

From: Mark Sinclair
To: [fracking inquiry](#)
Subject: Fracking Inquiry Submission
Date: Tuesday, 14 March 2017 2:59:17 AM

One of the many misrepresentations that continue to be portrayed by the anti-frack gang is the effect on the environment that the gas industry has. Perhaps, nothing shows this more than the continued use of pictures from the Jonah/Pinedale Gas Field in Wyoming, US.

Let's take a look at this gas field:

Jonah Field is a large natural gas field in the Green River Basin in Sublette County, Wyoming, in the United States. It is managed by the Bureau of Land Management (the Government of the United States). **The field has a productive area of 21,000 acres (8,500 ha).** The tight nature (**tight gas**) of these reservoir rocks makes it difficult for gas to move laterally and vertically for significant distances. As such, wells are drilled on very close spacing - as little as 10 acres (4.04 ha).

Please take the time to understand "spacing units" in the oil & gas industry, and how regulatory controls can and do influence the surface footprint of operations in the US. For example, in the Bakken oil field, spacing units consists mostly of 1280-acre or 2560-acre spacing units. Operators can drill from a single pad location, and cover 4 square miles through horizontal drilling from that single pad. Further, it would be inefficient to not drill the full length of that unit as reserves would be left as unrecovered. The desire is obviously always to most efficiently drain the reservoir. Development of a shale gas field, such as the Beetaloo, from a surface perspective would NEVER be comparable to the Jonah gas field. But it sure looks good in pictures from an anti-frack gang perspective. Clearly, it is misrepresentations and misinformation that does not do the public any good in understanding the industry.

Ironically, the Pinedale/Jonah Gas field has become THE model for tight gas sandstone development in fields around the world as it has been groundbreaking on environmental and regulatory issues, particularly in the creative ways that industry has worked with government and environmental regulators to shape policy and regulations that benefit both industry and the environment.

Technology and innovative thinking, mainly during the past 15 years, have driven Pinedale field's development and unlocked a giant domestic energy resource in the United States. These techniques have benefitted all of the following: (1) the oil and gas industry, which through enhanced geologic understanding, better hydraulic fracturing techniques, reduced drilling times and improved operational efficiency has been able to convert what until the 1990s had been a subeconomic play unsuccessfully chased by dozens of companies into one of the most commercially successful fields; (2) wildlife, due to the well thought out regulations and field development plans that have led to geographically focused human and drilling activities and reduced habitat fragmentation; (3) the environment through water recycling, reduced noxious air emissions, and a

network of pipelines for fluid transport; (4) safety by lowering the total recordable incidence rate through pad drilling, continuous operations, and long-term employment on the drill rigs; and (5) ultimately, the people of Wyoming through the millions of dollars spent for field development, the hundreds of jobs created both directly and indirectly by all the work done in the Pinedale field area, and the steady stream of tax revenue that the field's production has provided to the state.

Environmental mitigations included focusing year-round operations on pads within concentrated development areas, reducing air emissions, and installation of liquids gathering systems (LGSs) to reduce truck traffic to and from the area. Limited year-round access allowed Pinedale operators to operate within focused development areas throughout the year. Within these concentrated development areas, seasonal stipulations for big game animals and sage grouse are waived. Development progresses in a stipulated development pattern and reclamation is done after pads are fully developed. In each of the defined development areas, set development patterns exist. This ensures that at any one time, 92% of the anticline has no development activity. It also benefits wildlife in that it reduces habitat fragmentation by focusing operations, maintaining corridors for wildlife migration, and shortening the time for full field development. In addition, it leaves large areas of contiguous habitat available for migration corridors and places for animals to forage, rest, and reproduce. The ability to operate year round within a concentrated development area benefits industry, the environment, the people of Wyoming, and wildlife. It provides continuity to operations that leads to efficient application of technology, which allows operators to drill more wells per rig with less emissions per well, and to fully develop the resource. It also makes it feasible to use the latest technologies to reduce emissions such as installing LGSs, applying selective catalytic reduction (SCR) devices to rig engines to reduce emissions of nitrogen oxides to near zero, and consolidating production facilities. Continuity of operations also promotes a stable workforce with steady employment and a consistent tax revenue stream for the state of Wyoming.

Why isn't this information released when the pictures are shown? Because it would ruin their scare campaign.

