Hydraulic Fracturing in Michigan
Integrated Assessment
Integrated Assessment Program Objective:
To carry out the Institute’s mission of sustainability problem solving by using Integrated Assessment as a methodology for connecting academics, decision makers, and stakeholders.
Stakeholder Input

Technical Reports

Project Overview

Define the Issue, Identify Challenges

Clarify the Issue (History, Causes and Consequences)

Identify and Evaluate Potential Solutions

Develop Tools and Information to Guide Decisions

Policy Options

Gather Data

Conduct Analyses

Evaluate Options

Develop New Resources

Offer Direction and Feedback

Provide Background Data

Develop Goals

Prioritize Options
Benefits of Integrated Assessment

As identified by participants in previous assessments

- Generates reports and supporting data
- Modifies perspectives
- Creates new partnerships
- Changes processes
- Leverages resources
Hydraulic Fracturing in Michigan

**Key Points:**

- Hydraulic Fracturing (HF) has been used in thousands of wells in Michigan for decades

- 2003 State Review of Oil and Natural Gas Environmental Regulations (not HF specific) – "MDEQ has a well-managed oil and gas environmental regulatory program"

- Integrated Assessment developed to focus on High Volume Hydraulic Fracturing (HVHF) but data and analyses may cover a range of activity depending on topic or issue

- Limited HVHF activity in Michigan at present

- Broad range of perspectives on benefits/problems of expanded natural gas use
Pathways to Dialogue: What the Experts Say about the Env. Risks of Shale Gas Development

215 experts who responded to the survey questions were asked to choose from a total of 264 “risk pathways” that link specific shale gas development activities—from site development to well abandonment—to burdens such as air pollution, noise, or groundwater contamination.

National focus involving Industry, Government, NGO and Academia

http://www.rff.org/centers/energy_economics_and_policy/Pages/Shale_Gas.aspx
Of the 12 consensus risk pathways that all of the expert groups most frequently chose as priorities:

- 7 involve potential risks to surface water quality,
- 2 involve potential risks to air quality,
- 2 involve potential risks to groundwater quality, and
- 1 is related to habitat disruption.

- Only 2 are shale gas specific; potential impact of fracturing fluids on surface water during use and storage/disposal.

http://www.rff.org/centers/energy_economics_and_policy/Pages/Shale_Gas.aspx
Phase 1: Technical Reports

The first phase of the project will involve the preparation of technical reports on key topics related to hydraulic fracturing in Michigan.

- Human health
- Environment/ecology
- Economics
- Technology
- Social/public perception
- Policy/law
- Geology/hydrodynamics

Each report will consider a range of impacts/issues related to the primary topic. It is likely that there will be overlaps of impacts/issues analyses, as many of the items connect to multiple topics.
Phase 2: Integrated Assessment (IA) - the IA will build from the technical reports, focusing on an analysis of options regarding hydraulic fracturing in Michigan.

The IA will likely be formed around topics identified in the technical reports. Key aspects of the IA that will distinguish it from the technical reports include:

- Focus on the analysis of (policy) options,
- Collaboration and coordination across research teams to identify common themes and strategies,
- Regular engagement with decision makers, and
- Stakeholder engagement process to gauge public concerns and perceptions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late March 2013</td>
<td>Technical Reports sent out for Peer Review and shared with Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late April 2013</td>
<td>Steering committee and Technical Report leads meet to discuss plans for Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early June 2013</td>
<td>Technical Reports are released with 30 day Public Comment period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late July 2013</td>
<td>Phase 2 Plans finalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid 2014</td>
<td>Final Integrated Assessment Report released (tentative)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At present, the project is entirely funded by the University of Michigan.

The project is expected to cost at least $600,000 with support coming from the University of Michigan's Graham Institute, Energy Institute and Risk Science Center.

Current funding sources are limited to the U-M general fund and gift funds, all of which are governed solely by the University of Michigan.

