

---

Subject: : Conservation

Topic: : Duke Univ. Marcellus Study

Re: Duke Univ. Marcellus Study

Author: : pcray1231

Date: : 2011/5/12 9:45:12

URL:

Thank you troutbert, thats what I was looking for.

At first glance, from Figure 1, about half of the "near well" sampling sites were near Dimock. And from Figure 3, about half of the "near well" sites were elevated with methane, with the others showing no elevated methane.

Gong a little deeper, they break it down a lot by formation. Comparing Figure 2 and Figure 1, and the text, it looks to me like the Lockhaven formation wells are in Bradford County, the Genessee formation is in New York, and the Catskill formation is in Susquehanna, Wayne, and Lackawanna Counties. Well over half of the Catskill formation wells are located very close to Dimock.

Table 1 is very telling. In the Genesee formation, they tested both active and nonactive sites, and found no methane increase in active sites. However, there is only 1 data point from active sites, so you don't know how to take that.

Lockhaven formation methane levels were fairly high, but they tested no "non active" data points there, so you have no idea if this is enriched or not, could be just natural. Thus, throughout the article, any reader should simply ignore the value of the Lockhaven formation.

The only place where there's any real result is, predicably, in the Catskill formation. It shows enrichment of methane in "active" sites was the Catskill formation. As this is an average, and they don't give data for individual sites, it is very possible/likely that ALL of this enrichment is due to the Dimock sites.

Further, in Figure 4A, examining the Catskill sites, there is a clear group of wells in the Catskill formation enriched with gas, and a clear group that is not enriched. Remember, again, that the "active" wells in the Catskill formation were a group of wells near Dimock, and then a few outside of that area. Figure 4B splits em up by type of gas, and there is a clear cluster of the Catskill sites, which indicates that these increases likely come from one location. Then there are some random scatter, which likely comes from the unenriched sites farther from Dimock.

It is impossible to tell if they found any clearly enriched sites outside of the Dimock area. But a reader must conclude from the data that ALL of the enrichment may have come from a small area near Dimock. This group of sites skews the average, so when averages are taken, the "active" sites are enriched when compared with the "non active" sites.

It is pretty much proof that in Dimock, the contamination is likely from drilling activity, which I think we all knew anyway. But I'd take nothing from it, for good or bad, regarding other wells.