Total	Total Use (%)
	Fresh	Saline*	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Saline*	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Total Use (%)	Saline*	Total Use (%)		
Aquaculture	0	0	0	0%	4,641	0	4,641	<1%	4,641	<1%	0	0%	4,641	<1%
Domestic	0	-	0	0%	8,979	-	8,979	2%	8,979	2%	-	0%	8,979	2%
Industrial	0	0	0	0%	2,634	0	2,634	<1%	2,634	<1%	0	0%	2,634	<1%
Irrigation	381,241	-	381,241	78%	3,576	-	3,576	<1%	384,817	79%	-	0%	384,817	79%
Livestock	437	-	437	<1%	986	-	986	<1%	1,424	<1%	-	0%	1,424	<1%
Mining	2,724	0	2,724	<1%	3,677	5,257	8,934	2%	6,401	1%	5,257	1%	11,658	2%
Public Water Supply	21,613	0	21,613	4%	17,958	0	17,958	4%	39,571	8%	0	0%	39,571	8%
Thermoelectric Power	30,637	0	30,637	6%	2,298	0	2,298	<1%	32,935	7%	0	0%	32,935	7%
<b>Basin Totals</b>	<b>436,652</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>436,652</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>44,750</b>	<b>5,257</b>	<b>50,008</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>481,402</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>5,257</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>486,660</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Dieter et al. (2018).

Note: Values may not sum to totals because of independent rounding (Dieter et al. 2018). Water use data are in acre-feet/year unless otherwise indicated.

\* Saline water withdrawals are not reported for domestic, irrigation, or livestock water use (Dieter et al. 2018).




Figure 4-2. FFO (McKinley, Rio Arriba, Sandoval, and San Juan Counties) water use by category in 2015 (Dieter et al. 2018).

## 4.1.2. Water Use Trends and Planned Actions

### 4.1.2.1 Past and Present Actions

As noted previously, total water usage in the four counties comprising the FFO in 2015 was 486,660 AF and accounted for approximately 15% (3,249,667 AF) of the total state water withdrawals (Dieter et al. 2018). The largest use of water within the FFO is irrigation, comprising 79% of all water use within the FFO and 14% of all irrigation-related use within the state. Mining (which includes oil and gas development) comprised 2.4% of the total water withdrawals within the FFO and 7% of all mining-related water use in the state.

Data from FracFocus were evaluated to provide objective information on the amount of water used in hydraulic fracturing (see Appendix A). Operators are required by the State of New Mexico to disclose chemistry and water use information to FracFocus. Annual water use in oil and gas wells within the four counties comprising the FFO has varied over the last 7 years. The total water use for all wells decreased from 161 AF in 2019 to 51 AF in 2020, but average water use per well increased from 1.7 AF to 5.7 AF per well (Table 4-6) (FracFocus 2021). Wells on federal land consumed 51 AF of water in 2020, 100% of the 2020 total water usage. The number of wells completed decreased from 92 in 2019 to nine in 2020.

Combined water use is the amount of water cumulatively used each year by hydraulic fracturing and includes the water use for any given year plus the water use for each previous year since 2014. For example, the combined water use in 2017 would be generated using the following formula:

$$2017 \text{ Combined Water Use (WU)} = 2017 \text{ WU} + 2016 \text{ WU} + 2015 \text{ WU} + 2014 \text{ WU}$$

The combined water use estimates for federal and total (both federal and non-federal) water use associated with hydraulic fracturing in the FFO are shown in Table 4-6. With consideration of all water use by oil and gas wells for hydraulic fracturing from 2014 to 2020, the combined federal water use and total combined water use increased to 1,080 AF and 1,915 AF, respectively. The 7-year average water use was 273 AF/year and 3.4 AF per well.

**Table 4-6. Water use by oil and gas wells for hydraulic fracturing in the New Mexico portion of the San Juan Basin (McKinley, Rio Arriba, Sandoval, and San Juan Counties) from 2014 through 2020.**

Year	Federal Water Use	Non-Federal Water Use	Total Water Use	Federal Water Use (%)	Federal Combined Water Use	Total Combined Water Use	Average Water Use/Well	Well Count	Produced Water
2014	165	154	319	51.7	165	319	2.4	131	5,406
2015	83	255	338	24.6	248	657	3.8	89	5,040
2016	85	26	111	76.8	333	768	2.7	41	4,233
2017	228	50	278	82.0	561	1,046	4.6	61	3,554
2018	376	281	657	57.2	937	1,703	4.8	138	2,681
2019	92	69	161	57.2	1,029	1,864	1.7	92	4,391
2020	51	0	51	100	1,080	1,915	5.7	9	4,435
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,080</b>	<b>835</b>	<b>1,915</b>				<b>3.4</b>	<b>561</b>	<b>29,740</b>

Source: FracFocus (2021).


Note: Data are presented only for those wells reporting water usage to FracFocus. See Appendix A for data analysis methodology. Produced water data are from NMOCD (2021b). Produced water is naturally occurring water that exists in a formation that is being targeted for mineral extraction and is produced as a byproduct. Water use data are in acre-feet unless otherwise indicated.

Table 4-7 builds on the FracFocus data to identify minimum, maximum, median, and mean water by three completion types. As shown in the table, average (mean) water use is 1.9, 2.7, and 41.3 AF per well for nitrogen-, water-, and slickwater-stimulated wells, respectively. Proportion of oil and gas well stimulation techniques in the FFO from 2014 through 2020 is represented in Figure 4-1. As shown in Figure 4-1 and Table 4-7, most well completions over the last 7 years have been nitrogen-stimulated.

**Table 4-7. Water use of oil and gas wells for three stimulation technologies from 2014 through 2020 within the FFO.**

Well Type	Number of Wells in San Juan Basin	Water Use (AF/well)			
		Minimum	Maximum	Median	Mean
Nitrogen	470	0.005	13.1	0.4	1.9
Water	60	0.01	11.5	3.0	2.7
Slickwater	20	13.2	94.7	25.1	41.3

Note: Wells hydraulically fractured with water were identified as wells that did not use nitrogen or slickwater stimulation. Data are presented only for wells that reported chemical compositions to FracFocus (2021).



**Figure 4-3. Proportion of oil and gas well stimulation techniques in the FFO from 2014 through 2020 (FracFocus 2021).**

While the FracFocus database is an excellent tool for identifying well completions, FracFocus does not currently differentiate between wells that are new completions or recompletions of previously drilled wells. This discrepancy can skew water use statistics, as recompletions typically use less water than new completions. Additional well information was compiled from BLM records, available from NMOCD, and aggregated with the FracFocus data to provide a more detailed analysis of water use by well type (new completion versus recompletion and completion method) (Table 4-8). From 2014 to 2020, recompletions of previously existing wells and completions of vertical wells used an average of 0.3 AF/well. Water use associated with new completions of nitrogen and slickwater wells used an average of 3.8 and 41.3 AF/well, respectively.

**Table 4-8. Water use statistics by well type for the FFO from 2014 through 2020.**

Year	Well Type	Count	Average Water Use per Well (AF)	Total Water Use (AF)
2014	Nitrogen	105	2.9	301.3
	Recomplete	22	0.7	15.6
	Slickwater	0	-	-
	Vertical	4	0.4	1.7
	<b>Total</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>318.6</b>
2015	Nitrogen	65	3.3	213.3
	Recomplete	7	0.3	2.1
	Slickwater	3	40.4	121.3
	Vertical	15	0.4	5.8
	<b>Total</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>342.5</b>

Year	Well Type	Count	Average Water Use per Well (AF)	Total Water Use (AF)
2016	Nitrogen	16	5.1	81.5
	Recomplete	23	0.2	5.9
	Slickwater	1	23.3	23.3
	Vertical	0	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>109.4</b>
2017	Nitrogen	40	4.8	186.9
	Recomplete	11	0.3	3.4
	Slickwater	1	87.3	87.3
	Vertical	11	0.1	1.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>278.7</b>
2018	Nitrogen	19	4.6	88.3
	Recomplete	107	0.2	25
	Slickwater	14	38.9	544.5
	Vertical	2	0.1	0.2
	<b>Total</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>657.8</b>
2019	Nitrogen	17	5.6	94.4
	Recomplete	74	0.2	17.2
	Slickwater	1	49.2	49.2
	Vertical	0	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>160.9</b>
2020	Nitrogen	9	5.7	51.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>51.0</b>
2014–2020	Nitrogen	271	3.8	1,016.9
	Recomplete	244	0.3	67.6
	Slickwater	20	41.3	825.7
	Vertical	32	0.3	8.8
	<b>Total</b>	<b>567</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>1,919.0</b>

Note: Well data sourced from FracFocus (2021) and aggregated with additional data from BLM records (BLM 2021).

According to data from FracFocus (2021) (see Table 4-7 and Table 4-8), the average water use associated with slickwater stimulation of the 20 wells was 41 AF. Using this information, and an average lateral well bore of 1.5 miles (as obtained from the corresponding completion reports), the BLM has calculated an average of 27 AF per lateral mile. See Appendix B for more information on the FFO's revised slickwater well water use estimates.

#### 4.2.2.2 Water Use Associated with Reasonably Foreseeable Oil and Gas Development

##### 4.2.2.2.1 2018 RFD Water Use Projections

The 2018 RFD (Crocker and Glover 2018) was used to forecast the potential quantity of oil and gas wells in the Mancos-Gallup Planning Area, which includes most of the FFO and is where most potential oil and gas development is projected to occur. The RFD was also used to forecast estimates of the quantity of water that would be required for hydraulic fracturing of the forecasted wells. These water use estimates

assume that 100% of wells will be hydraulically fractured and do not account for reuse or recycling of hydraulic fracturing fluid.

The 2018 RFD is a reasonable estimate of the development (federal and non-federal) and consumptive water use associated with hydrocarbon production in the New Mexico portion of the San Juan Basin for 20 years (2018–2037). According to the 2018 RFD, 3,200 wells are expected to be drilled in the Mancos-Gallup Planning Area between 2018 and 2037 based on actualized data. Water use associated with hydraulic fracturing is dependent on many factors, including (but not limited to) the drilling method (horizontal or vertical) and the geologic formation at the well site. Of the 3,200 wells projected to be drilled between 2018 and 2037, 2,300 are expected to be horizontal and 900 are expected to be vertical.

The 2018 RFD projected water use for vertical wells is 0.537 AF per well (Crocker and Glover 2018). Horizontal wells require more water than vertical wells. The 2018 RFD reported that horizontal wells in the San Juan Basin would require on average approximately 3.13 AF of water per well (Table 4-9).

As depicted in Table 4-8, in 2020, the average horizontal well water use increased to 5.7 AF per well, bringing the 7-year average to 3.4 AF per well. Despite the 7-year average being lower than the revised water use estimates, an assumed water use of 4.8 AF per well (developed by the BLM in 2018 based on FracFocus data; see Table 4-8) provides a good upper limit on the estimated water use over the next 20 years.

**Table 4-9. Projected water use in the New Mexico portion of the San Juan Basin (FFO).**

<b>Factor</b>	<b>Water Use in RFD (Crocker and Glover 2018)</b>	<b>Revised Water Use</b>	<b>Rationale for Change</b>
Average water use per horizontal well during a hydraulic fracturing operation	3.13 AF*	4.84 AF†	Reflects actual use as reported in FracFocus in 2018
Average water use per vertical well during a hydraulic fracturing operation	0.537 AF	0.537 AF	No change
<b>Total Water Use (2018–2037)*</b>	<b>7,683 AF§</b>	<b>11,615 AF§</b>	

\* Derived from Crocker and Glover (2018).

† Source: FracFocus (2018)

‡ Total water use = (2,300 horizontal wells × horizontal well water use estimate) + (900 vertical wells × vertical well water use estimate).

§ Source: BLM (2020)

Water used for hydraulic fracturing of the estimated 3,200 wells in the 2018 RFD (Crocker and Glover 2018) is assumed to come primarily from fresh groundwater sources and is based on historic oil and gas development in the area and county water use data. Drilling and completion of the 3,200 wells estimated to occur in the Mancos-Gallup Planning Area would require approximately 7,683 AF using the water use estimates contained in the 2018 RFD. Using the BLM’s revised water use estimates (4.84 AF per horizontal well; see Table 4-8), development of the 3,200 wells in the 2018 RFD would require 11,615 AF of water, or 580 AF of water in any given year. Projected annual water use would be approximately 0.12% of the 2015 total water use in the four counties comprising the FFO (486,660 AF).

#### **4.2.2.2 Water Use Projections by Stimulation Technology**

As discussed in Section 4.1.2.1, water use associated with horizontal well completions varies by method of stimulation. This section provides RFD water use projections based on stimulation technology. In all scenarios, development of vertical wells is assumed to require 0.537 AF. Development of all 900 vertical wells in the 2018 RFD would require 483 AF, or approximately 24 AF/year.



### **Nitrogen Stimulation Water Use Projections**

Nitrogen stimulation, in which gaseous nitrogen is used in place of water to fracture oil and gas formations, is a common stimulation technique in the FFO. There are three predominant methods of nitrogen stimulation: nitrogen foam, energized nitrogen, and pure nitrogen. The three techniques vary in the amount of nitrogen and water used as well as the partnering chemicals. The advantage to using nitrogen in place of water is the reduced quantity of water needed to achieve the same oil and gas yields. The proportion of nitrogen-stimulated wells within a year has ranged from 76.6% to 100% (see Figure 4-4).

The average water use of a new nitrogen-stimulated well is 3.8 AF per well (see Table 4-8). If all 2,300 horizontal wells in the 2018 RFD used nitrogen-stimulated technologies, development of the 2018 RFD scenario would require 9,223 AF of water, or 461 AF of water in any given year. Projected annual water use would be approximately 0.09% of the 2015 total water use in the four counties comprising the FFO (486,660 AF).

### **Slickwater Stimulation Water Use Projections**

In 2015, the FFO began receiving APDs proposing slickwater hydraulic fracturing. Slickwater hydraulic fracturing utilizes greater quantities of water during the stimulation process than nitrogen or standard water hydraulic fracturing. To date, 20 wells have been drilled using long laterals with slickwater stimulation within the FFO (see Table 4-7). Appendix B contains additional background information on slickwater fracturing in the FFO as well as the methodology for capturing information and calculating water use by stage, the average number of stages per wells, and other information used to project water use associated with slickwater well development.