I watched quite a bit of the live streaming of the formal hearings taking place under this inquiry. It seems the panel itself has quite a bit of catching up to do in understanding the oil and gas industry. I mean no disrespect by that comment. It is a complex industry. But it is this complexness that the anti-frack gang uses against it to misinform the public. And there is A LOT of misinformation being thrown about. Especially references to what takes place in the United States. Every single one of the "studies" should be carefully examined on their merits. For example, one woman referenced "scientific studies" from a Dr. Anthony Ingraffea. Please investigate this man. Ingraffea is the president of Physicians Scientists & Engineers for Healthy Energy, an organization that is not only funded by the Park Foundation, but which has taken institutional stances against fracking. He is an anti-frack activist. His research is fundamentally flawed and biased.

There is also a continued fundamentally faulty argument to compare coal seam gas to

shale gas development. It appears the inquiry panel does have a fairly good grasp of the differences, but the anti-frack gang bases almost the entirety of it's' arguments in relation to coal seam gas.

There are a number of "facts" and "studies" thrown about concerning well integrity. Please actually take a look at how this is addressed in the United States. In some states, cement bond logs are required to be run on every well once a year. Now sometimes, these bond logs find issues with wellbore integrity. Under the anti-frack gang view, this is a well casing failure. This is not true. These issues can be and are fixed through remediation of the well bore. If they cannot be fixed, the well is required to be plugged and abandoned. It is permanently cemented in. I could go on and on about the misrepresentations from the United States. The anti-frack gang takes bits and pieces of information, and treats it as gospel. As I am sure you all will, please take the time to really understand the industry. The regulatory frameworks that are in place and have been implemented are obviously some of the strongest in the world. They work. All the fanatical rants the anti-frack gang uses against the industry are actually addressed in these regulations.

Lastly, the continued drumming that renewables are the answer to all our problems needs to be investigated as well. If you listen to the media narrative on climate change and "clean energy," you'd think that the rest of the world has moved smartly and seamlessly toward 21st-century green energy, while Australia is the high-polluting laggard that just won't get with the program to save the planet. Think again. The green energy revolution around the world has turned into a meltdown with many nations sprinting away from "renewable" energy. Here are a few of the latest news flashes from Europe and Asia. In Germany, the world leader in green energy, electricity prices have now reached a level triple those paid in the United States. Imagine the anger if middle-class Americans saw a tripling of their utility bills each month. In Britain, to comply with renewable energy requirements, power stations are burning hundreds of millions of pounds of wood pellets (pellets imported from the US). Environmental experts confirm that burning wood is much worse for the environment than burning natural gas or even coal. In each of these cases, the economies and local factories are taking a big hit. Look at Australia. According to the IER analysis of Australia: "The government has found that its electric system that is heavily reliant on wind power (40 percent comes from intermittent renewable sources) cannot cope without reliable power from traditional generation sources. The fallout is that Australia is finding that its energy-intensive businesses are relocating to Asian countries that provide stable regulation and costs, lower taxes, cheaper wages, and less red tape. So very quietly, Europe and other nations aren't going so green anymore. The EU spent an estimated \$750 billion on green energy handouts over the past decade and what it has bought for that is a doubling of its power costs. This has given American steel, auto, light manufacturing, agriculture, and technology firms a big competitive edge in world markets. This is why European nations and Australia are understandably desperate for the US to move to the same green energy policies that they adopted years ago. What would that mean for the US? One study by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce estimated that if America were to adopt the same mandates for renewable

energy, the total cost to American consumers would be more than \$600 billion and industry would pay out at least \$30 billion more. By the way, the US already provides subsidies to wind and solar power that are five times higher per unit of energy produced than for nuclear power and 20 times more generous than for fossil fuels, according to a 2016 American Action Forum study. Yet wind and solar are still less than 5 percent of American energy output despite all the money spent. Why not just eliminate all American energy subsidies and let the free market decide. The political "left" disparages this approach as a move toward "dirty energy." Wrong. Even though the US has never been all in on green energy the way Europe has, the Department of Energy reports that America has reduced its carbon emissions more than the EU has because we are producing and consuming more clean burning natural gas.

So in conclusion, I wish you all the best in this inquiry. I know it is a deluge of information. Please make sure all information is accurate and factual. The science has shown, time and time and time again, the oil and gas industry can operate safely under a robust regulatory regime and any risks can be managed. Just like in any other industry. Obviously, many people are unwilling to accept this conclusion.

Sincerely,

Mark Sinclair