



20 December 2012

HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT - SANTOS SOUTHWEST QUEENSLAND TENEMENTS

Site Setting and Hydraulic Fracturing Process

Submitted to:
Santos Ltd
Santos Centre
60 Flinders Street
Adelaide SA 5000

REPORT



Report Number. 127666004-011-R-Rev0

Distribution:

Santos - 1 paper, 1 electronic copy
Golder Associates - 1 electronic copy (file copy)





Executive Summary

Introduction

Santos Ltd (Santos) engaged Golder Associates Pty Ltd (Golder) to prepare a desktop risk assessment of hydraulic fracturing activities for conventional oil and gas production in their Southwest Queensland (SWQ) tenements. This Hydraulic Fracturing Risk Assessment (HFRA) is undertaken to meet Department of Environment and Heritage Protection (DEHP) Environmental Authority (EA) consent conditions.

This desktop HFRA is presented in two report volumes, as follows:

- Volume One (this report) discusses the environmental and geological settings within which Santos' fracturing activities take place and the general techniques for the drilling, completion and fracturing of wells. The report also discusses why hydraulic fracturing is essential in SWQ and outlines Santos' current forward programme for fracture-stimulation, although it should be noted that for a variety of reasons (including but not limited to future production performance and / or access-related issues such as the flooding of the Cooper Creek system), the forward programme is frequently reviewed and is subject to change.
- Volume Two relates specifically to the fracturing fluids proposed to be used by *Fracturing Service Providers* on Santos wells in the SWQ conventional oil and gas fields. The report considers the ecological and human health toxicity of the chemical constituents in the fracturing fluids, and includes an exposure pathway assessment and risk characterisation based on a review of complete exposure pathways and controls to mitigate exposure.

In the future, specific data relating to the fracturing fluids used by other Fracturing Service Providers may be submitted as a subsequent Volume Two of this report, to allow DEHP approval for fracture-stimulation operations by these contractors.

Golder previously prepared an Underground Water Impact Report (UWIR) for the SWQ conventional oil and gas operations, which was prepared for Santos in accordance with the requirements of the Water Act 2000 (Golder, 2012a). This HFRA report considers the geological and hydrogeological conceptual model developed in the UWIR, additional information provided by Santos, and the requirements of DEHP to provide a formal risk assessment of hydraulic fracturing activities in the SWQ Project Areas.

Comparison of Conventional Oil and Gas Operations to Coal Seam Gas (CSG) Operations

There are key differences between CSG and conventional oil and gas production, both in the geographic and geological setting of the resource and the methodology for accessing the resource, that have a substantial bearing on the risk profile presented by fracturing activities. These include:

- Santos' conventional oil and gas operations in SWQ are located in an arid, sparsely populated area of central Australia. Whilst groundwater is an important water supply to support the rural land uses, the extent of water supply development is limited (commensurate with the small population base).
- In Santos' SWQ operations, the hydrocarbon reservoirs generally occur in anticlines capped with thick, laterally-extensive low permeability formations that isolate the reservoirs from overlying water-bearing formations.
- The oil and gas reservoirs in the SWQ study area are very deep, of the order of 1500 to 3000 m below ground level, which provides hundreds to over a thousand metres vertical separation between the formations in which fracturing activities are proposed and the shallow groundwater resources. There is also no requirement to remove formation water in order to facilitate gas flow, with the possible exception of well blow downs on a case by case frequency.



Environmental Setting

Santos operates conventional gas and oil fields across petroleum tenements within an approximately 30,000 km² portion of Southwest Queensland. The operations are divided into three sub-areas of interest: *Western, Central and Eastern Project Areas*. These *Project Areas* and the land immediately surrounding the Santos tenement boundaries comprise the Santos SWQ study area. The terrain in the study area is generally characterised by low undulating topography (hills and ridges) between the drainage channel systems of the Cooper Creek. The area is sparsely developed, and generally comprises rural communities and homesteads that are largely engaged in pastoralism.

The stratigraphy primarily comprises the Eromanga and underlying Cooper Basins, where that oil and gas reservoirs are respectively located. These contain the proposed target formations for hydraulic fracturing activities. A detailed description of key geological and hydrogeological features is provided in the text, including geological models for the study area, identification of the target hydrocarbon-bearing sandstone formations (oil in the Eromanga Basin formations at depths ranging from 700 to 1,200 m below ground level (mbgl); and gas in the Cooper Basin formations at depths of 1,500 to greater than 2,000 mbgl), their hydraulic characteristics, adjacent aquifers and aquitards, structural features including faults and fracture characteristics (and their potential to behave as barriers or conduits), regional and local seismicity characteristics, aquifer environmental values and the location of groundwater users.

In terms of the environmental setting, this document has provided specific information that addresses the requirements anticipated of the EA conditions regarding hydraulic fracturing that will apply to new areas proposed for development.

These specific inclusions are located within the logical flow of the description of the existing environment in the SWQ study area.

Key Environmental Values

Based on an understanding of the environmental setting, this risk assessment considered the following key environmental values:

Groundwater environmental values:

- Town water supply;
- Stock and domestic water supply;
- Sandstone aquifers of the GAB; and
- Groundwater Dependant Ecosystems (GDEs).

Surface water environmental values:

- Protection of aquatic ecosystems;
- Recreation and aesthetics: primary recreation with direct contact, and visual appreciation with no contact; and
- Cultural and spiritual values.

Terrestrial environmental values:

- Protection of flora and fauna, particularly small mammals, reptiles and birds with a greater the potential to come into contact with flowback water in Flare Pits.

The report considers the applicable environmental values in the context of the proposed fracturing activities within the study area.



Hydraulic Fracturing Process Description Summary

With regard to the process of hydraulic fracturing, the requirements of the EA approval conditions are considered within the hydraulic fracturing description as they are proposed to be employed in the SWQ study area, with the specific information included as follows:

- Practices and procedures to ensure that the fracturing activities are designed to be contained within the target gas producing formation;
- Details of where, when and how often stimulation is to be undertaken on the tenures covered by this environmental authority;
- A description of Santos' well mechanical integrity testing program;
- Process control and assessment techniques to be applied for determining extent of stimulation activity(ies) (e.g. microseismic measurements, modelling etc); and
- A process description of the stimulation activity to be applied, including equipment and a comparison to best international practice.