If operators implement slickwater technology more frequently than in 2018 and prior years, it is expected that total water use volumes on a per-well basis will trend upward. If 100% of the 2,300 horizontal wells projected in the 2018 RFD were to use slickwater fracturing, development of the horizontal well portion of the RFD scenario would require 125,000 AF (see Appendix B) and development of the full 2018 RFD scenario would require approximately 125,483 AF of water (total), or 6,275 AF of water in any given year. Projected annual water use of 6,275 AF would be approximately 1.3% of the 2015 total water use in the four counties comprising the FFO (486,660 AF). However, water utilized in slickwater fracturing can have TDS of 50,000 ppm, well above the NMOSE potable water threshold. This allows for the use of non-traditional water sources, including connate water, recycled flowback water, and produced water. Currently, only 3% of wells within the San Juan Basin use slickwater fracturing.

#### **4.2.2.2. Water Use Forecasts Comparisons**

A good strategy for projecting water use over an extended period is the utilization of scenarios with varying conditions. This section provides a comparison of water use associated with the three water use scenarios described above.

- 2018 RFD revised water use projections scenario: This scenario predicts an annual use of 580 AF/year, which would result in a 20-year cumulative water use of 11,615 AF by 2037.
- Nitrogen scenario: This assumes all 2,300 horizontal wells predicted in the 2018 RFD will use nitrogen stimulation (3.8 AF per horizontal well), which would result in a 20-year cumulative water use of 9,223 AF by 2037 (4-10).
- Slickwater scenario: This scenario assumes that all 2,300 wells predicted in the RFD would use slickwater stimulation, with an average lateral length of 2 miles, which would require a result in a 20-year cumulative water use of 125,483 AF by 2037.

A fourth scenario assumes a consistent 3% increase in the proportion of slickwater wells and a corresponding decrease in nitrogen-stimulated wells from 2020 through 2037. An annual increase of 3% was used for this scenario because currently 3% of wells within the San Juan Basin use slickwater fracturing. Vertical well development is assumed to stay constant. Well count by completion method and estimated water use for this scenario is detailed by year in Table 4-10. This scenario assumes an


average water use of 3.8 and 41.3 AF per well for nitrogen- and slickwater-stimulated wells, respectively (as per the 2014–2020 water use averages described in Table 4-8) and 0.537 AF per well for vertical wells. This scenario would result in an 18-year (2020–2037) cumulative horizontal well water use of 29,822 AF.

**Table 4-10. Estimated well counts and associated water use for the 3% annual slickwater increase scenario.**

Year	Estimated Number of Wells			Estimated Water Use (AF) by Well Type			Annual Water Use	Cumulative Water Use
	Slickwater	Nitrogen	Vertical	Slickwater	Nitrogen	Vertical		
2020	3	112	45	124	376	24	524	524
2021	7	108	45	289	49	24	363	887
2022	10	105	45	413	357	24	794	1,681
2023	14	101	45	578	350	24	952	2,633
2024	17	98	45	702	342	24	1,068	3,702
2025	21	94	45	867	331	24	1,222	4,924
2026	24	91	45	991	323	24	1,338	6,262
2027	28	87	45	1,156	315	24	1,496	7,758
2028	31	84	45	1,280	308	24	1,612	9,370
2029	35	80	45	1,446	296	24	1,766	11,136
2030	38	77	45	1,569	289	24	1,882	13,019
2031	41	74	45	1,693	281	24	1,999	15,017
2032	45	70	45	1,859	266	24	2,149	17,166
2033	48	67	45	1,982	255	24	2,261	19,427
2034	52	63	45	2,148	239	24	2,411	21,838
2035	55	60	45	2,272	228	24	2,524	24,362
2036	59	56	45	2,437	213	24	2,674	27,036
2037	62	53	45	2,561	201	24	2,786	29,822

Note: Estimated well counts were calculated assuming 115 horizontal well completions per year (from the 2018 RFD) rounded to the whole number, a 3% annual increase in the number of slickwater wells developed per year, and a corresponding decrease in nitrogen well stimulation methods. An assumed water use of 41.3 and 3.8 AF/well was used for slickwater- and nitrogen- stimulated wells, respectively.

Figure 4-4 presents combined water use estimates for four well development scenarios within the New Mexico portion of the San Juan Basin (McKinley, Rio Arriba, Sandoval, and San Juan Counties) based on a predicted 2,300 horizontal and 900 vertical wells. Figure 4-4 estimates combined water use based on actual water use provided to FracFocus from 2014 through 2019.



**Figure 4-4. Cumulative water use estimates for four well development scenarios within the New Mexico portion of the San Juan Basin (McKinley, Rio Arriba, Sandoval, and San Juan Counties) based on a predicted 2,300 horizontal and 900 vertical wells.**

Current water use trends over the past 7 years (3.4 AF per well and 273 AF/year) indicate that cumulative water use by 2037 will be approximately 6,556 AF. Current new well completion water use trends fall below both the nitrogen and revised 2018 RFD scenarios. The slickwater scenario predicts that, starting in 2019, all wells within the San Juan Basin will use slickwater stimulation, whereas FFO data indicates that in 2019, one well was completed using slickwater stimulation. None of the nine wells completed in 2020 utilized slickwater stimulation (see Table 4-8). The slickwater scenario estimates a 2019 water use of 6,142 AF, whereas total water use for well completion reported to FracFocus in the FFO in 2019 and 2020 was 161 and 51 AF, respectively, which is 97.4% and 99.2% less, respectively, than the predicted 6,142 AF/year. Of the 92 wells completed in 2019, 90 (97.8%) used nitrogen stimulation, and all nine wells completed in 2020 used nitrogen stimulation. Therefore, it is a more likely scenario that all wells completed within the San Juan Basin will use nitrogen stimulation as opposed to slickwater stimulation.

### 4.1.3. Potential Sources of Water for Project Development

Because over 77% of all water used in mining activities, which include oil and gas development, in the counties that comprise the FFO is currently from groundwater (see Section 3.1.1 and Table 4-7), it is reasonable to project that a large portion of the water used for hydraulic fracturing under the 2018 RFD scenario would be groundwater. Groundwater is a more readily available source of water than surface water due to the ephemeral nature of many surface water features in the San Juan Basin. Generally, sources of groundwater can be found in nearly every area of the FFO. Water yields in these areas vary, but most aquifers yield less than 20 gallons per minute (gpm) (BLM 2003b). Aquifers that are known to yield sufficient quantities of water are usually found within sandstone units of Jurassic, Cretaceous, and Tertiary age (BLM 2003b). Aquifers that have the potential to yield 100 gpm include the Ojo Alamo Sandstone, the Nacimiento Formation, and the San Jose Formation, all of which are within the greater Uinta-Animas aquifer (BLM 2003b). However, water used in hydraulic fracturing may also originate from regulated and controlled surface water sources.

San Juan Basin oil and gas operators have included plans to use multiple hydraulic fracturing methods, including slickwater fracturing technology. The two general water types that may be used for slickwater

stimulation are categorized as potable/fresh and non-potable. Any water that has TDS greater than 1,000 ppm has been defined as non-potable by the State of New Mexico (72-12-25 New Mexico Statutes Annotated 1978). The BLM has identified anything less than 10,000 ppm to be protected in the casing rule of the BLM's Onshore Order No. 2 (BLM 1988). Non-potable water is outside the appropriate processes and is mainly diverted for mineral exploration purposes. The higher allowable TDS levels that are acceptable for slickwater stimulation expand the possible water sources beyond those that are traditionally used (e.g., surface water or groundwater) into non-traditional sources of water (e.g., non-potable groundwater sources). Recently, NMOSE has approved permits to drill wells within the San Juan Basin to withdraw non-potable connate water (groundwater) from the Entrada Sandstone formation for use as a potential source of water for slickwater stimulation operations (see Appendix B for more information). Water contained in the Entrada Sandstone is highly saline (Kelley et al. 2014). As such, it is considered non-potable and has not been declared an administrative aquifer by NMOSE. Table 4-11 identifies four aquifers found within the FFO, their associated rock types, and sources of recharge.

Other sources of non-potable water that can be utilized in stimulation are flowback fluid and produced water. Flowback fluid is a mixture of water and small amounts of chemicals and other proppants that flow back through the wellhead directly after stimulation activities. Generally, 10% to 40% of the initial volume utilized for stimulation activities returns as flowback fluid; of this flowback fluid, 10% to 40% is non-potable water that may be used in future stimulation activities. Produced water is naturally occurring water that exists in a formation that is being targeted for mineral extraction and is produced as a byproduct, thereby becoming produced water. Based on operator input, after the initial flowback recovery of 10% to 40%, the remaining water used for stimulation returns to the surface through production activities at a slower rate of return.

Water used for oil and gas drilling and completion would generally be obtained through the following methods:

- leasing a valid water right through an NMOSE permit
- buying/leasing water from a legal water provider (or from a private well owner at up to 3 AF)
- purchasing water from a non-potable reclaimed water supplier

In addition to utilizing surface water or groundwater, operators may also bring water to a well site via truck from any number of sources. The transaction would be handled by NMOCD as well as NMOSE. All water use would be evaluated at the APD stage in site-specific NEPA analysis and subject to standard lease terms and conditions; all water used for well development and operations would be from an approved source.

**Table 4-11. Potential sources of groundwater in the FFO.**

<b>Aquifer Name</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Sources of Recharge</b>
Mesaverde	Sandstone, coal, siltstone and shale of the Mesaverde Group	Upland areas, mainly in areas of the Zuni Uplift, the Chuska Mountains, and northern Sandoval County
Rio Grande	Unconsolidated sand and gravel basin-fill	Precipitation and snowmelt from the mountains and valleys that surround the basin; most precipitation is lost to evaporation and transpiration, and very little percolates to a sufficient depth to recharge the aquifer
Uinta-Animas	Lower tertiary rocks; permeable, coarse, arkosic sandstone interlayered with mudstone; permeable conglomerate and medium to very coarse sandstone interlayered with relatively impermeable shale and mudstone	In higher elevations that encircle the San Juan Basin
Entrada Sandstone	Sandstone; eolian sand dunes	Through surface exposures on the margins of the basin in the foothills of the Laramide uplifts

Source: BLM (2003); Kelley et al. (2014)

#### **4.1.4. Water Use Mitigations**

Public concern about water use from hydraulic fracturing is especially high in semiarid regions. Overall, there have been calls to increase the use of alternative water sources such as brackish water or recycling produced water, minimizing the strain on local freshwater resources (Kondash et al. 2018). The BLM encourages the use of recycled water in hydraulic fracturing techniques, and in 2019, the State of New Mexico passed the Produced Water Act, which encourages oil and gas producers to reuse produced water when possible rather than rely on freshwater sources for oil and gas extraction. Recent studies indicate that the water used for hydraulic fracturing may be retained within the shale formation, with only a small fraction of the fresh water injected into the ground returning as flowback water; water returning to the surface is highly saline, difficult to treat, and often disposed through deep injection wells (Kondash et al. 2018). The NMED recently signed an MOU with New Mexico State University to develop new technologies for treating produced water to inform future policies for produced water reuse.


As noted above, water-intensive stimulation methods such as slickwater fracturing can be accomplished using non-traditional water sources, including the connate water within the Entrada Sandstone. NMOSE is the agency responsible for water withdrawal permitting actions. Its notice of intent process includes a model-based evaluation of the potential effects of proposed withdrawals and the identification of possible requirements for applicants to obtain water rights to offset any depletions identified in NMOSE's analyses prior to applicants commencing diversions.

## **4.2. WATER QUALITY**

### **4.2.1. Groundwater**

Results of the hydrologic assessment of oil and gas development of the Mancos Shale in the San Juan Basin (Kelley et al. 2014) indicate that groundwater quality in the San Juan Basin is variable (ranging from fresh to brackish) due to the complex stratigraphy and varying rock formations within the basin. Brackish and saline water is typically found in the center of the basin, and fresh groundwater is typically found along the basin margins. Deep saline water can migrate upward along cracks and fissures. Fresh water along the basin margins at depths greater than 3,500 feet indicate fast recharge rates influenced by geologic structures (Kelley et al. 2014).

The geologic formation where groundwater resides also influences groundwater salinity. Figure 4-5 is an illustrated geologic cross section showing the distribution of saline aquifers within the San Juan Basin.



**Figure 4-5. Geologic cross section showing the distribution of saline aquifers in the San Juan Basin (Kelley et al. 2014).**

TDS concentration is a measure of all dissolved matter in a sample of water and is the primary indicator of groundwater quality, as higher TDS concentrations typically render water less suitable for drinking or agricultural purposes such as irrigation. In groundwater, TDS is influenced by the dissolution of natural materials such as rock, soil, and organic material. Anthropogenic activities also contribute to TDS concentrations in shallow, unconfined aquifers.

TDS concentration in the San Juan Basin is dependent on the stratigraphic location and geologic formation where the water resides. Fresh water (TDS <1,000 mg/L) is typically found at depths less than 2,500 feet below the ground surface, although exceptions to this generalization occur in deeper layers such as the Gallup Sandstone and Morrison Formation. Saline and brackish water is dominant in the center of the San Juan Basin at deeper depths (Kelley et al. 2014).

#### **4.2.2. Surface Water**

Stream and river conditions vary widely, from completely undisturbed river and vegetative communities in the mountainous highlands to deep, erodible soil banks at lower elevations where livestock, recreationists, and other public users have access to stream- and riverbanks.

Water quality in streams flowing on BLM-managed lands is influenced by both natural water quality with regard to salinity content and the intensity of human and industrial activities in the watershed. For example, water quality may be vastly different in a remote mountain spring creek than in waters with natural brine discharge or where there are human impacts due to urban, farming, ranching, or industrial activities.

Additional chemistry samples of surface water in the region are needed to establish a baseline for the waters. Variances in baseline chemistry can indicate water quality changes attributable to changes in land

use. The most common pollutants for waters in the region are sediment and mercury. Beneficial uses listed for these waters are industrial water supply, irrigation storage, livestock watering, recreation, warm water fishery, and wildlife habitat. The dominant legislation affecting national water quality and BLM compliance with New Mexico water quality requirements is the CWA.

### **4.2.3. Potential Sources of Surface Water or Groundwater Contamination**

#### **Spills**

Spills associated with oil and gas development may reach surface water directly during the spill event. Spills may also reach surface waters indirectly, after a spill has occurred and a rain event moves contaminants into nearby surface waterbodies through surface water flow or subsurface groundwater flow into springs that discharge into a surface waterbody.

The San Juan Basin has been a producing oil and natural gas field since the early to middle 1900s. In 2020, oil and gas development resulted in 8,014,296 bbl of oil (NMOCD 2021b). There were a total of 88 spills in the New Mexico portion of the San Juan Basin in 2020 (Table 4-12).

