Subject: : Conservation
Topic: : Duke Univ. Marcellus Study
Re: Duke Univ. Marcellus Study
Author: : franklin
Date: : 2011/5/12 9:16:14
URL:

Quote:

> pcray1231 wrote:
> Thanks troutbert. It's still not the actual peer reviewed article I'm looking for, but its definitely better than the cnn article.
>
> Franklin, if what you're saying is true, then no question its a biased study. I'm just tryin to verify. Do you have a source?
>
> Gone4Day, thanks, good info as always. I do have a question. I am aware that the gas can be chemically traced to a formation, likely even to an area within a formation. But I'm not sure how specific they can get. For instance, if 2 wells are 3 miles apart and tapping the same shale formation, could you chemically determine which exact well the gas came from?
>
> In any case, the whole situation becomes a circular argument. If gas in aquifers is the result of natural fissures, and gas companies target these fissures, then of course there's going to be more gas in aquifers near gas wells. They chose those areas to drill because there's more gas in aquifers. For any sort of conclusion, you have to have before and after tests from the same wells.

The paper goes into details on how they conclude if methane in samples came from shallow or deep deposits. Most of the paper discusses the sample analysis not any detailed statistics relating to sample sites. I'd like to see the actual site data. How many different gas wells are associated with water sample sites? Why wasn't the testing conducted across a wider geographic area?

If you look at their chart on methane concentration for active extraction sites vs non-active maybe 60% of the active sites are of concern and the rest have similar methane concentrations as non-active sites. Which of the locations were the high concentration sites and which are the lower ones? They don't detail. What if all the high concentration sites are centered in one small location that they sampled? I'd like to know.