Conclusions

Based on the available geological information for the study area, the following key points are noted:

- The DEHP database and the interim results of the WBBA program indicate that groundwater supply development in the vicinity of Santos' tenements is limited to the Glendower and Winton Formations, and to a lesser extent the Hooray Sandstone. The minimum vertical offset between the Glendower and Winton Formations and the shallowest hydrocarbon reservoirs (oil reservoirs of the Cadna-Owie Formation) is 400 to 800 m, which includes the low permeability formations of the Wallumbilla Formation and Allaru Mudstone, which form a thick, competent and regionally extensive seal between the Cadna-Owie Formation and the shallower aquifers. The vertical offset to gas reservoirs is much greater (1,000 m to 1,800 m).
- Within formations that host both aquifers and hydrocarbon reservoirs (e.g. Hooray Sandstone), the water-bearing zones are separated from hydrocarbon reservoirs by intra-formational seals. However there is not enough information available to discretise the internal stratigraphy of these formations. Where petroleum activities (including fracturing) occur within a formation that hosts both aquifers and hydrocarbon reservoirs, the lateral distance of the water supply bores accessing the aquifer to Santos' tenements was considered.
- The closest beneficial use bore to the Santos tenements targeting the Hooray Sandstone in the DEHP database records is the Whim Well, which is indicated as being located 20 km from the closest tenement with hydraulic fracturing activities proposed (the existence of this bore was unable to be confirmed during the WBBA). The closest observed bore, the Coothero Bore, is at least 25 km from the closest tenement proposed for hydraulic fracturing and more than 80 km from the closest tenement with activities proposed at a similar.

Based on the available site setting information for the study area, the following key points are noted:

- Cooper Creek, which has been declared as a Wild River Area, is largely influenced by surface water flows and evaporation, with negligible contribution from groundwater. Waterholes and billabongs occur throughout the Cooper Creek floodplain and channel complex, some of which coincide directly with Santos tenements.
- Two of the identified wetlands (Cooper Creek – Wilson River Junction and Bulloo Lake) are within the boundaries of Santos' tenements in the Central and Western Project Areas. None of the wetlands are located within a reasonable radius (>75 km) of the Eastern Project Area tenements where hydraulic stimulation activities are currently proposed for oil production. Stimulation activities for gas production



are proposed in the Western Project Areas PL131 and ATP 259P which coincide with the location of Cooper Creek – Wilson River Junction. It should be noted that hydraulic fracturing activities may be completed within any tenement boundary over the life of the Project.

- The Cooper Creek catchment and downstream Lake Eyre are popular recreational fishing destinations. Popular fishing spots include Bulloo River at Thargomindah, Wilson River at Nockatunga and Cooper Creek flows (episodically).

Based on the hydraulic fracturing process information provided by Santos, the following key points are noted:

- Buffers are assigned during establishment of well leases between petroleum operations and potential “environmentally sensitive areas” identified through database review and site-specific ecological assessment where warranted.
- The procedures employed by Santos’ and its contractors follow a design philosophy predicated on the guidance, specifications and recommended practices of the American Petroleum Institute (API), considered to represent international best practice.
- The procedures employed by Santos’ and its contractors for mechanical integrity and surveillance follow a design philosophy with international best practice. Practices for ensuring well mechanical integrity consist of a robust surveillance plan.
- OH&S procedures are implemented during hydraulic fracturing operations to prevent workers from direct contact with chemicals during spills and when handling flowback water or sediments. Golder understands that there has not been a recordable spill since hydraulic fracturing commenced in 1987.
- Santos operational procedures monitor fracture design to stay within the target formation.
- Santos implement spill containment procedures during operations to prevent migration of and exposure to chemicals.
- Fencing is installed around Flare Pits to prevent access by trespassers, livestock and large native fauna. Signs also indicate that well leases are work zones to be accessed by authorised personnel.
- Engineering and operational controls (grading of well leases, stormwater controls and maintenance of a 300 mm freeboard within the Flare Pits) are in place to limit the potential for uncontrolled surface releases of flowback water to the environment.
- As a minimum Flare Pits are lined, and fluid storage and containment methods will be improved, to prevent seepage of flowback water into the underlying aquifer.
- Sediments and fluids contained within Flare Pits are removed via vacuum truck techniques.

Hence, the combination of the remote project location, sparse local population density (and limited water supply development), different production methods and the substantial vertical separation of oil and gas reservoirs from primary groundwater supply aquifers results in an inherently low risk profile with regard to fracturing activities. In addition, Santos procedures and operational controls are design to mitigate residual risk.



Table of Contents

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	Preamble	1
1.1	Santos SWQ Project – Overview	1
1.1.1	Production Areas	2
1.1.2	Proposed Fracturing Operations	2
1.1.3	EA Consent Conditions	5
1.2	Risk Assessment Process	6
1.3	Study Area	7
1.3.1	Oil and Gas Occurrences and Production.....	8
1.3.1.1	Target Gas Formations.....	8
1.3.1.2	Target Oil Formations	9
1.4	Comparison of Conventional Oil and Gas Operations to Coal Seam Gas Operations.....	12
1.5	Limitations	12
2.0	SITE SETTING AND ISSUE IDENTIFICATION.....	13
2.1	Climate	13
2.2	Topography	14
2.3	Surface Water.....	14
2.4	Geological Setting.....	18
2.4.1	Continental Setting.....	18
2.4.2	Regional Geological Setting.....	18
2.4.3	Local Geological Setting and Petroleum Field Models	23
2.4.3.1	Cooper Basin Geological Setting and Model	23
2.4.3.2	Eromanga Basin Geological Setting and Model	24
2.4.3.3	Conceptual Geological Cross Sections.....	24
2.4.3.4	Primary Oil and Gas Producing Reservoirs	28
2.4.3.5	Faults and Other Geological Controls.....	30
2.4.4	Stress Field Setting	32
2.4.4.1	Regional Setting	32
2.4.4.2	Basin Stress Regime	32
2.4.4.3	Stress Assumptions and Principal Stresses – General Faulting Regime.....	33
2.4.4.4	Hydrostatic Stress.....	33