In 2020, ability for spill recovery varied by spill type, but in general, about 72% of all spills were lost. Of the spills in 2020, two incidents were reported as having affected surface waterways. The BLM works with NMOCD to remediate spills on associated federal oil and gas wells, including spills from federal wells drilled on private or state surface. According to 19.15.29.11 NMAC, the responsible person shall complete NMOCD-approved corrective action for releases that endanger public health or the environment in accordance with a remediation plan submitted to and approved by NMOCD or with an abatement plan submitted in accordance with 19.15.30 NMAC. The remaining contaminants from unrecovered spills are remediated in accordance with federal and state standards. Some remediation consists of removing contaminated soil and replacing it with uncontaminated soil and performing corresponding chemical testing.

The chemical composition of water used during the hydraulic fracturing process varies due to differences in fracturing techniques used by oil and gas companies. The most common chemical disclosed in FracFocus for wells within the FFO was water, with 1,061 disclosures (Table 4-13). Other frequent disclosures included quartz-alpha (n = 942), sodium chloride (n = 589), and methanol (n = 574). There were 4,442 records of non-disclosed chemicals, including chemicals listed as proprietary, confidential, and trade secrets. Five records had CAS registry number errors and were unidentifiable.

**Table 4-12. Summary of 2020 spills in the New Mexico portion of the San Juan Basin (McKinley, Rio Arriba, Sandoval, and San Juan Counties).**

Material Type*	Spill Count	Volume Spilled	Volume Lost	Units	Average Volume Spilled	Percent Lost	Waterway Affected	Groundwater Affected
Condensate	17	693	552	bbl	32	77%	1	0
Crude oil	13	1,574	1,223	bbl	94	58%	0	0
Lube oil	2	1	1	bbl	1	51%	0	0
Other (specify)	3	51	51	bbl	17	100%	0	0
Produced water	40	1,058	628	bbl	16	71%	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>3,337</b>	<b>2,455</b>	<b>bbl</b>		<b>72%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Natural gas (methane)	21	15,699	15,699	mcf	748	100%	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>15,699</b>	<b>15,699</b>	<b>mcf</b>	<b>748</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total Spill Count</b>	<b>96</b>				<b>Average</b>	<b>76%</b>		
					<b>Percent Lost</b>			

Source: NMOCD (2021a)

Note: bbl = barrels; mcf = thousand cubic feet.

\* No spills of brine water, chemicals, drilling mud/fluid, gelled brine (frac fluid), glycol, sulfuric acid, or natural gas liquids were reported in 2020.

**Table 4-13. Twenty-five most frequently disclosed chemicals in horizontal wells within the San Juan Basin (McKinley, Rio Arriba, Sandoval, and San Juan Counties) from 2014 through 2020.**

Ingredient name	CAS Registry Number	Number of Disclosures <sup>†</sup>	Percentage of Hydraulic Fracturing Job*	Percentage of Total Number of FracFocus Disclosures <sup>†</sup>
Not disclosed	Not applicable	3,092	0	13%
Water	7732-18-5	1,137	25%	5%
Methanol	67-56-1	611	1%	3%
Crystalline silica, quartz	14808-60-7	610	16.29%	3%
Sodium chloride	7647-14-5	608	3%	3%
Quaternary amine	Confidential	555	<1%	2%
Amine salts	Confidential	467	<1%	2%



Ingredient name	CAS Registry Number	Number of Disclosures <sup>†</sup>	Percentage of Hydraulic Fracturing Job*	Percentage of Total Number of FracFocus Disclosures <sup>†</sup>
Nitrogen	7727-37-9	443	19%	2%
Ethanol	64-17-5	423	1%	2%
Naphthalene	91-20-3	419	0%	2%
Heavy aromatic petroleum naphtha	64742-94-5	404	1%	2%
Guar gum	9000-30-0	376	14%	2%
Glycerine	56-81-5	359	1%	2%
Inner salt of alkyl amines	Confidential	354	5%	1%
Hydrochloric acid	7647-01-0	334	30%	1%
1,2,4 trimethylbenzene	95-63-6	317	0%	1%
Poly(oxy-1,2-ethanediyl), alpha-(4-nonylphenyl)-omega-hydroxy-, branched	127087-87-0	317	0%	1%
Hydroxyalkylammonium chloride	Proprietary	278	3%	1%
Formaldehyde	50-00-0	251	0%	1%
Hemicellulase enzyme	9012-54-8	248	0%	1%
Isopropanol	67-63-0	242	5%	1%
Ethylene glycol	107-21-1	223	1%	1%
Cured acrylic resin	Confidential	218	0%	1%
Oxylated phenolic resin	Proprietary	217	0%	1%

Source: FracFocus (2021)

Note: Ingredient names and CAS numbers are not standardized in FracFocus, leading to widespread differences and discrepancies in CAS numbers, number of disclosures, and ingredient names. For this reason, the number of disclosures and ingredients presented in this table are to be used for general information only.

\* The amount of the ingredient in the total hydraulic fracturing volume by percent mass (definition from FracFocus [2021] data dictionary).

† The total number of FracFocus ingredient disclosures in the Pecos tri-county area is 23,838.

## Drilling and Completion Activities

When wells are drilled, they most likely pass through usable groundwater aquifers currently or potentially supplying stock, residential, and/or irrigation water. If proper cementing and casing programs are not followed, there may be a loss of well integrity, surface spills, or loss of fluids in the drilling and completion process that could result in large volumes of high concentrations of chemicals reaching groundwater resources. If contamination of usable water aquifers (TDS less than 10,000 ppm) from any source occurs, changes in groundwater quality could impact springs and water wells that are sourced from the affected aquifers.

The BLM and NMOCD have casing, cementing, and inspection requirements in place to limit the potential for groundwater reservoirs and shallow aquifers to be impacted by hydraulic fracturing or the migration of hydrocarbons during oil and gas drilling and production activities. The BLM requires operators to comply with the regulations at 43 CFR 3160. In addition, these regulations require oil and gas development to comply with directives in the Onshore Oil and Gas Orders and the orders of the Authorized Officer. Onshore Order No. 2 and the regulations at 43 CFR 3162.3-3 provide regulatory requirements for hydraulic fracturing, including casing specifications, monitoring and recording, and management of recovered fluids. The State of New Mexico also has regulations for drilling, casing and cementing, completion, and plugging to protect freshwater zones (19.15.16 NMAC). Complying with the aforementioned regulations requires producers and regulators to verify the integrity of casing and cementing jobs. Casing specifications are designed and submitted to the BLM in a drilling plan as a component of an Application for Permit to Drill (APD). The BLM petroleum engineer independently reviews the drilling plan and, based on site-specific geologic and hydrologic information, ensures that proper drilling, casing, and cementing procedures are incorporated in the plan to protect usable groundwater. The aforementioned regulations and review practices surrounding proper casing and cementing procedures isolate usable water zones from drilling, completion/hydraulic fracturing fluids, and fluids from other mineral-bearing zones, including hydrocarbon-bearing zones. Conditions of approval (COAs) may be attached to the APD, if necessary, to ensure groundwater protection. These may include requirements for closed loop drilling systems, spill prevention plans, leak detection plans, and appropriate equipment (leak detection and automatic shutoff system) in sensitive groundwater recharge areas. Casing and cementing operations are witnessed by certified BLM petroleum engineering technicians (PETs). At the end of the well's economic life, the operator is required to submit a plugging plan to the BLM for approval. A BLM petroleum engineer will review the plan prior to commencement of the plugging operations. The BLM PETs witness plugging operations to ensure the planned procedures are properly followed. The BLM's review, approval, and inspections ensure the permanent isolation of usable groundwater from hydrocarbon-bearing zones.

In summary, the BLM, the NMED, and NMOCD have put in place numerous requirements for oil and gas producers so that drilling fluids, hydraulic fracturing fluids, and produced water and hydrocarbons remain within the well bore and do not enter groundwater or any other formations. These include BLM regulations covered under 43 CFR 3160; Onshore Orders Nos. 1, 2, and 7; 43 CFR 3162.3-3; 43 CFR 3162.3-5; Notice to Lessees and Operators of Onshore Federal and Indian Oil and Gas Leases (NTL)-3A; NMOCD regulations under 19.15.26 NMAC; and the state's primacy agreement under the Safe Water Drinking Act. With these requirements in place, including the use of casing and cementing measures, contamination of groundwater resources from development of the lease parcels is highly unlikely. In addition, the BLM has authority under standard terms and conditions to require additional measures to protect water quality if site-specific circumstances require them. Site-specific mitigation tools would be developed as appropriate for the individual circumstances, including groundwater-quality monitoring studies. The regulations at 43 CFR 3162.5-2(d) give the BLM the authority to require an operator to monitor water resources to ensure that the isolation procedures utilized to protect water and other resources are effective.

## **CHAPTER 5. RIO PUERCO FIELD OFFICE**

The RPFO is approximately 8,620,838 acres and includes all of Bernalillo, Cibola, Torrance, and Valencia Counties; most of Sandoval County; and small parts of McKinley and Santa Fe Counties (Figure 5-1). To date, most of the drilling in the RPFO has occurred in the northeastern corner of Sandoval County, which is in the San Juan Basin (FracFocus 2021). Additionally, the 2019 RFD predicts future oil and gas development will occur in the San Juan Basin (Crocker et al. 2019).




Figure 5-1. Map of BLM Rio Puerco Field Office boundaries.

Chapter 5 outlines existing and projected (reasonably foreseeable) water quantity and water quality for the RPFO. The analysis is based on information gathered from the following sources:

- the RFD for the RPFO (Crocker et al. 2019)
- 2015 consumptive water use data from the USGS report *Estimated Use of Water in the United States in 2015* (Dieter et. al. 2018)
- FracFocus, a national hydraulic fracturing chemical registry managed by the GWPC and IOGCC (FracFocus 2021)
- Spill data from the NMOCD database (NMOCD 2021a)

## **5.1. WATER QUANTITY**

### **5.1.1. Existing Surface and Groundwater Use**

The water use of counties within RPFO boundaries varies greatly and is dependent on the predominant industry within that county. In 2015, public water supply and domestic water use comprised the greatest proportion of water use in McKinley County (53%; 7,006 AF) (Table 5-1). Bernalillo County (which contains Albuquerque) consumed 155,382 AF of water in 2015, with public water supply (69%; 106,820 AF) and irrigation (30%; 46,544 AF) representing 99% of water use (Table 5-2). Irrigation used the greatest proportion of water in Sandoval (71%; 50,647 AF), Valencia (93%; 146,246), Torrance (94%; 45,849), Santa Fe (62%; 24,314 AF), and Cibola (50%; 5,448 AF) Counties (Tables 5-3 through 5-7). Water use associated with mining (which includes oil and gas development), ranged from 112 to 2,309 AF (in Torrance and McKinley Counties, respectively). The proportion of surface water and groundwater use varied by county and was also industry specific. Water use for all RPFO counties totaled 495,874 AF (Table 5-8), with surface water and groundwater comprising 60% and 40%, respectively. Mining activities consumed 5,953 AF, which made up 1% of water use in 2015. Irrigation, at 320,146 AF (65% of all water use), was the sector that consumed the greatest amount of water within RPFO boundaries. Irrigation water usage made up 14% of all water use within the state (3,249,667 AF).

**Table 5-1. McKinley County water use by category in 2015.**

Category	Surface Water				Groundwater				Total Withdrawals				Total	Total Use (%)
	Fresh	Saline	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Saline	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Total Use (%)	Saline	Total Use (%)		
Aquaculture	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Domestic	0	-	0	0%	3,195	-	3,195	24%	3,195	24%	-	0%	3,195	24%
Industrial	0	0	0	0%	34	0	34	<1%	34	<1%	0	0%	34	<1%
Irrigation	1,099	-	1,099	8%	0	-	0	0%	1,099	8%	-	0%	1,099	8%
Livestock	101	-	101	<1%	370	-	370	3%	471	4%	-	0%	471	4%
Mining	0	0	0	0%	1,625	684	2,309	17%	1,625	12%	684	5%	2,309	17%
Public Water Supply	0	0	0	0%	3,811	0	3,811	29%	3,811	29%	0	0%	3,811	29%
Thermoelectric Power	0	0	0	0%	2,298	0	2,298	17%	2,298	17%	0	0%	2,298	17%
<b>County Totals</b>	<b>1,199</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,199</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>11,333</b>	<b>684</b>	<b>12,017</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>12,533</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>684</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>13,217</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Dieter et al. (2018)

Note: Water use data are presented in acre-feet unless otherwise indicated.

**Table 5-2. Bernalillo County water use by category in 2015.**

Category	Surface Water				Groundwater				Total Withdrawals				Total	Total Use (%)
	Fresh	Saline	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Saline	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Total Use (%)	Saline	Total Use (%)		
Aquaculture	0	0	0	0%	22	0	22	<1%	22	<1%	0	0%	22	<1%
Domestic	0	-	0	0%	1,312	-	1,312	<1%	1,312	<1%	-	0%	1,312	<1%
Industrial	0	0	0	0%	56	0	56	<1%	56	<1%	0	0%	56	<1%
Irrigation	38,843	-	38,843	25%	7,701	-	7,701	5%	46,544	30%	-	0%	46,544	30%
Livestock	11	-	11	<1%	191	-	191	<1%	202	<1%	-	0%	202	<1%
Mining	0	0	0	0%	135	0	135	<1%	135	<1%	0	0%	135	<1%
Public Water Supply	52,743	0	52,743	34%	54,077	0	54,077	35%	106,820	69%	0	0%	106,820	69%
Thermoelectric Power	0	0	0	0%	291	0	291	<1%	291	<1%	0	0%	291	<1%
<b>County Totals</b>	<b>91,597</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>91,597</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>63,785</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>63,785</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>155,382</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>155,382</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Dieter et al. (2018)

Note: Water use data are presented in acre-feet unless otherwise indicated.

**Table 5-3. Sandoval County water use by category in 2015.**

Category	Surface Water				Groundwater				Total Withdrawals				Total	Total Use (%)
	Fresh	Saline	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Saline	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Total Use (%)	Saline	Total Use (%)		
Aquaculture	0	0	0	0%	1,087	0	1,087	2%	1,087	2%	0	0%	1,087	2%
Domestic	0	-	0	0%	3,128	-	3,128	4%	3,128	4%	-	0%	3,128	4%
Industrial	0	0	0	0%	2,578	0	2,578	4%	2,578	4%	0	0%	2,578	4%
Irrigation	48,326	-	48,326	68%	2,320	-	2,320	3%	50,647	71%	-	0%	50,647	71%
Livestock	101	-	101	<1%	123	-	123	<1%	224	<1%	-	0%	224	<1%
Mining	0	0	0	0%	1,065	247	1,312	2%	1,065	1%	247	<1%	1,312	2%
Public Water Supply	135	0	135	<1%	12,466	0	12,466	17%	12,600	18%	0	0%	12,600	18%
Thermoelectric Power	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>County Totals</b>	<b>48,562</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>48,562</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>22,768</b>	<b>246.62</b>	<b>23,014</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>71,329</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>246.6</b>	<b>&lt;1%</b>	<b>71,576</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Dieter et al. (2018)

Note: Water use data are presented in acre-feet unless otherwise indicated.