As the project develops, the Graham Institute may seek additional funding to expand stakeholder engagement efforts. All funding sources will be publicly disclosed.
Steering Committee

- Claire Allard, Strategy Advisor, Office of Strategic Policy, State of Michigan
- Mark Barteau, Director, U-M Energy Institute
- Valerie Brader, Senior Strategy Officer, Office of Strategic Policy, State of Michigan
- John Callewaert, Int. Assessment Program Director, U-M Graham Sustainability Institute
- James Clift, Policy Director, Michigan Environmental Council
- John De Vries, Attorney, Mika Meyers Beckett & Jones; Michigan Oil and Gas Association
- Hal Fitch, Director of Oil, Gas, and Minerals, Michigan Department of Environmental Quality
- Gregory Fogle, Owner, Old Mission Energy; Michigan Oil and Gas Association
- James Goodheart, Senior Policy Advisor, Michigan Department of Environmental Quality
- Manja Holland, Research Programs Officer, U-M Graham Sustainability Institute
- Andy Hoffman, Director, U-M Erb Institute for Global Sustainable Enterprise
- Drew Horning, Deputy Director, U-M Graham Sustainability Institute
- Andrew Maynard, Director, U-M Risk Science Center
- Don Scavia, Director, U-M Graham Sustainability Institute
- Tracy Swinburn, Managing Director, U-M Risk Science Center
- Grenetta Thomascoy, Program Director, Tip of the Mitt Watershed Council
- John Wilson, Consultant, U-M Energy Institute
Technical Report Leads

**Technology:** Johannes Schwank, Chemical Engineering; John Wilson, Energy Inst.

**Geology/hydrodynamics:** Brian Ellis, Civil and Environmental Engineering

**Environment/ecoogy:** Allen Burton, School of Natural Resources & Env.; Knute Nadelhoffer, Dept. of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology

**Human health:** Nil Basu, School of Public Health

**Policy/law:** Sara Gosman, Law School

**Economics:** Roland Zullo, Inst. for Research on Labor, Employment, & the Economy

**Social/public perception:** Andy Hoffman and Kim Wolske, Erb Institute for Global Sustainable Enterprise
TECHNOLOGY – key areas

• Technical issues related to hydraulic fracturing technologies and related gas recovery
  o Emphasis on methods used in Michigan

• Identification of issues that require additional research
  o Emphasis on Utica-Collingwood shales and the deeper
  o A-1 and A-2 carbonate deposits
GEOLOGY – key areas

• Proximity of unconventional reservoirs to subsurface drinking water resources

• Potential fluid migration pathways

• Factors controlling chemical composition of flowback fluids

• Disposal of flowback fluids
ECOLOGY – key areas

• Site disturbance and resulting erosion with solids and nutrient inputs into sensitive streams

• Water withdrawal impacts to neighboring streams/wetlands during drought conditions

• Review of operation “footprint” decision making in light of sensitive ecological areas

• Quality control during operations and site construction
HUMAN HEALTH – key areas

• A number of hazards have been identified
  o Workplace: accidents, silica, toxic chemicals…
  o Ecosystem: water & air pollution, ecosystem services…
  o Community: risk perception, “boomtown” impacts…

• Hazard ≠ Risk

• Relative tradeoffs & human health risk/benefits need careful consideration
POLICY/LAW – key areas

• Laws governing life cycle of a HF well
• Level of government
• Type of law
• Policy approach
ECONOMICS – key areas

• Provide an overview of the major economic issues related to the natural gas extraction industry (hydraulic fracturing) in Michigan, with an emphasis on employment.

• Estimate the employment effects of expanding natural gas extraction:
  1. Direct industry employment
  2. Indirect supplier employment
  3. Induced regional employment
SOCIAL/PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS – key areas

• What does the public think about “fracking?”

• What factors influence perceptions?

• What might we expect if HVHF increases in MI?

• What is the nature of the dialogue about fracking in Michigan?
Hydraulic Fracturing in Michigan
Integrated Assessment

http://graham.umich.edu/ia/hydraulic-fracturing.php