2.4.5	Seismic History of the Project Region	34
2.4.5.1	Vulnerability	34
2.4.5.2	Local Historical Faults and Potential Seismic Activity	35
2.4.5.3	Active Seismic Area and Faults	35
2.4.5.4	Seismic History of the Cooper Basin Area	36
2.5	Hydrogeology and the Groundwater Resource	38
2.5.1	Introduction and Setting	38
2.5.2	Hydrostratigraphy	38
2.5.2.1	Eromanga Basin	40
2.5.2.2	Cooper Basin	42
2.5.2.3	Observed Reservoir Pressure Data	44
2.5.3	Groundwater Flow	46
2.5.4	Recharge/Discharge	47
2.5.5	Aquifer and Aquitard Hydraulic Properties	47
2.5.6	Groundwater Quality	47
2.5.6.1	Water Types of the Study Area Formations	48
2.5.6.2	Total Dissolved Solids	48
2.5.7	Groundwater Use (Excluding Produced Water)	51
2.5.7.1	Regional Bore Inventory	53
2.6	Environmental Values in the Study Area	58
2.6.1	Introduction	58
2.6.2	Environmental Values of Groundwater	58
2.6.2.1	Town Water Supply	58
2.6.2.2	Stock and Domestic Water Supply	58
2.6.2.3	Sandstone Aquifers of the Great Artesian Basin	58
2.6.2.4	Groundwater Dependant Ecosystems	59
2.6.2.5	Proximity of Oil and Gas Targets to Overlying and Underlying Aquifers	60
2.6.3	Environmental Values of Surface Water	61
2.6.3.1	Aquatic Ecosystems	61
2.6.3.2	Recreational Values	63
2.6.3.3	Proximity of Santos Tenements to Surface Water with Environmental Values	63
2.6.4	Terrestrial Environmental Values	64
3.0	HYDRAULIC FRACTURING PROCESS	67



3.1	Introduction	67
3.2	Well Design and Hydraulic Fracturing - General Considerations	67
3.2.1	Comparison to International Best Practice	67
3.2.2	Well Mechanical Integrity and Integrity Testing	69
3.2.2.1	Background	69
3.2.2.2	Drilling and Well Completion	70
3.2.2.3	Selection and Sourcing of Casing Materials	70
3.2.2.4	Logging the Borehole	71
3.2.2.5	Casing Design	72
3.2.2.6	Casing Completion	72
3.2.2.7	Cementing	73
3.2.2.8	Well Completion Design	74
3.3	Description of the Hydraulic Fracturing Process	76
3.3.1	Introduction	76
3.3.2	Description of Hydrocarbon Reservoir Formations in the Study Area	76
3.3.2.1	Conventional Gas	76
3.3.2.2	Conventional Oil	76
3.3.3	Purpose of the Hydraulic Fracturing Process	77
3.3.4	Fracture Treatment Design Considerations	77
3.3.5	Hydraulic Fracturing Process Description	79
3.3.6	Infrastructure and Equipment Used	80
3.3.7	Stages of Hydraulic Fracturing	84
3.3.7.1	Hydraulic Fracture Event Design	84
3.3.7.2	Stage Perforation/Jetting	84
3.3.7.3	Pre-Treatment	84
3.3.7.4	Minifrac	85
3.3.7.5	Corrosion Inhibitor	85
3.3.7.6	Pad Volume Injection	85
3.3.7.7	Slurry Volume Injection	87
3.3.7.8	Flush Volume	88
3.3.7.9	Flowback	88
3.3.7.10	Hydraulic Fracture Treatment Monitoring	88
3.3.7.11	Timing of Hydraulic Fracturing Process	91



3.4	Program for Wells to be Fractured	91
3.4.1	Frequency of Hydraulic Fracturing	91
3.4.2	Distribution of Completed and Scheduled Fracturing Locations	92
3.5	Location of Landholders Active Bores	95
4.0	CONCLUSIONS.....	96
4.1	Environmental Setting	96
4.2	Hydraulic Fracturing Process Description	97
4.3	Summary	97
5.0	REFERENCES.....	100
	LIMITATIONS	107

TABLES

Table 1: Summary of Consent Conditions.....	5
Table 2: SWQ Project – Gas Production Areas.....	9
Table 3: SWQ Project – Oil Production Areas.....	9
Table 4: Mean Climate Characteristics within the Cooper Basin Operations Area - Windorah Station	13
Table 5: Stratigraphic Sequence for the Study Area	20
Table 6: Geological Abbreviations for Stratigraphical Markers.....	25
Table 7: Earthquake Locations and Depths in the Study Area Since 1950	36
Table 8: Hydrostratigraphy of the Study Area (DERM, 2005).....	39
Table 9: Hydraulic Parameters	47
Table 10: Summary of WBBA Priority 1 and 2 bores Observed to be used by Third Parties (assumed private landowners).....	54
Table 11: Stratigraphic Thickness between Hydrocarbon-Bearing Formations and Aquifers.....	60
Table 12: Identified Wetlands of National and International Significance in the Study Area	62
Table 13: Distance of Active Landholder Bores in the Study Area to the Closest Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Location.....	95

FIGURES

Figure 1: Santos SWQ Study Area.....	3
Figure 2: Oil and Gas Fields for the SWQ Project.....	4
Figure 3: Location of the Great Artesian Basin.....	11
Figure 4: Rainfall and Temperature Diagram - Monthly Averages from 1931-2012 for Windorah Station.....	14
Figure 5: Topography and Drainage of the Study Area.....	16
Figure 6: Study Area During a Flood Event (2010)	17
Figure 7: GAB Structural Geology of the Study Area	19