**Table 5-4. Valencia County water use by category in 2015.**

Category	Surface Water				Groundwater				Total Withdrawals				Total	Total Use (%)
	Fresh	Saline	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Saline	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Total Use (%)	Saline	Total Use (%)		
Aquaculture	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Domestic	0	-	0	0%	3,554	-	3,554	2%	3,554	2%	-	0%	3,554	2%
Industrial	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Irrigation	136,157	-	136,157	87%	10,089	-	10,089	6%	146,246	93%	-	0%	146,246	93%
Livestock	34	-	34	<1%	986	-	986	<1%	1,020	<1%	-	0%	1,020	<1%
Mining	0	0	0	0%	437	0	437	<1%	437	<1%	0	0%	437	<1%
Public Water Supply	0	0	0	0%	5,538	0	5,538	4%	5,538	4%	0	0%	5,538	4%
Thermoelectric Power	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>County Totals</b>	<b>136,190</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>136,190</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>20,604</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20,604</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>156,794</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>156,794</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Dieter et al. (2018)

Note: Water use data are presented in acre-feet unless otherwise indicated.

**Table 5-5. Torrance County water use by category in 2015.**

Category	Surface Water				Groundwater				Total Withdrawals				Total	Total Use (%)
	Fresh	Saline	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Saline	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Total Use (%)	Saline	Total Use (%)		
Aquaculture	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Domestic	0	-	0	0%	437	-	437	<1%	437	<1%	-	0%	437	<1%
Industrial	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Irrigation	0	-	0	<1%	45,849	-	45,849	94%	45,849	94%	-	0%	45,849	94%
Livestock	45	-	45	0%	605	-	605	1%	650	1%	-	0%	650	1%
Mining	0	0	0	0%	112	0	112	<1%	112	<1%	0	0%	112	<1%
Public Water Supply	0	0	0	0%	1,973	0	1,973	4%	1,973	4%	0	0%	1,973	4%
Thermoelectric Power	0	0	0	<1%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>County Totals</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>&lt;1%</b>	<b>48,976</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>48,976</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>49,021</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>49,021</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Dieter et al. (2018)

Note: Water use data are presented in acre-feet unless otherwise indicated.

**Table 5-6. Santa Fe County water use by category in 2015.**

Category	Surface Water				Groundwater				Total Withdrawals				Total	Total Use (%)
	Fresh	Saline	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Saline	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Total Use (%)	Saline	Total Use (%)		
Aquaculture	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Domestic	0	-	0	0%	2,522	-	2,522	6%	2,522	100%	-	0%	2,522	6%
Industrial	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Irrigation	11,378	-	11,378	29%	12,936	-	12,936	33%	24,314	100%	-	0%	24,314	62%
Livestock	56	-	56	<1%	67	-	67	<1%	123	100%	-	0%	123	<1%
Mining	0	0	0	0%	224	0	224	<1%	224	100%	0	0%	224	<1%
Public Water Supply	4,663	0	4,663	12%	7,186	0	7,186	18%	11,849	100%	0	0%	11,849	30%
Thermoelectric Power	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>County Totals</b>	<b>16,098</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16,098</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>22,936</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>22,936</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>39,033</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>39,033</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Dieter et al. (2018)

Note: Water use data are presented in acre-feet unless otherwise indicated.



**Table 5-7. Cibola County water use by category in 2015.**

Category	Surface Water				Groundwater				Total Withdrawals				Total	Total Use (%)
	Fresh	Saline	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Saline	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Total Use (%)	Saline	Total Use (%)		
Aquaculture	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Domestic	0	-	0	0%	1,143	-	1,143	100%	1,143	11%	-	0%	1,143	11%
Industrial	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Irrigation	1,592	-	1,592	15%	3,856	-	3,856	71%	5,448	50%	-	0%	5,448	50%
Livestock	34	-	34	<1%	135	-	135	80%	168	2%	-	0%	168	2%
Mining	0	0	0	0%	67	1,356	1,424	100%	67	<1%	1,356	13%	1,424	13%
Public Water Supply	0	0	0	0%	2,668	0	2,668	100%	2,668	25%	0	0%	2,668	25%
Thermoelectric Power	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>County Totals</b>	<b>1,625</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,625</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>7,869</b>	<b>1,356</b>	<b>9,226</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>9,495</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>1,356</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>10,851</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Dieter et al. (2018)

Note: Water use data are presented in acre-feet unless otherwise indicated.

**Table 5-8. RPFO counties water use by category in 2015.**

Category	Surface Water				Groundwater				Total Withdrawals				Total	Total Use
	Fresh	Saline	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Saline	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Total Use (%)	Saline	Total Use (%)		
Aquaculture	0	0	0	0%	1,110	0	1,110	<1%	1,110	<1%	0	0%	1,110	<1%
Domestic	0	-	0	0%	15,290	-	15,290	3%	15,290	3%	-	0%	15,290	3%
Industrial	0	0	0	0%	2,668	0	2,668	<1%	2,668	<1%	0	0%	2,668	<1%
Irrigation	237,394	-	237,394	48%	82,752	-	82,752	17%	320,146	65%	-	0%	320,146	65%
Livestock	381	-	381	<1%	2,477	-	2,477	<1%	2,859	<1%	-	0%	2,859	<1%
Mining	0	0	0	0%	3,666	2,287	5,953	1%	3,666	<1%	2,287	<1%	5,953	1%
Public Water Supply	57,541	0	57,541	12%	87,718	0	87,718	18%	145,259	29%	0	0%	145,259	29%
Thermoelectric Power	0	0	0	0%	2,590	0	2,590	<1%	2,590	<1%	0	0%	2,590	<1%
<b>County Totals</b>	<b>295,316</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>295,316</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>198,271</b>	<b>2,287</b>	<b>200,558</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>493,588</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2,287</b>	<b>&lt;1%</b>	<b>495,874</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Dieter et al. (2018)

Note: Water use data are presented in acre-feet unless otherwise indicated.




Figure 5-2. RPFO (Bernalillo, Cibola, Tarrant, Valencia, Sandoval, McKinley, and Santa Fe Counties) water use by category in 2015 (Dieter et al. 2018).

### 5.1.2. Water Use Associated with Reasonably Foreseeable Oil and Gas Development

In 2019, a new RFD was published (Crocker et al. 2019) that updates the estimates for the number of oil and gas wells that could reasonably occur within the boundaries of the RPFO. Although the RPFO encompasses several counties, the only county with consistent oil and gas well development is Sandoval County. As such, oil and gas development scenarios and discussion in this chapter assumes that all development will occur in the portion of Sandoval County within the RPFO.

The 2019 RFD (Crocker et al. 2019) forecasted development of 200 oil and gas wells (federal and non-federal) over a 20-year period from 2020 to 2039 (Table 5-9). Of the 200 projected wells, 160 wells are expected to be vertical and 40 wells are expected to be horizontal. Annual well counts are expected to increase from seven to 13 per year from 2020 to 2039.

The 2019 RFD was also used to forecast estimates of the quantity of water that would be required for hydraulic fracturing of the forecasted wells. These water use estimates assume that 100% of wells will be hydraulically fractured and do not account for reuse or recycling of hydraulic fracturing fluid. These are conservative water use estimates, as the 2019 RFD suggests most wells would be vertical wells, which typically require less water to drill than horizontal wells. The quantity of water used during hydraulic fracturing is expected to increase from 8.34 to 22.49 AF/year from 2020 to 2039, with an estimated total water use of 308 AF over the 20-year period. The water use projections assume that one vertical well will require 0.32 AF and one horizontal well with a 1-mile lateral will require 6.44 AF (Crocker et al. 2019).

**Table 5-9. Annual projections for oil and gas well development and water use for federal and non-federal well development within the RPFO from 2020 to 2039.**

Year	Number of Wells to be Developed						Water Use for Hydraulic Fracturing (AF)	
	Total		Horizontal		Vertical		Non-Federal	Federal
	Non-Federal	Federal	Non-Federal	Federal	Non-Federal	Federal		
2020	2	5	0	1	2	4	0.63	7.71
2021	2	5	0	1	2	4	0.63	7.71
2022	2	5	1	1	1	4	6.76	7.71
2023	3	5	1	1	2	4	6.76	7.71
2024	3	5	1	1	2	4	6.76	7.71
2025	3	5	1	1	2	4	6.76	7.71
2026	3	6	1	1	2	5	7.07	8.03
2027	3	6	1	1	2	5	7.07	8.03
2028	4	6	1	1	3	5	7.39	8.03
2029	4	6	1	1	3	5	7.39	8.03
2030	4	6	1	1	3	5	7.39	8.03
2031	4	7	0	2	4	5	1.26	14.47
2032	4	7	0	2	4	5	1.26	14.47
2033	4	7	0	2	4	5	1.26	14.47
2034	4	8	0	2	4	6	1.26	14.79
2035	4	8	0	2	4	6	1.26	14.79
2036	4	8	0	2	4	6	1.26	14.79
2037	4	8	0	2	4	6	1.26	14.79
2038	5	8	1	2	4	6	7.7	14.79
2039	5	8	1	2	4	6	7.7	14.79
<b>Total</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>88.83</b>	<b>218.56</b>

Water used for development of the estimated 200 wells in the 2019 RFD scenario is assumed to come primarily from groundwater sources, based on previous oil and gas development in the area and USGS county water use data. Projected well developments within Sandoval County were estimated at 23.4% of the water used in mining and 0.43% of the total water consumption in 2015. Due to the split of Sandoval County between the FFO and RPFO and the lack of historical water use data, it is difficult to accurately predict the water use of oil and gas development throughout the county over the next 20 years.


### 5.1.3. Water Use Trends and Planned Actions

#### Past and Present Actions

Since 2014, there have been no completed oil and gas wells (federal or non-federal) reported to FracFocus within the administrative boundaries of the RPFO (FracFocus 2021). Although there has been consistent development within Sandoval County, the completed oil and gas wells are within FFO boundaries. As such, there are no data available for water use by oil and gas wells within RPFO boundaries, and statistical analysis and forecasting is not possible.

### 5.1.4. Water Use Associated with Reasonably Foreseeable Oil and Gas Development

The 2019 RFD (Crocker et al. 2019) predicts an initial development of seven wells and a water use of 8.34 AF in 2020, which is predicted to increase to 13 wells and a water use of 22.49 AF by 2039, resulting in a 20-year average water use of 15.4 AF/year and a total water use of 308 AF (Figure 5-3). The projected well developments would be an estimated 23.4% of water used in mining and 0.43% of the total water consumption in 2015.



**Figure 5-3. Water use associated with reasonably foreseeable oil and gas development in the RPFO from 2020 through 2039.**

Water use estimates from the neighboring FFO may also provide some insight regarding water use by oil and gas wells developed in the RPFO in the future. From 2014 to 2020, 79 wells in the portion of Sandoval County in the FFO reported data to FracFocus (Section 4.1.2 discusses the water use associated with reasonably foreseeable oil and gas development in the FFO). Average water use varied by well stimulation technique and averaged 3.9, 3.8, and 19.2 AF per well for nitrogen, water, and slickwater stimulation techniques, respectively (Table 5-10). The distribution of stimulation technologies within a year varies greatly in the FFO, which makes it difficult to predict total water usage. As such, the values provided in the 2019 RFD should be used for water use projections.

**Table 5-10. Descriptive statistics of water use of oil and gas wells in the FFO portion of Sandoval County for three stimulation technologies from 2014 to 2020.**

Stimulation Technique	Number of Wells	Water Use (AF/well)			
		Minimum	Maximum	Median	Mean
Nitrogen	61	0.1	13.1	3.6	3.9
Slickwater	8	13.2	25.3	19.5	19.2
Water	10	2.6	5.3	3.6	3.8

Source: BLM (2021)

Note: Wells hydraulically fractured with water were identified as wells that did not use nitrogen or slickwater stimulation. Data are only presented for wells that reported chemical compositions to FracFocus (2021).

### 5.1.5. Potential Sources of Water for Project Development

The RPFO contains many types of surface waterbodies, including springs, seeps, lakes, rivers, streams, and ephemeral drainages and draws. However, waters from spring developments, reservoirs, streams, and stream diversions within the RFPO planning area are used primarily for irrigation, livestock, and wildlife. Diversions of surface water on BLM-managed lands support private land crop irrigation and stock water needs.

Because most water used in mining activities in the counties that compose the RPFO is currently from groundwater (see Table 5-8), it is reasonable to assume that a large portion of the water used for hydraulic fracturing under the 2019 RFD scenario would likely be groundwater. Groundwater is a more readily available source of water than surface water due to the ephemeral nature of many surface water features in the San Juan Basin.

Information about the aquifers underlying the RPFO comes primarily from *Hydrologic Assessment of Oil and Gas Development of the Mancos Shale in the San Juan Basin* (Kelley et al. 2014) and *Farmington Proposed Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement* (BLM 2003).

The geologic setting of the region is highly stratified and complex. Geologic processes have created both continuous and discontinuous sandstone aquifers. There are 10 major confined aquifers in the San Juan Basin: Morrison Formation, Ojo Alamo Sandstone, Pictured Cliffs Sandstone, Cliff House Sandstone, Menefee Formation, Kirtland Shale/Fruitland Formation, Point Lookout Sandstone, Gallup Sandstone, Dakota Sandstone, and Entrada Sandstone (Kelley et al. 2014). “Most of the groundwater in the San Juan Basin is developed in Cenozoic to Mesozoic sandstones that are separated by low-permeability shale to mudstone intervals” (Kelley et al. 2014:10). Table 5-11 lists the general description of the major formations in the San Juan Basin.

Cenozoic (younger) aquifers in the San Juan Basin, such as the Ojo Alamo Sandstone, the Nacimiento Formation, and the San Juan Formation, have potential to produce water at a rate of 100 gpm (BLM 2003). Other aquifers in the San Juan Basin are known to yield water at a rate of less than 20 gpm (BLM 2003). According to Kelley et al. (2014:55), “of the aquifers investigated in this study, the ‘true’ Gallup Sandstone contains the least amount of water and the San Jose/Nacimiento aquifer contains the most.”

In the southern portion of the San Juan Basin, water for hydraulic fracturing of oil wells comes from sources that tap the Nacimiento Formation and the Ojo Alamo Sandstone. Kelley et al. (2014) state, “water level monitoring by the U.S. Geological Survey during the 1980s reveals that long term use of a well drilled into these aquifers will cause water levels to drop, potentially affecting neighboring wells.”

Water used for oil and gas drilling and completion would be purchased legally from those who hold water rights in or around the San Juan Basin. The transaction would be handled by NMOCD and NMOSE. Water used for oil and gas drilling and completion would generally be obtained through the following methods:

- leasing a valid water right through a NMOSE permit
- buying/leasing water from a legal water provider (or from a private well owner at up to 3 AF)
- purchasing water from a non-potable reclaimed water supplier

It is difficult to predict the actual source of water that would be used for development of the RPFO RFD (or the development of any specific lease sales) because in addition to utilizing surface water or groundwater, operators may also bring water to a well site via truck from any number of sources. All water uses would be evaluated at the APD stage in site-specific NEPA analysis and subject to standard lease terms and conditions; however, it is important to note that sources of water for lease development are also not always known at the APD stage.

**Table 5-11. General description of the major rock units in the San Juan Basin.**

<b>Youngest</b>	<b>Formation</b>	<b>Rock Type (major rock listed first)</b>	<b>Resource</b>
Cenozoic	San Jose Formation	Sandstone and shale	Water, gas
	Nacimiento Formation	Shale and sandstone	Water, gas
	Ojo Alamo Sandstone	Sandstone and shale	Water, gas
Cretaceous	Kirtland Shale	Interbedded shale, sandstone	Water, oil, gas
	Fruitland Shale	Interbedded shale, sandstone, and coal	Coal, coalbed, methane
	Pictured Cliffs Sandstone	Sandstone	Oil, gas
	Lewis Shale	Shale, thin limestones	Gas
	Cliff House Sandstone	Sandstone	Oil, gas
	Menefee Formation	Interbedded shale, sandstone, and coal	Coal, coalbed, methane, gas
	Point Lookout Sandstone	Sandstone	Oil, gas, water
	Crevasse Canyon Formation	Interbedded shale, sandstone, and coal	Coal
	Gallup Sandstone	Sandstone, and a few shales, and coals	Oil, gas, water
	Mancos Shale	Shale, thin sandstones	Oil, gas
	Dakota Sandstone	Sandstone, shale, and coals	Oil, gas, water
Jurassic	Morrison Formation	Mudstones, sandstone	Uranium, oil, gas, water
	Wanakah/Summerville/Cow Springs/Bluff	Siltstone, sandstone	N/A
<b>Oldest</b>	Entrada Sandstone	Sandstone	Oil, gas, water

Source: Kelley et al. (2014)

Note: N/A=not applicable.

### 5.1.6. Water Use Mitigations


Public concern about water use from hydraulic fracturing is especially high in semiarid regions. Overall, there have been calls to increase the use of alternative water sources such as brackish water or recycling produced water, minimizing the strain on local freshwater resources (Kondash et al. 2018). The BLM encourages the use of recycled water in hydraulic fracturing techniques, and in 2019, the State of New Mexico passed the Produced Water Act, which encourages oil and gas producers to reuse produced water when possible rather than relying on freshwater sources for oil and gas extraction. Recent studies indicate that the water used for hydraulic fracturing may be retained within the shale formation, with only a small fraction of the fresh water injected into the ground returning as flowback water; water returning to the surface is highly saline, difficult to treat, and often disposed through deep injection wells (Kondash et al. 2018). The NMED recently signed an MOU with New Mexico State University to develop new technologies for treating produced water to inform future policies for produced water reuse.

## 5.2. WATER QUALITY

### 5.2.1. Groundwater

Results of the hydrologic assessment of oil and gas development of the Mancos Shale in the San Juan Basin (Kelley et al. 2014) indicate that groundwater quality in the San Juan Basin is variable (ranging from fresh to brackish) due to the complex stratigraphy and varying rock formations within the basin. Brackish and saline water is typically found in the center of the basin while fresh groundwater is typically found along the basin margins. Deep saline water can migrate upward along cracks and fissures. Fresh water along the basin margins at depths greater than 3,500 feet indicate fast recharge rates influenced by geologic structures (Kelley et al. 2015).

The geologic formation where groundwater resides also influences groundwater salinity. Figure 5-4 (Kelley et al. 2014) is an illustrated geologic cross section showing the distribution of saline aquifers within the San Juan Basin.



**Figure 5-4. Geologic cross section showing the distribution of saline aquifers in the San Juan Basin (Kelley et al. 2014).**

TDS concentration is a measure of dissolved matter in a sample of water. TDS is the primary indicator of groundwater quality, as higher TDS concentrations typically make water less suitable for drinking or agricultural purposes such as irrigation. In groundwater, TDS is influenced by the dissolution of natural materials such as rock, soil, and organic material. Anthropogenic activities also contribute to TDS concentrations in shallow, unconfined aquifers.

TDS concentration in the San Juan Basin is dependent on the stratigraphic location and geologic formation where the water resides. Fresh water (TDS <1,000 mg/L) is typically found at depths less than 2,500 feet below the ground surface, although exceptions to this generalization occur in deeper layers such as the Gallup Sandstone and Morrison Formation. Saline and brackish water is dominant in the center of the basin at deeper depths (Kelley et al. 2014).

### 5.2.2. Surface Water

Stream and river conditions vary widely, from completely undisturbed river and vegetative communities in the mountainous highlands to deep, erodible soil banks at lower elevations where livestock, recreationists, and other public users have access to stream and riverbanks.

Water quality in streams flowing on BLM-managed lands is influenced by both natural water quality with regard to salinity content and the intensity of human and industrial activities in the watershed. For example, water quality may be vastly different in a remote mountain spring creek than in waters with natural brine discharge or where there are human impacts due to urban, farming, ranching, or industrial activities.

Further chemistry samples of surface water in the region are needed to establish a baseline chemistry data for the waters. Variances in baseline chemistry can indicate water quality changes attributable to changes in land use. The most common pollutants for waters in the region are sediment and mercury. Beneficial uses listed for these waters are industrial water supply, irrigation storage, livestock watering, recreation, warm water fishery, and wildlife habitat. The dominant legislation affecting national water quality and BLM compliance with New Mexico water quality requirements is the CWA.

### 5.2.3. Potential Sources of Surface Water or Groundwater Contamination

#### Spills

Spills associated with oil and gas development may reach surface water directly during the spill event. Spills may also reach surface waters indirectly when the spill has occurred and a rain event moves contaminants into nearby surface waterbodies through surface water flow or even subsurface groundwater flow into springs that discharge into a surface waterbody.

Spill data from NMOCD were retrieved from the spills database and further reviewed and summarized (NMOCD 2021a; see Appendix A).

A total of 12 spills occurred in the New Mexico portion of the RPFO in 2020 (NMOCD 2021a) (Table 5-12). The percentage of a spill that was not recovered (the amount lost) varied by material that was spilled, but on average, about 67% of the spilled material was lost. Of the spills in 2020, one incident was reported as having affected surface waterways (NMOCD 2021a). The BLM works with NMOCD to remediate spills on BLM-managed lands. According to 19.15.29.11 NMAC, the responsible person shall complete NMOCD-approved corrective action for releases that endanger public health or the environment in accordance with a remediation plan submitted to and approved by NMOCD or with an abatement plan submitted in accordance with 19.15.30 NMAC. The remaining contaminants from unrecovered spills are remediated in accordance with federal and state standards. Some remediation consists of removing contaminated soil and replacing it with uncontaminated soil and performing corresponding chemical testing

**Table 5-12. Summary of 2020 spills in the New Mexico portion of the RPFO (Sandoval County).\***

Material Type <sup>†</sup>	Spill Count	Volume Spilled	Volume Lost	Units	Average Spill Volume	Percent Lost	Waterway Affected	Groundwater Affected
Crude oil	3	748	723	bbl	241	33%	0	0
Produced water	1	70	70	bbl	70	100%	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>818</b>	<b>793</b>	<b>bbl</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Natural gas (methane)	8	3,943	3,943	mcf	492.88	100%	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3,943</b>	<b>3,943</b>	<b>mcf</b>	<b>492.88</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total Spill Count</b>	<b>12</b>				<b>Average Percent Lost</b>	<b>77.67%</b>		

Source: NMOCD (2021a)

Note: bbl = barrels; mcf = thousand cubic feet.

\* No spills were reported in Bernalillo, Cibola, Torrance, Valencia, or Santa Fe Counties in 2020.

† No spills of brine water, condensate, chemicals, drilling mud/fluid, gelled brine (frac fluid), other, glycol, sulfuric acid, lube oil, or natural gas liquids were reported in 2020.



## Drilling, and Completion Activities

When wells are drilled, they most likely pass through usable groundwater aquifers currently or potentially supplying stock, residential, and/or irrigation water. If proper cementing and casing programs are not followed, there may be a loss of well integrity, surface spills, or loss of fluids in the drilling and completion process that could result in large volumes of high concentrations of chemicals reaching groundwater resources. If contamination of usable water aquifers (TDS <10,000 ppm) from any source occurs, changes in groundwater quality could impact springs and water wells that are sourced from the affected aquifers.

The BLM and NMOCD have casing, cementing, and inspection requirements in place to limit the potential for groundwater reservoirs and shallow aquifers to be impacted by hydraulic fracturing or the migration of hydrocarbons during oil and gas drilling and production activities. The BLM requires operators to comply with the regulations at 43 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 3160. In addition, these regulations require oil and gas development to comply with directives in the Onshore Oil and Gas Orders and the orders of the Authorized Officer. Onshore Order No. 2 and the regulations at 43 CFR 3162.3-3 provide regulatory requirements for hydraulic fracturing, including casing specifications, monitoring and recording, and management of recovered fluids. The State of New Mexico also has regulations for drilling, casing and cementing, completion, and plugging to protect freshwater zones (19.15.16 NMAC). Complying with the aforementioned regulations requires producers and regulators to verify the integrity of casing and cementing jobs. Casing specifications are designed and submitted to the BLM in a drilling plan as a component of an Application for Permit to Drill (APD). The BLM petroleum engineer independently reviews the drilling plan and, based on site-specific geologic and hydrologic information, ensures that proper drilling, casing, and cementing procedures are incorporated in the plan to protect usable groundwater. The aforementioned regulations and review practices surrounding proper casing and cementing procedures isolate usable water zones from drilling, completion/hydraulic fracturing fluids, and fluids from other mineral-bearing zones, including hydrocarbon-bearing zones. Conditions of approval (COAs) may be attached to the APD, if necessary, to ensure groundwater protection. These may include requirements for closed loop drilling systems, spill prevention plans, leak detection plans, and appropriate equipment (leak detection and automatic shutoff system) in sensitive groundwater recharge areas. Casing and cementing operations are witnessed by certified BLM petroleum engineering technicians (PETs). At the end of the well's economic life, the operator is required to submit a plugging plan to the BLM for approval. A BLM petroleum engineer will review the plan prior to commencement of plugging operations. The BLM PETs witness plugging operations to ensure the planned procedures are properly followed. The BLM's review, approval, and inspections ensure the permanent isolation of usable groundwater from hydrocarbon-bearing zones.

In summary, the BLM, the NMED, and NMOCD have put in place numerous requirements for oil and gas producers so that drilling fluids, hydraulic fracturing fluids, and produced water and hydrocarbons remain within the well bore and do not enter groundwater or any other formations. These include BLM regulations covered under 43 CFR 3160; Onshore Orders Nos. 1, 2, and 7; 43 CFR 3162.3-3; 43 CFR 3162.3-5; Notice to Lessees and Operators of Onshore Federal and Indian Oil and Gas Leases (NTL\_-3A; NMOCD regulations under 19.15.26 NMAC; and the state's primacy agreement under the Safe Water Drinking Act. With these requirements in place, including the use of casing and cementing measures, contamination of groundwater resources from development of the lease parcels is highly unlikely. In addition, the BLM has authority under standard terms and conditions to require additional measures to protect water quality if site-specific circumstances require them. Site-specific mitigation tools would be developed as appropriate for the individual circumstances, including groundwater-quality monitoring studies. The regulations at 43 CFR 3162.5-2(d) give the BLM the authority to require an operator to monitor water resources to ensure that the isolation procedures utilized to protect water and other resources are effective.

## CHAPTER 6. LITERATURE CITED

- Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 1988. *Onshore Oil and Gas Operations; Federal and Indian Oil and Gas Leases; Onshore Oil and Gas Order Number 2, Drilling Operations*. *Federal Register* 53(223). Available at [https://www.blm.gov/sites/blm.gov/files/energy\\_onshoreorder2.pdf](https://www.blm.gov/sites/blm.gov/files/energy_onshoreorder2.pdf). Accessed November 2021.
- . 2003a. *Farmington Resource Management Plan with Record of Decision*. Farmington, New Mexico: U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Farmington Field Office. Available at: <https://eplanning.blm.gov/eplanning-ui/project/64524/570>. Accessed November 2021.
- . 2003b. *Farmington Proposed Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement*. Available at: [https://eplanning.blm.gov/public\\_projects/lup/64524/20001905/250002264/FDO\\_-\\_FFO\\_-\\_2003\\_-\\_Farmington\\_Proposed\\_RMP\\_Vol\\_1.pdf](https://eplanning.blm.gov/public_projects/lup/64524/20001905/250002264/FDO_-_FFO_-_2003_-_Farmington_Proposed_RMP_Vol_1.pdf). Accessed November 2021.
- . 2017. 43 CFR Part 3160 Onshore Oil and Gas Operations: Federal and Indian Oil and Gas Leases; Onshore Oil and Gas Order Number 1, Approval of Operations. *Federal Register* 82(6), Rules and Regulations. Available at: <https://www.blm.gov/programs/energy-and-minerals/oil-and-gas/operations-and-production/onshore-orders>. Accessed September 2019.
- . 2018. *Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement Carlsbad Field Office, Pecos District, New Mexico*. Available at: [https://eplanning.blm.gov/public\\_projects/lup/64444/153042/187358/BLM\\_CFO\\_Draft\\_RMP\\_-\\_Volume\\_I\\_-\\_EIS\\_-\\_August\\_2018\\_\(1\).pdf](https://eplanning.blm.gov/public_projects/lup/64444/153042/187358/BLM_CFO_Draft_RMP_-_Volume_I_-_EIS_-_August_2018_(1).pdf). Accessed November 13, 2021.
- . 2020. *Farmington Mancos-Gallup Draft Resource Management Plan Ammendment and Environmental Impact Statement, Farmington Field Office, New Mexico*. Available at: [https://eplanning.blm.gov/public\\_projects/lup/68107/20013477/250018467/FMG\\_DraftRMPA-EIS\\_Vol-1\\_508.pdf](https://eplanning.blm.gov/public_projects/lup/68107/20013477/250018467/FMG_DraftRMPA-EIS_Vol-1_508.pdf). Accessed December 16, 2021.
- . 2021. Farmington Field Office data files to determine well completion type. On file at SWCA Environmental Consultants, Salt Lake City, Utah.
- Crocker, K., and J.F. Glover. 2018. *Reasonable Foreseeable Development Scenario for Oil and Gas Activities, Mancos-Gallup RMPA Planning Area, Farmington Field Office, northwestern New Mexico*. Final report. U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management. Available at: [https://eplanning.blm.gov/public\\_projects/nepa/110578/161453/197157/2018.02.27\\_Crocker\\_Glover\\_FFO\\_RFD.pdf](https://eplanning.blm.gov/public_projects/nepa/110578/161453/197157/2018.02.27_Crocker_Glover_FFO_RFD.pdf). Accessed November 2021.
- Crocker, K., J.F. Glover, I. Dahal, and M. Haque. 2019. *Reasonably Foreseeable Development Scenario for Oil and Gas Activities, Rio Puerco Field Office, New Mexico*. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, New Mexico State Office. On file at SWCA Environmental Consultants, Salt Lake City, Utah.
- Dieter, C.A., M.A. Maupin, R.R. Caldwell, M.A. Harris, T.I. Ivahnenko, J.K. Lovelace, N.L. Barber, and K.S. Linsey. 2018. *Estimated Use of Water in the United States in 2015*. U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1441. Available at: <https://pubs.er.usgs.gov/publication/cir1441>. Accessed November 2021.