Figure 8: Chronology and Stratigraphy of the Cooper and Eromanga Basins (Queensland and South Australia)	21
Figure 9: Surface Geology	22
Figure 10: Geological Schematic Cross Section across the GAB Eromanga Basin	26
Figure 11: Geological Conceptual Cross Section across the Study Area	27
Figure 12: Hydrocarbon 'Traps' Geological Settings	28
Figure 13: Petroleum Reservoirs Trapping Mechanisms of the Cooper and Eromanga Basins	28
Figure 14: Summary of Regional Major Faults (Santos, 2004)	31
Figure 15: Continental Geomechanical Setting – Mean Stress Orientation within Australian Stress Provinces (Hillis and Reynolds, 2003).	33
Figure 16: Primary Stress Field Distribution for SWQ Queensland (Reynolds et.al, 2006)	34
Figure 17: N-S Seismic Section for SWQ Project Area Showing Fault Models	35
Figure 18: Epicentre and Magnitude for Earthquakes in the Study Area	37
Figure 20: Observed Tickalara (top) and Iliad Field Pressure with Depth Plots	45
Figure 21: Map of GAB Extent, Regional Flow Paths, Recharge Beds, and Spring Clusters:	46
Figure 22: Piper Diagram	49
Figure 23: Piper Diagrams of Individual Formations	50
Figure 24: Wilcox Plot Showing Salinity and Sodicity Hazard Classes.	51
Figure 25: Groundwater Use within the Santos Study Area	52
Figure 26: Target Groundwater Sources for Groundwater Usage in the Study Area	52
Figure 27: Geographical Distribution of Groundwater Use	56
Figure 28: Location of Water Flooding Activities	57
Figure 29: Environmentally Sensitive Areas in the Study Area	66
Figure 30: Conceptual Conventional Oil or Gas Well Construction Detail	75
Figure 31: Typical Hydraulic Fracturing Wellhead Fixture (Source: Economides and Martin, 2007).	79
Figure 32: Conceptualised Shape of Hydraulic Fracturing Zone of Influence (source: Economides and Martin, 2007)	80
Figure 33: Diagrammatic layout of a typical hydraulic fracturing operation on a conventional oil or gas well lease (Saxon Rigs 182, 183 and 184)*.	83
Figure 34: Example of a typical slurry gum constituent: Guar Gum – illustrating its native form, seed form, splits and powder	86
Figure 35: Example of Typical Stages of Gum (Guar) Cross-linking to Achieve 300 cp. Source Economides and Martin, 2007.	86
Figure 36: Typical 20-40 Grade Sand used in Hydraulic Fracturing (Source Economides and Martin, 2007.)	87
Figure 37: Typical Sand-Guar Gum fluid mix	87
Figure 38: Lateral View of the Locatable Microseismic Events during Monitoring of Multi-Stage Fracture Stimulation of Cowralli-10 (South Australia)	90
Figure 39: Map View of the Locatable Microseismic Events During Monitoring of Multi-stage Fracture Stimulation of Cowralli-10 and Cowralli-12 (SA).	91
Figure 40: Historical Fracturing Locations in SWQ	93



Figure 41: Potential Oil and Gas Hydraulic Fracturing Locations 2012 – 2016	94
---	----

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Regulatory Consent Conditions

APPENDIX B

Limitations

APPENDIX C

Geological Contour Plans

APPENDIX D

Hydrogeological Contour Plans

APPENDIX E

Santos Hydraulic Fracturing - Schematic Well Lease Set up

APPENDIX F

Historical Well Hydraulic Stimulations in SWQ

APPENDIX G

Potential Hydraulic Fracture Locations



1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Preamble

On 29 June 2012 Santos Ltd (Santos) submitted an application to the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection (DEHP) for consolidation of Santos' Southwest Queensland (SWQ) Environmental Authorities (EAs) into three Project Area EAs. Project activities covered under the application to DEHP included stimulation activities (henceforth referred to as "hydraulic fracturing") of conventional oil and gas reservoirs.

To meet EA consent conditions, a formal risk assessment of hydraulic fracturing activities is required and subsequently, Golder Associates Pty Ltd (Golder) has been engaged by Santos to prepare this Hydraulic Fracturing Risk Assessment (HFRA).

This desktop HFRA is presented in two volumes, as follows:

- Volume One discusses the environmental and geological settings within which Santos' fracturing operations take place and the general techniques for the drilling, completion and fracturing of wells. The report also discusses why hydraulic fracturing is essential in SWQ and outlines Santos' current forward programme for fracture-stimulation, although it should be noted that for a variety of reasons (including but not limited to future production performance and / or access-related issues such as the flooding of the Cooper Creek system), the forward programme is frequently reviewed and is subject to change.
- Volume Two relates specifically to the fracturing fluids proposed to be used by *Fracturing Service Providers* on Santos wells in the SWQ conventional oil and gas fields. The report considers the ecological and human health toxicity of the chemical constituents in the fracturing fluids, and includes an exposure pathway assessment and risk characterisation based on a review of complete exposure pathways and controls to mitigate exposure.

In the future, specific data relating to the fracturing fluids used by other Fracturing Service Providers may be submitted as a subsequent Volume Two of this report, to allow DEHP approval for fracture-stimulation operations by these contractors.

Golder previously prepared an Underground Water Impact Report (UWIR) for the SWQ conventional oil and gas operations, which was prepared for Santos in accordance with the requirements of the Water Act 2000 (Golder, 2012a). This report considered the geological and hydrogeological conceptual model developed in the UWIR, additional information provided by Santos, and the requirements of DEHP to provide a formal risk assessment of hydraulic fracturing activities for the future development of the SWQ Project Areas.

1.1 Santos SWQ Project – Overview

Santos currently operates a significant number of conventional gas and oil fields within SWQ (Figure 1). The area covered by the petroleum tenements within which these fields encompasses approximately 30,000 km² of largely semi-arid agricultural land and was first developed for petroleum operations in the early 1970's. Within the Cooper-Eromanga Basin as a whole (including that part which lies in South Australia), Santos operates approximately 190 gas fields and 115 oil fields, the majority of which are currently in production (Figure 2).

- *Conventional oil* is produced from the formations of the Eromanga Basin (a sub-basin within the GAB). The oil is present in discontinuous oil reservoirs within interbedded sandstones beds or larger sandstone formations. There are several types of oil reservoirs resulting from the process of "trapping" of the oil (Section 2.4.3.4).
- *Conventional gas production* is undertaken from porous sandstone formations and as such does not require the depressurisation of the target beds (with respect to groundwater). Some water is produced as a by-product however the volumes are limited (refer to the UWIR for detailed discussion). The conventional gas production is typically associated with the deeply-buried formations of the Cooper



Basin (separate from and underlying the GAB). Very limited volumes of gas have also been produced from within the Eromanga Basin.

1.1.1 Production Areas

In the Draft Environmental Management Plans (EMPs) for the SWQ operations, Santos has divided the production fields into three areas (Figure 2):

- The *Western Project Area* generally includes the land from near Cameron Corner in the southwest, up to near Tanbar in the North (Figure 2). The *Western Project Area* has been further sub-divided into the *Baryulah Development Area*, the *Northern Development Area*, and the *Central Development Area* (Section 1.3.1.1). Santos' leases cover approximately 17,214 km²;
- The *Eastern Project Area* is located 10 km from Eromanga. Santos' leases cover approximately 1,750 km²; and
- The *Central Project Area* comprises an area of land aligned approximately northwest-southeast through the centre of Santos' leases. The *Central Project Area* covers approximately 12,000 km².

For the purposes of this assessment, the term "*study area*" refers to the area applicable to this assessment: all tenements operated by Santos comprising the *Eastern*, *Western* and *Central Project Areas* and the land immediately surrounding the Santos tenement boundaries (Figure 2).

1.1.2 Proposed Fracturing Operations


The use of hydraulic fracturing is essential in order to achieve economically-viable flow-rates and recoverable volumes from the majority of the production wells that are drilled in SWQ.

Potentially, 83 oil and gas wells will undergo hydraulic fracturing activities between 2012 and 2016, including:

- 69 gas wells within the *Western Project Area* comprising of 13 existing gas producing wells, 39 new gas production wells and 17 new exploration wells;
- 14 new oil wells are proposed to be drilled and hydraulically fractured in the *Eastern Project Area*; and
- The *Central Project Area* is not proposed for hydraulic fracturing at this time.

It should be noted that for a variety of reasons (including but not limited to future production performance and / or access-related issues such as the flooding of the Cooper Creek system), the forward drilling and fracturing programme is frequently reviewed and is subject to change.

The oil and gas production field and lease areas are further discussed in Section 1.3.



SWQ HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT

SANTOS

SANTOS SWQ STUDY AREA

COPYRIGHT

1. Base information copyright MapInfo Australia Pty Ltd
2. ATP/PL tenure supplied by Santos, January 2009
3. Golder Associates 2012a Cooper Basin UWIR Report



LEGEND

- Town/Locality
- Highway/Major Road
- Santos Operated Tenements
- Study Area

0 25 50 100 150 200 250 Kilometres


SCALE (at A4) 1:8,000,000

Coordinate System: GCS GDA 1994

PROJECT: 127666004
DATE: 19/12/2012
DRAWN: FA
CHECKED: RS

FIGURE 1





SWQ HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT

SANTOS

OIL AND GAS FIELDS FOR THE SWQ PROJECT

COPYRIGHT

1. Base information copyright MapInfo Australia Pty Ltd
2. ATP/PL tenure supplied by Santos, August 2011
3. Golder Associates 2012a Cooper Basin UWIR Report



LEGEND

- Town/Locality
- River/Creek
- Highway/Major Road
- Tenements within Central Project Area
- Tenements within Eastern Project Area
- Tenements within Western Project Area
- Additional Lease Area
- Study Area

0 10 20 40 60 80 Kilometres

SCALE (at A4) 1:2,500,000

Coordinate System: GCS GDA 1994

PROJECT: 127666004
DATE: 19/12/2012
DRAWN: FA
CHECKED: RS

FIGURE 2





1.1.3 EA Consent Conditions

The 20 July 2012 model conditions (J11) included in the *Environmental Protection Act 1994, Level 1 Environmental Authority, Chapter 5A Petroleum Activity*. (APPENDIX A) indicate that prior to undertaking well stimulation activities, the holder of the EA must develop a risk assessment to ensure that hydraulic fracturing activities are managed to prevent environmental harm. *The **stimulation** risk assessment must include, but not necessarily be limited to:*

Table 1: Summary of Consent Conditions

Condition	Report Volume
(a) a process description of the hydraulic fracturing activity to be applied, including equipment and a comparison to best international practice	One
(b) provide details of where, when and how often hydraulic fracturing is to be undertaken on the tenures covered by this environmental authority	One
(c) a geological model of the field to be stimulated including geological names, descriptions and depths of the target gas producing formation(s)	One
(d) naturally occurring geological faults	One
(e) seismic history of the region (e.g. earth tremors, earthquakes)	One
(f) proximity of overlying and underlying aquifers	One
(g) description of the depths that aquifers with environmental values occur, both above and below the target gas producing formation	One
(h) identification and proximity of landholders' active groundwater bores in the area where hydraulic fracturing activities are to be carried out	One
(i) the environmental values of groundwater in the area	One
(j) an assessment of the appropriate limits of reporting for all indicators relevant to hydraulic fracturing monitoring in order to accurately assess the risks to environmental values of groundwater	-
(k) description of overlying and underlying formations in respect of porosity, permeability, hydraulic conductivity, faulting and fracture propensity	One
(l) consideration of barriers or known direct connections between the target gas producing formation and the overlying and underlying aquifers	One
(m) a description of the well mechanical integrity testing program	One
(n) process control and assessment techniques to be applied for determining extent of hydraulic fracturing activities (e.g. microseismic measurements, modelling etc.)	One
(o) practices and procedures to ensure that the hydraulic fracturing activities are designed to be contained within the target gas producing formation	One
(p) groundwater transmissivity, flow rate, hydraulic conductivity and direction(s) of flow	One



HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT SWQ

(q)	a description of the chemicals used in hydraulic fracturing activities (including estimated total mass, estimated composition, chemical abstract service numbers and properties), their mixtures and the resultant compounds that are formed after hydraulic fracturing	Two
(r)	a mass balance estimating the concentrations and absolute masses of chemicals that will be reacted, returned to the surface or left in the target gas producing formation subsequent to hydraulic fracturing	Two
(s)	an environmental hazard assessment of the chemicals used including their mixtures and the resultant chemicals that are formed after hydraulic fracturing including: (i). toxicological and ecotoxicological information of chemicals used (ii). information on the persistence and bioaccumulation potential of the chemicals used (iii). identification of the hydraulic fracturing fluid chemicals of potential concern derived from the risk assessment	Two
(t)	an environmental hazard assessment of use, formation of, and detection of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in hydraulic fracturing activities	Two
(u)	identification and an environmental hazard assessment of using radioactive tracer beads in hydraulic fracturing activities	One
(v)	an environmental hazard assessment of leaving chemicals used in stimulation fluids in the target gas producing formation for extended periods subsequent to hydraulic fracturing	Two
(w)	human health exposure pathways to operators and the regional population	Two
(x)	risk characterisation of environmental impacts based on the environmental hazard assessment	Two
(y)	potential impacts to landholder bores as a result of hydraulic fracturing activities	Two
(z)	an assessment of cumulative impacts, spatially and temporally of the hydraulic fracturing activities to be carried out on the tenures covered by this environmental authority	-
(aa)	potential environmental or health impacts which may result from hydraulic fracturing activities including but not limited to water quality, air quality (including suppression of dust and other airborne contaminants), noise and vibration	One and Two

1.2 Risk Assessment Process

Risk assessment provides a systematic framework for characterising the nature and magnitude of risks from stressors (in this case, hydraulic fracturing chemicals). Risk assessment is an important tool for decision-making. Australian risk assessment guidance has been used in the preparation of this report, namely draft guidance for ecological risk assessment provided by the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) Victoria (Gibson *et al.*, 1997) and enHealth-Environmental Health Risk Assessment, "Guidelines for Assessing Human Health Risks from Environmental Hazards", June 2004 (enHealth, 2004).

The scope of the qualitative risk assessment comprises of:



- **Issue identification** (Volume One) - A description of the current environmental setting (including a description of potential receiving environments and the various factors which act upon them, including climatic influences), detailed geological and hydrogeological information, gas well integrity and a description of the hydraulic fracturing process including an identification of the constituents of the hydraulic fracturing fluid;
- **Exposure Assessment** (Volume Two) – The exposure assessment comprises an evaluation of surface and subsurface exposure pathway assessment;
- **Hazard assessment** (Volume Two) – An evaluation of the environmental hazard of relevant chemical additives in the hydraulic fracturing fluid based on aquatic toxicity, environmental persistence and bioaccumulation. The environmental hazard assessment provides a relative ranking of the chemical additives and those chemicals considered to represent a high hazard are identified as chemicals of potential concern (COPC) for further assessment. An evaluation of terrestrial and human health toxicity will also be presented;
- **Risk Characterisation** (Volume Two) – A qualitative evaluation of environmental and human health risk associated with the hydraulic fracturing activities based on the identification of complete exposure pathways and hazard identification.

The evaluation of exposure pathways includes both *subsurface* and *surface* processes. The principles for ecological and human health risk assessment consist of the following steps: issue identification, hazard (or toxicity) assessment, exposure assessment, and risk characterisation. Human health risk assessment is limited to assessment of effects on one receptor: *humans*. Ecological risk assessment is concerned with assessment of effects on the ecosystem (populations and communities) and therefore is not limited to one receptor. The guidance framework for ecological risk assessment in Australia is the “Guideline on Ecological Risk Assessment” (NEPM, Schedule B(5), 1999) which refers to draft guidance prepared by EPA Victoria (Gibson *et al.*, 1997). These guidance documents focus on risks to terrestrial environments although the overall approach for assessment or risk is the same. The risk assessment was undertaken in general accordance with these guidelines and national guidelines for risk assessment recommended by enHealth (enHealth-Environmental Health Risk Assessment, “Guidelines for Assessing Human Health Risks from Environmental Hazards”, June 2004).

If, in the future, conditions, hydraulic fracturing methodologies and/or regulatory requirements change, and/or additional exposure pathways to additional receiving environments are identified, further evaluation of the associated risks *may* be warranted.

1.3 Study Area

Santos’ Production Licences in SWQ cover an area of over 8,160 km². The development of petroleum fields in SWQ started in the early 1970s. Santos currently produces conventional gas and oil from approximately 191 gas wells and 230 oil wells in SWQ.

The land is generally characterised by low undulating topography (hills, ridges and valleys) between the various fluvial systems (e.g. the Cooper Creek; Figure 5). The areas occupied by these creek systems are regionally referred to as “Channel Country”, and consist of a system of braided or anastomosing channels and associated inter-channel areas and floodplains. Surrounding the floodplains are gravel plains, dunefields and low ranges. The area is sparsely developed, and generally comprises rural communities and homesteads that are largely engaged in pastoralism.

The Cooper Basin underlies, but is considered to be geologically separate from, the Eromanga Basin, which is the largest sub-basin within the Great Artesian Basin (GAB). Some of the sedimentary formations associated with the GAB are recognised as regionally significant aquifers (Figure 3). There are no outcrops of the GAB formations within the study area, which is overlain by quaternary alluvium. With a couple of localised exceptions, conventional gas is produced from formations within the Cooper Basin, at depths exceeding 2000 m, while oil is mainly produced from formations within the Eromanga Basin at depths of approximately 700 to 1,200 m below ground level.