- Engler, T.W., and M. Cather. 2012. *Reasonable Foreseeable Development (RFD) Scenario for the B.L.M. New Mexico Pecos District*. Final report. New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology. Available at: [https://eplanning.blm.gov/public\\_projects/lup/64444/77502/86228/Final\\_Report-BLM-NMT-RFD.pdf](https://eplanning.blm.gov/public_projects/lup/64444/77502/86228/Final_Report-BLM-NMT-RFD.pdf). Accessed November 10, 2021.
- . 2014. *Update to the Reasonable Foreseeable Development (RFD) for the BLM Pecos District, SENM*. Final report. New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology. Available at: [https://eplanning.blm.gov/public\\_projects/lup/64444/80056/93025/Final\\_Report-SENM-DEC2014\\_updated\\_RFD.pdf](https://eplanning.blm.gov/public_projects/lup/64444/80056/93025/Final_Report-SENM-DEC2014_updated_RFD.pdf). Accessed November 5, 2021.
- FracFocus. 2021. FracFocus data download. Available at: <http://fracfocus.org/data-download>. Accessed November 1, 2021.
- Kelley, S., T. Engler, M. Cather, C. Pokorny, Cheng-Heng Yang, E. Mamer, G. Hoffman, J. Wilch, P. Johnson, and K. Zeigler. 2014. Open File Report – 566. *Hydrologic Assessment of Oil and Gas Resource Development of the Mancos Shale in the San Juan Basin*. New Mexico Bureau of Geology and Mineral Resources. Available at: [https://eplanning.blm.gov/public\\_projects/lup/68107/86635/103806/2014.11.24\\_BLM\\_final\\_hydrology\\_report.pdf](https://eplanning.blm.gov/public_projects/lup/68107/86635/103806/2014.11.24_BLM_final_hydrology_report.pdf). Accessed November 2021.
- Kondash, A.J., NE. Lauer, and A. Vengosh. 2018. *The intensification of the water footprint of hydraulic fracturing*. Available at: <https://advances.sciencemag.org/content/advances/4/8/eaar5982.full.pdf>. Accessed November 2021.
- Lowry, Thomas S., Michael D. Schuhen, Owen W. Lofton, La Tonya N. Walker, Patricia B. Johnson, Dennis W. Powers, and Dale O. Bowman. 2018. *Water Resource Assessment in the New Mexico Permian Basin*. Prepared by Sandia National Laboratories. SAND2018-12018. October. Available at: <https://www.osti.gov/servlets/purl/1481567>. Accessed November 10, 2021.
- Murray, David. 2021. Personal communication, Hydrologist, Bureau of Land Management, to SWCA Environmental Consultants. Information regarding well completion types in the Pecos District Office. December 3, 2021 (internal comment received on draft 2021 Water Support Document).
- New Mexico Environment Department (NMED). 2021. *EPA-Approved 2020-2022 State of New Mexico Clean Water Act §303(d)/§305(b) Integrated Report*. Available at: [https://www.env.nm.gov/wp-content/uploads/sites/25/2018/03/EPA-approved-2020-IR\\_012221.pdf](https://www.env.nm.gov/wp-content/uploads/sites/25/2018/03/EPA-approved-2020-IR_012221.pdf). Accessed November 13, 2021.
- New Mexico Oil Conservation Division (NMOCD). 2021a. 2020 Spill Data. Available at: <https://www.apps.emnrd.nm.gov/ocd/ocdpermitting/data/Spills/Spills.aspx>. Accessed November 3, 2021.
- . 2021b. New Mexico County Production and Injection Data. Available at: <https://wwwapps.emnrd.nm.gov/ocd/ocdpermitting/Reporting/Production/CountyProductionInjectionSummary.aspx>. Accessed November 20, 2021.
- . 2021c. New Mexico Oil and Gas Maps. Available at: <https://www.emnrd.nm.gov/ocd/ocd-gis-and-maps/>. Accessed December 13, 2021.
- Purcell, Ben. 2020. Personal communication, Geographic Information System Specialist, Bureau of Land Management, to Janet Guinn, SWCA Environmental Consultants, regarding the amount of acres leased for oil and gas development by field office. November 27, 2020 (email).
- Reardon, Alexander J., Owen W. Lofton, Patricia B. Johnson, Thomas S. Lowry. 2021. *Addendum to Water Resource Assessment in the New Mexico Permian Basin*. Prepared by Sandia National Laboratories. Sandia Report SAND2021-1869. Available at: <https://www.osti.gov/servlets/purl/1769223>. Accessed November 10, 2021.

Summers, W.K. 1972, *Geology and Regional Hydrology of the Pecos River Basin, New Mexico*. Open File Report #37. New Mexico Water Resources Institute, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2016. *Hydraulic Fracturing for Oil and Gas: Impacts from the Hydraulic Fracturing Water Cycle on Drinking Water Resources in the United States (Final Report)*. EPA-600-R-16-236Fa. Available at: <https://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/hfstudy/recordisplay.cfm?deid=332990>. Accessed November 2021.

World Population Review. 2021. Oil Production by State 2021. Available at: <https://worldpopulationreview.com/state-rankings/oil-production-by-state>. Accessed August 2021.

## **APPENDIX A**

**Data Processing Information  
(information on FracFocus, USGS, and spill data)**



## PURPOSE AND SCOPE

This appendix is intended to provide instructions on processing data that are included in the Water Support Document. For each dataset described in this appendix, various data processing applications may be used to process the data, depending on user preference (e.g., Excel or R statistical software [R]). Additionally, there are multiple approaches within each application to generate the same information (e.g., in Excel, the use of pivot tables, copying data into new tabs to use the Remove Duplicates button, or using filters; in R, various functions to aggregate and summarize data). Therefore, these instructions provide basic aggregation rules and specific column names in the datasets to accommodate different user preferences and styles of approaching data management.

In the water support document, some counties span multiple field offices. In that instance, it is possible that a county can be associated with multiple field offices. Data for the county will be reported in full for each field office that it overlaps.

## FRACFOCUS DATA PROCESSING INSTRUCTIONS

### Data Acquisition and Preparation

1. Download FracFocus data from <https://fracfocus.org/data-download>
2. The Water Support Document analyzes data from 2014 onward. The 2021 Water Support Document considers FracFocus data from 2014 to 2020. The 2022 Water Support Document will consider data from 2014 to 2021, and so on.
3. Isolate data for desired year using column heading JobStartDate, which is the “date on which the hydraulic fracturing job was initiated” (FracFocus 2021) and state (e.g., New Mexico). One Excel sheet for each year is helpful for data management and will also reduce file size.
  - a. The file named readme.txt in the data download packet is the FracFocus data dictionary and should be retained with the original downloads.

### Data Screening and Quality Control

The following data checks are intended to evaluate and validate the consistency, completeness, and uniqueness of FracFocus data. In this process, records that do not meet the following data quality criteria are flagged and are rejected from analysis. Flagged records are not deleted but are marked as flagged in a new column in the data and are not included in further data aggregation.

1. For the purpose of this analysis, a drilling activity (a job) is defined as the job start date and the well name. Data users should check that the same well does not have multiple job start dates within the same year. If so, the job should be appended to differentiate the two jobs so that the two different water volumes are counted separately. These records should be included in data aggregation. This can be corrected by creating a new column in the data using the date alone (and not the date and time) to form a new primary key in the data. A new, unique primary key can be generated by combining the date and well name.
2. Any row where TotalBaseWaterVolume = 0 gallons should be flagged and rejected from analysis based on the assumption that all drilling activities require water. Therefore, if a well reports 0 gallons of water use, it is likely erroneous data and should be rejected from analysis.
3. American Petroleum Institute (API) well identification numbers are assumed to be a unique identifier in the data, and there should be a 1:1 relationship between API number and well name. Differing well names having the same API number should be flagged and rejected from analysis, as this indicates a non-unique API number (e.g., a 1:2 relationship). Similarly, if the same well

name is given two different API numbers, these records should be flagged and rejected from analysis.

4. Federal well designation should be mutually exclusive. A well can either be federal or non-federal but not both. Wells that are given both designations should be flagged and rejected from analysis.
5. TotalBaseWaterVolume is “the total volume of water used as a carrier fluid for the hydraulic fracturing job (in gallons)” (FracFocus 2021). For each job (e.g., a unique job start date and well name), there should be one reported total base water volume for all rows. Any jobs that have differing total base water volumes should be flagged and rejected from analysis.

## Unit Conversions

Water use in FracFocus is reported in gallons and water use in the Water Support Document is reported in AF. The following conversion factors can be used to convert from gallons to AF and vice-versa:

$$\begin{aligned}1 \text{ AF} &= 325,851 \text{ gallons} \\1 \text{ gallon} &= 3.0689 \times 10^{-6} \text{ AF}\end{aligned}$$

## Data Aggregation


To present the summarized information in tables summarizing water use by oil and gas wells for hydraulic fracturing in the state of New Mexico from 2014 through 2020, FracFocus data are processed and aggregated by various factors such as year and water use by both federal and non-federal wells. The following instructions describe the process by which the summarized totals are obtained. The data totals do not include the records that were flagged in the Data Screening and Quality Control section of this document.

For each job (note that a job is the well name and job start date) in the FracFocus data, there are many rows to document the various ingredients and chemicals used in the drilling activity, and the total base water volume is duplicated in each row for the specific ingredient. Therefore, the duplicate entries for total base water volume will need to be removed to generate totals. Duplicate rows can be removed by one of the following methods:

- A. Creating a new primary key using JobStartDate and WellName, copying the data to a new tab, and then removing duplicates based on the new primary key.
- B. Aggregating values in an Excel pivot table using average, minimum, or maximum, but not sum.

**Federal Water Use:** For each year (2014–2020), federal water use is the sum of total base water volumes reported for each job where the well is identified as a federal well. Duplicate total base water volumes for the various chemicals are not included in the total. More specifically, there should be one total base water volume for each job. An example pivot table setup is included in Figure A-1. The filters remove the flagged data and non-federal wells. Total federal water use is the sum of the total base water volumes for each job in AF.





**Figure A-1. Example pivot table setup to generate federal water use data.**

**Non-Federal Water Use:** Similar to federal water use, non-federal water use is generated for each year of data (2014–2020). Non-federal water use is the sum of total base water volumes reported for each job where the well is identified as a non-federal well. Duplicate total base water volumes for the various chemicals are not included in the total. The example pivot table setup for non-federal water use is the same as for federal wells (see Figure A-1), however, the filter should be set to show FederalWell = FALSE. The units are acre-feet.

**Total Water Use:** Federal water use plus non-federal water use for each year of FracFocus data (2014–2020), reported in AF.

**Federal Water Use Percentage:** Obtained by dividing the federal water use by the total water and multiplying by 100. Federal water use percentage is calculated for each year of FracFocus data.

**Federal Cumulative Water Use:** For any given year in the FracFocus data, the federal cumulative water use is that year’s federal water use plus the sum of all previously reported federal water use estimates. For example

$$2020_{FCWU} = 2020_{FWU} + 2019_{FWU} + 2018_{FWU} + 2017_{FWU} + 2016_{FWU} + 2015_{FC} + 2014_{FC}$$

Where FCWU is federal cumulative water use and FWU is federal water use

**Total Cumulative Water Use:** Similar to federal cumulative water use, the total cumulative water use is that year’s total water use plus the sum of all previously reported total water use estimates.

**Average Water Use Per Well:** The average water use for all wells in the data (both federal and non-federal).

**Total Number of Federal Wells:** The number of federal wells drilled in any given year.

## USGS DATA PROCESSING INSTRUCTIONS

The following processes are intended to guide obtaining data from the USGS 2015 data file to include in the state and field office water use tables throughout the Water Support Document.

## Data Acquisition and Preparation

1. Download *Estimated Use of Water in the United States County-Level Data for 2015* (Dieter et al. 2018) from <https://www.sciencebase.gov/catalog/item/get/5af3311be4b0da30c1b245d8>
  - a. File name: usco2015v2.0.xlsx All Data XLSX

## Data Aggregation

To present the summarized water use data in tables throughout the Water Support Document, USGS data are processed and aggregated by state and county. The instructions below describe the process by which the summarized totals are obtained.

**State of New Mexico Water Use:** For each county in the USGS data, there are many columns to document the various types of water usage. The total water use is listed per county in each state, so total water use per category for the state must be manually generated. Follow the steps listed below to generate totals for the state of New Mexico.