Santos activities are described in the SWQ *Project Areas* Environmental Management Plans (Santos, 2011b,c,d) sourced from draft Project Area EAs. The summary information on activities and infrastructure reported below has been extracted from these environmental management plans.

As a summary, the SWQ study area includes a combination of gas and oil production, associated transport, storage and processing infrastructure and ongoing exploratory, appraisal and development drilling. The operations are grouped in “processing satellites” or centres where Santos has developed all the facilities necessary to the operations of the fields. Santos has developed the following infrastructure within the Cooper-Eromanga Basin as a whole (including that part which lies in South Australia):

- Approximately 33 Oil and Gas Processing Satellites, the main ones for SWQ are discussed in Section 1.3.1; and
- Approximately 191 producing gas wells and 230 producing oil wells in SWQ.

1.3.1 Oil and Gas Occurrences and Production

A consequence of the geological setting of the Cooper and Eromanga Basins is the location of gas fields within the centre of the basin system (covered in SWQ by the *Western Project Area*; Figure 2) and the oil fields mainly around the edges of the study area (covered in SWQ mainly by the *Central and Eastern Project Areas*).

The petroleum fields proposed for production, the corresponding lease areas and infrastructures are discussed in the following sections.

1.3.1.1 Target Gas Formations

Gas is primarily extracted from the formations of the Cooper Basin. The geology of the Cooper Basin is presented in Section 2.4.3.1. The main consequence of the geological setting is the very deep location of the target gas reservoirs at depths of 2,000 m or more. The gas fields are located in the centre of Santos tenements in SWQ and in SA (Figure 2).

The primary gas reservoirs (discussed in Section 2.4.3.4) targeted for hydraulic fracturing are sandstones within:

- The Paning and Doonmulla Members (Nappamerri Group);
- The Toolachee Formation (Gidgealpa Group);
- The Epsilon Formation (Gidgealpa Group); and
- The Patchawarra Formation (Gidgealpa Group).

These reservoirs are stacked porous sandstones, separated by coals and / or finer-grained siltstones mudstones (refer to detailed stratigraphy in Section 2.5.2). These impermeable layers are typically referred to as the seal or cap rock beds where they are located immediately above the reservoirs. The sandstone reservoirs often have low porosities and permeabilities (usually of the order of 1-10 milliDarcies), such that fracture-stimulation is essential in order to achieve economic flow-rates and production volumes.

In addition, other sediments may become targets for stimulation if encountered in future wells.

The *Project Area* and corresponding tenements for gas production are summarised in Table 2.



HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT SWQ

Table 2: SWQ Project – Gas Production Areas

SWQ Project Area	Petroleum Tenements	Approximate Area (km ²)
Western	Authority to Prospect (ATP)259P Petroleum Lease (PL)23, PL24, PL25, PL26, PL34, PL35, PL36, PL37, PL55, PL58, PL59, PL60, PL61, PL62, PL63, PL68, PL75, PL76, PL77, PL78, PL79, PL80, PL81, PL82, PL83, PL84, PL85, PL86, PL87, PL88, PL97, PL107, PL108, PL109, PL110, PL111, PL112, PL113, PL114, PL129, PL130, PL131, PL132, PL133, PL134, PL135, PL136, PL137, PL138, PL139, PL140, PL141, PL142, PL143, PL144, PL145, PL146, PL147, PL148, PL149, PL150, PL151, PL152, PL153, PL154, PL155, PL156, PL157, PL158, PL159, PL168, PL175, PL177, PL178, PL181, PL182, PL186, PL187, PL188, PL189, PL193, PL205, PL207, PL208, PL241, PL249, PL254, PL255, PL287 (formerly PL 105), PL288 (formerly PL106), PL301, PL302, PL409, PL410, PL411,	14, 850

* These fields include potential exploration wells

In addition, three tenements (ATP661P, ATP303P and ATP752P) have been considered; as these may become active at a later date. Operation of tenements is likely to change in the future and assessment of additional tenements will be considered prior to fracturing being undertaken following due consultation with DEHP and the Department of Natural Resources and Mines (DNRM).

1.3.1.2 Target Oil Formations

Oil is produced from sediments within the formations of the Eromanga Basin (part of the Great Artesian Basin), at depth of approximately 700 to 1,200 m below ground level. There are 230 producing oil wells within Santos tenements in SWQ.

The oil reservoirs (discussed in Section 2.4.3.4) targeted for hydraulic fracturing are:

- The Murta Formation (Upper Hooray Sandstone). Oil reservoirs are abundant in the Murta Formation (interbedded mudstones, siltstones and fine grained sandstones);
- The Birkhead Formation, comprising interbedded siltstone, mudstone and fine sandstone. Oil reservoirs are present mostly in the Lower Birkhead unit, scattered oil reservoirs also occur in the Middle Birkhead unit; and
- The Wyandra Sandstone Member (upper unit of the Cadna-Owie Formation), oil occurrence is less frequent.

Table 3 summarises the oil Production Areas and the corresponding lease areas currently proposed for hydraulic stimulation.

Table 3: SWQ Project – Oil Production Areas


SWQ Project Areas	Petroleum Tenements	Approximate Area (km2)
Central	ATP267P, PL33, PL50, PL51, PL244, PL245, PL117, ATP765P (under application), ATP766P (under application), ATP1063P (under application), ATP1174P (under application)	6,794
Eastern	ATP 299P PL29, PL38, PL39, PL52, PL57, PL95, PL169, PL170, PL293,	1,319



HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT SWQ

SWQ Project Areas	Petroleum Tenements	Approximate Area (km2)
	PL294, PL295, PL298	


In addition, two tenements (ATP636P and ATP820P) have been considered; as these may become active at a later date. Operation of tenements is likely to change in the future and assessment of additional tenements will be considered prior to fracturing being undertaken following due consultation with DEHP and DNRM.