1. Isolate data for the state of New Mexico using the column titled STATE, copy the data to a new tab, and generate state grand total values (in AF). Grand total values should be a sum of all county values for each water use. A pivot table in Excel can be used to do this, and an example pivot table setup is included in Figure A-2.
  - a. Columns selected for values can include all columns
  - b. Retain the Excel data dictionary with the original data using the DataDictionary tab in the downloaded data file.
2. Once grand totals are calculated, copy and paste data into a new tab as values, making sure to transpose the data.
  - a. It is helpful to set up a definition lookup table for the abbreviated column names by using the translations found in the DataDictionary tab in the original data during this step.
3. Filter all data so the column tag can be filtered to fill out data tables later.




Figure A-2. Example pivot table setup.

**County Water Use:** Similar to state water use, county water use is generated for each county in each field office. The following steps are used to prepare the data for the County Water Use data table entry.

1. Isolate data by filtering the original data by STATE = NM. For each county, use the column titled COUNTY to filter data further.
2. Create a new row to generate totals per field office and use the =sum Excel formula to sum each county value per water use.

## Unit Conversions

Water use in the USGS data is reported in million gallons per day, and water use in the Water Support Document is reported in AF. The following conversion factors can be used to convert from gallons to AF and vice-versa.

$$\text{Grand total in AF per year} = (\text{Grand Total [MGD]} \times 1.121) \times 1,000$$

## Data Tables

To present the summarized information in Table 2-1 in the Water Support Document (*State of New Mexico Water Use by Category in 2015*), and individual county water use data included in each field office chapter, USGS data are processed and aggregated. The following instructions describe the process by which the summarized total water use values are obtained. These instructions provide specific column names in the USGS data to guide data entry.

**State of New Mexico Water Use:** State water use for each water use category is included in the USGS data. Each entry in Table 2-1 in the Water Support Document corresponds with a specific column header in the USGS data. For each category and water use (surface water, groundwater, and total withdrawals), refer to Figure A-3 when pulling data from the USGS data. Text in Figure A-3 and associated data dictionary terms in Table A-1 refer to the specific column tag that should be used for each data entry.

Category	Surface Water				Groundwater				Total Withdrawals					
	Fresh	Saline	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Saline	Total	Total Use (%)	Fresh	Total Use (%)	Saline	Total Use (%)	Total	Total Use (%)
Aquaculture	AQ-WSWFr	AQ-WSWSa	AQ-WSWTo	AQ-WSWTo / TO-Wtotl	AQ-WGWFr	AQ-WGWSa	AQ-WGWTo	AQ-WGWTo / TO-Wtotl	AQ-WFrTo	AQ-WFrTo / TO-Wtotl	AQ-WSaTo	AQ-WSaTo / TO-Wtotl	AQ-Wtotl	AQ-Wtotl / TO-Wtotl
Domestic	DO-WSWFr	---	DO-WSWFr	DO-WSWFr / TO-Wtotl	DO-WGWFr	---	DO-WGWFr	DO-WGWFr / TO-Wtotl	DO-WFrTo	DO-WFrTo / TO-Wtotl	--	DO-WFrTo / TO-Wtotl	DO-WFrTo	DO-WFrTo / TO-Wtotl
Industrial	IN-WSWFr	IN-WSWSa	IN-WSWTo	IN-WSWTo / TO-Wtotl	IN-WGWFr	IN-WGWSa	IN-WGWTo	IN-WGWTo / TO-Wtotl	IN-WFrTo	IN-WFrTo / TO-Wtotl	IN-WSaTo	IN-WSaTo / TO-Wtotl	IN-Wtotl	IN-Wtotl / TO-Wtotl
Irrigation	IR-WSWFr	---	IR-WSWFr	IR-WSWFr / TO-Wtotl	IR-WGWFr	---	IR-WGWFr	IR-WGWFr / TO-Wtotl	IR-WFrTo	IR-WFrTo / TO-Wtotl	--	IR-WFrTo / TO-Wtotl	IR-WFrTo	IR-WFrTo / TO-Wtotl
Livestock	LI-WSWFr	---	LI-WSWFr	LI-WSWFr / TO-Wtotl	LI-WGWFr	---	LI-WGWFr	LI-WGWFr / TO-Wtotl	LI-WFrTo	LI-WFrTo / TO-Wtotl	--	LI-WFrTo / TO-Wtotl	LI-WFrTo	LI-WFrTo / TO-Wtotl
Mining	MI-WSWFr	MI-WSWSa	MI-WSWTo	MI-WSWTo / TO-Wtotl	MI-WGWFr	MI-WGWSa	MI-WGWTo	MI-WGWTo / TO-Wtotl	MI-WFrTo	MI-WFrTo / TO-Wtotl	MI-WSaTo	MI-WSaTo / TO-Wtotl	MI-Wtotl	MI-Wtotl / TO-Wtotl
Public Water Supply	PS-WSWFr	PS-WSWSa	PS-WSWTo	PS-WSWTo / TO-Wtotl	PS-WGWFr	PS-WGWSa	PS-WGWTo	PS-WGWTo / TO-Wtotl	PS-WFrTo	PS-WFrTo / TO-Wtotl	PS-WSaTo	PS-WSaTo / TO-Wtotl	PS-Wtotl	PS-Wtotl / TO-Wtotl
Thermoelectric	PT-WSWFr	PT-WSWSa	PT-WSWTo	PT-WSWTo / TO-Wtotl	PT-WGWFr	PT-WGWSa	PT-WGWTo	PT-WGWTo / TO-Wtotl	PT-WFrTo	PT-WFrTo / TO-Wtotl	PT-WSaTo	PT-WSaTo / TO-Wtotl	PT-Wtotl	PT-Wtotl / TO-Wtotl
Totals	TO-WSWFr	TO-WSWSa	TO-WSWTo	TO-WSWTo / TO-Wtotl	TO-WGWFr	TO-WGWSa	TO-WGWTo	TO-WGWTo / TO-Wtotl	TO-WFrTo	TO-WFrTo / TO-Wtotl	TO-WSaTo	TO-WSaTo / TO-Wtotl	TO-Wtotl	TO-Wtotl / TO-Wtotl

Figure A-3. Abbreviated column names for water use tables.

**Table A-1. Data dictionary terms and associated abbreviated column names for water use data.**

<b>Dictionary Term</b>	<b>Abbreviated Column Name</b>
Aquaculture, groundwater withdrawals, saline	AQ-WGWSa
Aquaculture, groundwater withdrawals, total	AQ-WGWTot
Aquaculture, surface-water withdrawals, fresh	AQ-WSWFr
Aquaculture, surface-water withdrawals, saline	AQ-WSWSa
Aquaculture, surface-water withdrawals, total	AQ-WSWTot
Aquaculture, total withdrawals, saline	AQ-WSaTot
Aquaculture, total withdrawals, total (fresh+saline)	AQ-Wtotl
Aquaculture, total withdrawals, fresh	AQ-WFrTot
Domestic, self-supplied groundwater withdrawals, fresh	DO-WGWFr
Domestic, self-supplied surface-water withdrawals, fresh	DO-WSWFr
Domestic, total self-supplied withdrawals, fresh	DO-WFrTot
Industrial, self-supplied groundwater withdrawals, fresh	IN-WGWFr
Industrial, self-supplied groundwater withdrawals, saline	IN-WGWSa
Industrial, self-supplied groundwater withdrawals, total	IN-WGWTot
Industrial, self-supplied surface-water withdrawals, fresh	IN-WSWFr
Industrial, self-supplied surface-water withdrawals, saline	IN-WSWSa
Industrial, self-supplied surface-water withdrawals, total	IN-WSWTot
Industrial, self-supplied total withdrawals, saline	IN-WSaTot
Industrial, self-supplied total withdrawals, total (fresh+saline)	IN-Wtotl
Irrigation, groundwater withdrawals, fresh	IR-WGWFr
Irrigation, surface-water withdrawals, fresh	IR-WSWFr
Irrigation, total withdrawals, fresh	IR-WFrTot
Livestock, groundwater withdrawals, fresh	LI-WGWFr
Livestock, surface-water withdrawals, fresh	LI-WSWFr
Livestock, total withdrawals, fresh	LI-WFrTot
Mining, groundwater withdrawals, fresh	MI-WGWFr
Mining, groundwater withdrawals, saline	MI-WGWSa
Mining, groundwater withdrawals, total	MI-WGWTot
Mining, surface-water withdrawals, fresh	MI-WSWFr
Mining, surface-water withdrawals, saline	MI-WSWSa
Mining, surface-water withdrawals, total	MI-WSWTot
Mining, total withdrawals, fresh	MI-WFrTot
Mining, total withdrawals, saline	MI-WSaTot
Mining, total withdrawals, total (fresh+saline)	MI-Wtotl
Public Supply, groundwater withdrawals, fresh	PS-WGWFr
Public Supply, groundwater withdrawals, saline	PS-WGWSa
Public Supply, groundwater withdrawals, total	PS-WGWTot
Public Supply, surface-water withdrawals, fresh	PS-WSWFr

Dictionary Term	Abbreviated Column Name
Public Supply, surface-water withdrawals, saline	PS-WSWSa
Public Supply, surface-water withdrawals, total	PS-WSWTo
Public Supply, total withdrawals, fresh	PS-WFrTo
Public Supply, total withdrawals, saline	PS-WSaTo
Public Supply, total withdrawals, total (fresh+saline)	PS-Wtotl
Thermoelectric, groundwater withdrawals, fresh	PT-WGWFr
Thermoelectric, groundwater withdrawals, saline	PT-WGWsa
Thermoelectric, groundwater withdrawals, total	PT-WGWTo
Thermoelectric, surface-water withdrawals, fresh	PT-WSWFr
Thermoelectric, surface-water withdrawals, saline	PT-WSWSa
Thermoelectric, surface-water withdrawals, total	PT-WSWTo
Thermoelectric, total withdrawals, saline	PT-WSaTo
Thermoelectric, total withdrawals, total (fresh+saline)	PT-Wtotl
Thermoelectric, total withdrawals, fresh	PT-WFrTo
Total groundwater withdrawals, fresh	TO-WGWFr
Total groundwater withdrawals, saline	TO-WGWsa
Total groundwater withdrawals, total (fresh+saline)	TO-WGWTo
Total surface-water withdrawals, fresh	TO-WSWFr
Total surface-water withdrawals, saline	TO-WSWSa
Total surface-water withdrawals, total (fresh+saline)	TO-WSWTo
Total withdrawals, fresh,	TO-WFrTo
Total withdrawals, saline	TO-WSaTo
Total withdrawals, total (fresh+saline)	TO-Wtotl

**County Water Use:** Similar to state water use, county water use is generated for each county in each field office. Using the specific county data of interest and Figure A-3, data can be entered into tables in each field office section of the Water Support Document.

**Total Water Use Percentage:** Total water use % is generated individually by dividing the total water use of a specific category in either surface water, groundwater, or total withdrawals by the total water use for the state, county, or field office of interest. See Figure A-3 and Table A-1 for guidance.

## SPILL DATA ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

Spill data are available for download from the NMOCD spills database located at <https://wwwapps.emnrd.nm.gov/ocd/ocdpermitting/data/Spills/Spills.aspx> (NMOCD 2021). The entire spills database contains records with incident dates ranging from 1900 to 2021 (at the time this update to the report was written). For each update to this report, spill data will be analyzed for the year of the report revision. For example, the 2020 Water Support Document will summarize records in the spills database with incident dates in the year 2020.

A spills data dictionary from NMOCD is not available to accompany the data. Therefore, several assumptions and definitions were made about the data that are summarized below. These data checks are intended to evaluate and validate the consistency, completeness, and uniqueness of spill data. In this process, records that do not meet the data quality criteria are flagged and are rejected from analysis.

Flagged records are not deleted but are marked as 'Flagged' in a new column in the data and are not included in further data aggregation.

## Data Acquisition and Preparation

1. Downloaded spill data for all spill reports in all counties and filtered out the 2020 records (1,556 records)
2. Created a primary key in the data to identify and remove duplicates. *Primary key=Incident Number\_Spilled Material*
3. Flagged duplicate records, records where Volume Spilled was 0 and where the entry for 'Unit of Volume' was missing or non-volumetric (185 records). The remaining record count for 2020 is 1,371.
4. Created a new column for Percent Loss, which is defined as follows:

$$\text{Percent Recovery} = (\text{Volume Lost}/\text{Volume Released}) * 100$$

5. Converted gallons to bbl using the following conversion factor:  
$$1 \text{ gallon} = 0.02381 \text{ bbl}$$
6. Created a new column in the data to identify field office or district based on county. The Pecos District = Leah, Chaves, and Eddy Counties.


## Data Screening and Quality Control

- For the purpose of this report, a *spill* is defined as the loss of a measurable volume of a material on the same day.
- The incident number is not unique, and for any one incident number, there may be many spill materials.
- Incidents where Volume Released is 0 are flagged and rejected from further analysis because these records are not in alignment with the definition of a spill, where a measurable volume of material has been released.
- Incidents where Unit of Volume is not volumetric (e.g., pounds [lbs]) are flagged and rejected from analysis.
- Records where the spill material type is Natural gas (methane) or Natural gas liquids should be reported in mcf and not bbl. Records where Spilled material is Natural gas (methane) and Natural gas liquids and Unit of Volume is bbl were rejected from analysis. Records where the material is natural gas flared or vented are not counted in the spills summary on the assumption that these are lost to the air.

## Data Aggregation

To present the summarized information in the spill tables throughout the Water Support Document, spill data are processed and aggregated by various factors such as field office and material. The following instructions describe the process by which the summarized totals are obtained. The data totals do not include the records that were flagged in the Data Quality Review and Assumptions section of this document.

An example pivot table setup is included in Figure A-4. Using a pivot table or other data aggregation method, the values for the data descriptions below can be generated.



**Figure A-4. Example pivot table setup to generate volume released, volume lost, and percent lost.**

**Spill Count:** Spill count is the number of spill records within a field office for a particular material.

**Volume Spilled:** Volume released is a sum of the volume released for all spills of a particular material within a field office. The data should be filtered to remove the flagged data.

**Volume Lost:** Volume lost is a sum of the volume lost for all spills of a particular material within a field office. The data should be filtered to remove the flagged data.

**Average Spill Volume:** Average volume spilled is an average of the volume released for all spills or all types of material within a field office. Data should be filtered to not include flagged data.

**Percentage Lost:** Percentage lost is the percentage of the volume spilled that was also lost. An average of percentage lost for all material spilled in a field office can be used to calculate the average percent of volume lost in spills across the entire field office for all spills.



## LITERATURE CITED

Dieter, C.A., M.A. Maupin, R.R. Caldwell, M.A. Harris, T.I. Ivahnenko, J.K. Lovelace, N.L. Barber, and K.S. Linsey. 2018. *Estimated Use of Water in the United States in 2015*. U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1441. Available at: <https://pubs.er.usgs.gov/publication/cir1441>. Accessed November 2021.

Barber, N.L., and Linsey, K.S..2018. *Estimated Use of Water in the United States in 2015*. U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1441. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3133/cir1441>. Downloaded November 2021. Accessed November 2021.

FracFocus. 2021. FracFocus data download. Available at: <http://fracfocus.org/data-download>. November 1, 2021.

New Mexico Oil Conservation Division (NMOCD). 2021. 2020 Spill Data. Available at: <https://wwwapps.emnrd.nm.gov/ocd/ocdpermitting/data/Spills/Spills.aspx>. Accessed November 3, 2021.

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## **APPENDIX B**

### **Farmington Field Office Slickwater Stimulation Water Use Update**



## ASSUMPTIONS

This update evaluates the potential water requirements for the development of the Mancos Shale formation and Gallup Sandstone member (Mancos-Gallup development) within the San Juan Basin using the slickwater stimulation technique. Current industry trends in unconventional reservoir development have shifted to drilling of long (1- to 3-mile) horizontal laterals that are stimulated using large volumes of low-viscosity water-based fluids (slickwater stimulation). This development scenario evaluates the projected water demand of Mancos-Gallup development based on current industry expectations of lateral density. No evaluation of other factors (i.e., execution pace, reservoir recovery factor, economic results, alternative completion techniques) are made in this model.

## PURPOSE OF THE UPDATE

Fluid mineral development in the San Juan Basin has experienced technological advances with the introduction of slickwater stimulation beginning in 2015. Since the development of the *RFD Scenario for Oil and Gas Activities, Mancos-Gallup RMPA Planning Area* (Mancos-Gallup RFD) (Crocker and Glover 2018), additional information regarding the slickwater stimulation technique has been gathered by the BLM FFO. The 2018 Mancos-Gallup RFD presents the projected fluid mineral development potential for the Mancos-Gallup RMPA planning area, encompassing a total area of 4 million acres. Half of the total planning area (2 million acres) is located within one major horizontal oil and gas play, resulting in fluid mineral interest with “high” and “medium” development potentials (Crocker and Glover 2018). The purpose of this update is to address the forecasted amount of water from the 2018 Mancos-Gallup RFD that may be used during Mancos-Gallup development utilizing slickwater stimulation in the San Juan Basin.

## CONTEXT

The Colorado River Compact (The Compact) of 1922 determined how much water would be delivered downstream for use in the western states listed in The Compact. The remaining water is left to the individual states for allocation. It is the responsibility of NMOSE to allocate remaining useable water within New Mexico and to ensure that all water is used according to state regulations and correctly reported. The authority and regulation of NMOSE applies to water acquired for use in the production and operation of oil and natural gas wells. Water use is published every 5 years in the report titled *Estimated Use of Water in the United States in 2015*, most recently published in 2018 (Dieter et al. 2018). See Section 4 of the Water Support Document for information on the volume of water that was used specifically for oil and gas wells in the San Juan Basin using information from the USGS water use report (Dieter et al. 2018).

The two general water types that may be used for slickwater stimulation are categorized as potable/fresh and non-potable. Any water that has TDS greater than 1,000 ppm has been defined as “non-potable” by the State of New Mexico (72-12-25 NMSA 1978); the BLM has identified anything less than 10,000 ppm to be protected in the casing rule of the BLM’s Onshore Oil and Gas Order #2 (BLM 1988). Non-potable water is outside the appropriative processes and is mainly diverted for mineral exploration purposes. Conversely, any water that has less than 1,000 ppm TDS is potable/fresh. In general, potable water has a water right associated with it and is permitted and regulated by NMOSE and may or may not be adjudicated.

During the process of gathering information regarding slickwater stimulation, the FFO prepared a questionnaire to conduct industry interviews. The questionnaire focused on estimated water use during the drilling, completion, and operation/production phases of oil and gas wells, with specific focus on water sources and water use associated with slickwater stimulation. The questions were used to help the BLM to determine how saline water is being utilized and to better understand the potential TDS levels within source water for the stimulation fluid. Onshore Oil and Gas Order #1 (BLM 2017) requires operators to identify adequate water sources for stimulation plans as part of their APD.

Based on results of the questionnaire, the FFO concluded that the water used for slickwater stimulation can have high levels of TDS for the technology to be effective. The majority of operators within the San Juan Basin limit their TDS levels to 50,000 ppm for use in a slickwater stimulation operation. The higher allowable TDS levels that are acceptable for slickwater stimulation expand the possible water sources beyond those that are traditionally used (e.g., surface water or groundwater) into non-traditional sources of water (e.g., non-potable groundwater sources).

Recently, the NMOSE received notices of intent to appropriate non-potable water from aquifers at depths 2,500 feet below ground level or greater. NMOSE has approved permits to drill wells within the San Juan Basin to withdraw non-potable connate water (groundwater) from the Entrada Sandstone formation for use as a potential source of water for slickwater stimulation operations. The Entrada Sandstone maximum depth is approximately 9,500 feet below ground level. Water contained in the Entrada Sandstone is highly saline (Kelley et al. 2014). As such, it is considered non-potable and has not been declared as an administrative aquifer by NMOSE. NMOSE is the agency responsible for water withdrawal permitting actions. Its notice of intent process includes a model-based evaluation of the potential effects of proposed withdrawals and the identification of possible requirements for applicants to obtain water rights to offset any depletions identified in NMOSE's analyses prior to applicants commencing diversions.

Other sources of non-potable water that can be utilized in stimulation are flowback fluid and produced water. Flowback fluid is a mixture of chemical proppant, water, and sand that flows back through the wellhead directly after stimulation activities. Generally, 10% to 40% of the initial volume utilized for stimulation activities returns as flowback fluid; of this, 10% to 40% is non-potable water that may be used in future stimulation activities. Produced water is naturally occurring water that exists in the formation that is being targeted for mineral extraction and is produced as a byproduct, thereby becoming produced water. Based on the results of the FFO questionnaire, after the initial flowback recovery of 10% to 40%, the remaining water used for stimulation returns to the surface through production activities at a slower rate of return.

## **METHODOLOGY FOR WELL COMPLETION TYPE DETERMINATION**

To determine the well completion type, data from FracFocus is obtained for wells in the desired county and during the desired year. The individual well reports will provide the well American Petroleum Institute (API) number and water use. If the water quality information includes nitrogen and water use is ~2.5 AF, then it is a nitrogen well (BLM 2021).

To determine if a well is slickwater, BLM Form 3160-4 must be downloaded from the NMOCD website using the well API number and the NMOCD Well File Search form (NMOCD 2021). This form will have information on if the well is new or recompleting. If the well is new, the water use is greater than 2.5 AF and the chemical data does not include nitrogen, then the well is slickwater (BLM 2021). The chemical data will also include a listing for guar gum.

## **METHODOLOGY FOR PROJECTED WATER USE**

To gain the most current information, a questionnaire was distributed to local operators actively drilling and producing mineral resources in the San Juan Basin to gather information regarding slickwater stimulation and reservoir development.

Horizontal wells are currently stimulated during completion in short sections of laterals called stages. To date, 20 wells have been drilled using long laterals with slickwater stimulation within the FFO. The water volume and stage length were averaged from the 20 wells using the APD and data from FracFocus. The equation for calculating estimated water volume is as follows:

$$\text{Total water volume} = (\text{stage water volume}/\text{stage length}) \times (\text{number of stages}/\text{lateral length})$$

The total miles of lateral estimated to develop the Mancos Shale formation and Gallup Sandstone member are based on the 2,300 horizontal wells projected in the 2018 Mancos-Gallup RFD. On average, the wells would be stimulated in 2-mile laterals, which equates to approximately 4,600 miles, all of which are projected to be slickwater stimulated. For the 20 completed wells, the FFO calculated the average stage length to be 200 feet and the average water used per stage to stimulate the formation to be 1 AF (Table B-1).

According to the 20 APDs, the average lateral well bore is 1.5 miles in length for a horizontal well. The estimated water use is approximately 41 AF for slickwater stimulation. Advances in horizontal drilling and completion techniques in the San Juan Basin in the past 4 to 5 years have resulted in the ability to drill and complete horizontal laterals up to 3 miles in length (according to operator input). Horizontal well bores are stimulated in intervals; each interval is called a stage.

Refer to Table B-2 for the number of stages dependent on the length of the well bore and Table B-3 for the average water use of 1- to 3-mile laterals per completion.

**Table B-1. Water use averages from 20 slickwater APDs from the FFO using FracFocus data.**

<b>Well Name/Operator</b>	<b>Water Usage Per Stage (gallons)</b>	<b>Stage Length (feet)</b>
NEBU604_3H(BP)	517,171.19	201
NEBU602COM1H(BP)	444,653.34	149.6
NEBU604COM2H(BP)	535,124.92	200
NEBU604COM1H(BP)	526,524.65	200
NEBU605COM2H(BP)	551,075.29	205
NEBU605COM1H(BP)	427,903	165
SEscavdaUnit353H(Enduring)	160,437.94	176.64
EscavadaUnit302H(Enduring)	162,902.25	179.5
NEscavadaUnit316H(Enduring)	143,312.48	177.28
NEscavadaUnit330H(Enduring)	429,107.70	482.85
NEscavadaUnit317H(Enduring)	150,050.52	180
NEscavadaUnit318H(Enduring)	152,921.60	180
NEscavadaUnit331H(Enduring)	143,150.40	175.48
NEscavadaUnit315H(Enduring)	145,898.40	179.4
ROSAUnit641H(WPX)	468,363.91	207.3
ROSAUnit643H(WPX)	338,364.25	202.3
ROSAUnit640H(WPX)	389,188.64	200.3
ROSAUnit642H(WPX)	330,273.30	212.7
PallucheHZMC1H(Hilcorp)	207,003.06	201.25
SanJuan29-6UnitCom601_1H(Hilcorp)	458,228.90	194.9
<b>Average</b>	<b>334,082.79</b>	<b>203.525</b>

**Table B-2. Projected water use of slickwater wells in the New Mexico portion of the San Juan Basin (San Juan, Rio Arriba, and Sandoval Counties) by lateral length.**

Lateral Length (feet)	Lateral Length (miles)	Number of Stages	Water Used (gallons)	Water Used (AF)
5,280	1.0	25.94	8,667,029.18	26.60
7,920	1.5	38.91	13,000,543.76	39.90
10,560	2.0	51.89	17,334,058	53.20
13,200	2.5	64.86	21,667,572.94	66.50
15,840	3.0	77.83	26,001,087.53	79.79

**Table B-3. Average volume of water required to complete 1- to 3-mile laterals using slickwater stimulation in the Mancos Shale formation and Gallup Sandstone member.**

Lateral Length (miles)	Number of Stages	Volume (AF)
1.0	26	27
1.5	39	40
2.0	52	53
2.5	65	67
3.0	78	80

## CONCLUSIONS

The amount of water that would be required to completely develop 4,600 miles of horizontal wells in the Mancos Shale formation and Gallup Sandstone member via slickwater stimulation is estimated to be approximately 125,000 AF. The 2018 RFD estimates 2,300 horizontal wells may be developed between 2018 and 2037. Based on operator input, the horizontal lengths would range from 1 to 3 miles. Current technology allows operators to utilize water with TDS of 50,000 ppm, well above the NMOSE potable water threshold of 1,000 ppm. This allows for the use of currently non-traditional potable water sources, including the connate water within the Entrada Sandstone and recycled flowback water and produced water for use in slickwater stimulation activities.



## LITERATURE CITED

- Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 2017. 43 CFR Part 3160 Onshore Oil and Gas Operations: Federal and Indian Oil and Gas Leases; Onshore Oil and Gas Order Number 1, Approval of Operations. *Federal Register* 82(6), Rules and Regulations. Available at: <https://www.blm.gov/programs/energy-and-minerals/oil-and-gas/operations-and-production/onshore-orders>. Accessed September 2019.
- . 2018. *Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement Carlsbad Field Office, Pecos District, New Mexico*. Available at: [https://eplanning.blm.gov/public\\_projects/lup/64444/153042/187358/BLM\\_CFO\\_Draft\\_RMP\\_-\\_Volume\\_I\\_-\\_EIS\\_-\\_August\\_2018\\_\(1\).pdf](https://eplanning.blm.gov/public_projects/lup/64444/153042/187358/BLM_CFO_Draft_RMP_-_Volume_I_-_EIS_-_August_2018_(1).pdf). Accessed November 13, 2021.
- . 2021. Farmington Field Office data files to determine well completion type. On file at SWCA Environmental Consultants, Salt Lake City, Utah.
- Crocker, K., and J.F. Glover. 2018. *Reasonable Foreseeable Development Scenario for Oil and Gas Activities, Mancos-Gallup RMPA Planning Area, Farmington Field Office, northwestern New Mexico*. Final report. U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management. Available at: [https://eplanning.blm.gov/public\\_projects/nepa/110578/161453/197157/2018.02.27\\_Crocker\\_Glover\\_FFO\\_RFD.pdf](https://eplanning.blm.gov/public_projects/nepa/110578/161453/197157/2018.02.27_Crocker_Glover_FFO_RFD.pdf). Accessed November 2021.
- Dieter, C.A., M.A. Maupin, R.R. Caldwell, M.A. Harris, T.I. Ivahnenko, J.K. Lovelace, N.L. Barber, and K.S. Linsey. 2018. *Estimated Use of Water in the United States in 2015*. U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1441. Available at: <https://pubs.er.usgs.gov/publication/cir1441>. Accessed November 2021.
- Kelley, S., T. Engler, M. Cather, C. Pokorny, Cheng-Heng Yang, E. Mamer, G. Hoffman, J. Wilch, P. Johnson, and K. Zeigler. 2014. Open File Report – 566. *Hydrologic Assessment of Oil and Gas Resource Development of the Mancos Shale in the San Juan Basin*. New Mexico Bureau of Geology and Mineral Resources. Available at: [https://eplanning.blm.gov/public\\_projects/lup/68107/86635/103806/2014.11.24\\_BLM\\_final\\_hydrology\\_report.pdf](https://eplanning.blm.gov/public_projects/lup/68107/86635/103806/2014.11.24_BLM_final_hydrology_report.pdf). Accessed November 2021.
- New Mexico Oil Conservation District (NMOCD). 2021. OCD Permitting. Well Search. Available at: <https://wwwapps.emnrd.nm.gov/OCD/OCDPermitting/Data/Wells.aspx>. Accessed December 3, 2021.

*This page intentionally left blank.*