SWQ HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT

SANTOS

LOCATION OF THE GREAT ARTESIAN BASIN



NOTES

1. Map produced by Environment Resources Information Network (ERIN) Australian Government, Department of the Environment and Water Resources 07 May 2007
2. Golder Associates 2012a Cooper Basin UWIR Report

FIGURE 3





1.4 Comparison of Conventional Oil and Gas Operations to Coal Seam Gas Operations

HFRA reports have previously been prepared to address hydraulic fracturing activities related to Santos' coal seam gas (CSG) developments as part of the Gladstone Liquefied Natural Gas (GLNG) Project. There are key differences between CSG and conventional oil and gas production, both in the geological setting of the resource and the methodology for access, that have a substantial bearing on the risk profile presented by fracturing activities.

Santos' conventional oil and gas operations in SWQ are located in an arid, sparsely populated area of central Australia. Whilst groundwater is an important water supply to support the rural land uses, the extent of water supply development of the productive aquifers is limited (commensurate with the low population base), and is almost entirely within the upper sedimentary formations of the Eromanga Basin. The lateral equivalents of the GAB aquifers in Eastern Queensland that support substantial beneficial uses have little or no water supply development in the study area.

The nature of the hydrocarbon resources in SWQ is also fundamentally different from CSG targets. Conventional oil and gas reservoirs are formed when hydrocarbons in a porous (typically sandstone) formation are "trapped" and accumulate as a result of encountering a low permeability sedimentary or structural "seal". In Santos' SWQ operations, the hydrocarbon reservoirs generally occur in anticlines capped with thick, laterally-extensive low permeability formations that isolate the reservoirs from overlying water-bearing formations. The nature of the geological and hydrogeological setting provides for substantial separation of fracturing and production activities from the shallower groundwater resources that support the majority of water supply development in the region. There is also no requirement to remove formation water in order to facilitate gas flow, with the possible exception of well blow downs on a case by case frequency. In addition, the oil and gas reservoirs in the SWQ study area are very deep, in the order of 1500 to 3000 m bgl, which provides hundreds to over a thousand metres vertical separation between the formations in which fracturing activities are proposed and the shallow aquifers that provide the majority of private groundwater supply.

Hence, the combination of the remote project location, sparse local population density (and limited water supply development), different production methods and the substantial vertical separation of oil and gas reservoirs from primary groundwater supply aquifers results in an inherently low risk profile with regard to fracturing activities.

1.5 Limitations

Your attention is drawn to the document - "Limitations", which is included in APPENDIX B of this report. The statements presented in this document are intended to advise you of what your realistic expectations of this report should be. The document is not intended to reduce the level of responsibility accepted by Golder, but rather to ensure that all parties who may rely on this report are aware of the responsibilities each assumes in so doing.



2.0 SITE SETTING AND ISSUE IDENTIFICATION

The description of the site setting and issue identification is covered under the following headings:

- Description of the climate in SWQ;
- Description of the topography;
- Description of the hydrology;
- Description of the continental geological setting and basin stress regime;
- Description of the regional geology and stratigraphy of the GAB;
- Description of the local geology and oil and gas field models;
- Seismic history of the region;
- Description of the GAB hydrogeological setting and hydrostratigraphy;
- Description of the hydrogeological context of oil and gas production;
- Groundwater quality and use in the study area;
- Environmental values of groundwater and surface water in the study area, which comprise the potential receptors considered in the exposure analysis for fracturing activities; and
- Proximity of overlying and underlying aquifers to the target oil or gas formations, and proximity of surface operations to sensitive receptors.

2.1 Climate

The Cooper Basin of SWQ is an arid to semi-arid region of central Australia where the average rainfall is low (<300 mm per year), and is significantly exceeded by the pan evaporation potential (approximately 3000 mm per year). The seasons are generally characterised by hot summers with significant thunderstorm activity and mild dry winters. December to February are the wettest and hottest months where temperatures generally exceed 35°C. The Bureau of Meteorology (BOM) provides monthly average data for temperature and rainfall for anywhere in Australia. For more detailed description please refer to <http://www.bom.gov.au/>.

Table 4 and Figure 4 present the average minimum and maximum monthly temperatures, the average monthly total rainfall and evaporation for the study area collected from Windorah Post Office, the closest station to Durham. These data are averages for number of years. Annual average values are presented for temperature while average annual total amount of rainfall and evaporation are presented in the same table. Maximum values are in red and minimum values in blue.

Table 4: Mean Climate Characteristics within the Cooper Basin Operations Area - Windorah Station

Mean	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Annual	Years
Temp (°C) - Max	38.1	36.6	34.5	30.2	25.3	21.7	21.4	24.1	28.4	32.5	35.4	37.8	30.5	1931-2012
Temp (°C) - Min	24.1	23.5	21.1	16.0	11.3	7.6	6.6	8.1	12.1	16.5	19.9	22.5	15.8	1931-2012
Rainfall (mm)	42.9	49.2	43.3	19.7	18.8	16.5	15.0	9.8	10.6	17.7	22.3	30.7	297	1887-2012
Evaporation (mm) *	372	319	291	216	149	108	115	161	222	298	339	388	2980	1969-2012

* Estimated from the average *daily* pan evaporation as reported by BOM.




Figure 4: Rainfall and Temperature Diagram - Monthly Averages from 1931-2012 for Windorah Station
Source: BOM, 2012

2.2 Topography

The study area is situated across a large, relatively flat drainage area of the Cooper Creek river system referred to as the 'Channel Country' of far south-western Queensland (extending into South Australia).

The topography of the study area comprises low undulating hills and ridges between the drainage channel systems. The Channel Country is characterised by extensive alluvial plains with braided channel networks of the Diamantina and Coopers Plains. Surrounding the floodplains are gravel or gibber plains, dune fields and low ranges. The low resistant hills and tablelands present in the study area are remnants of the flat-lying Cretaceous (65 to 140 million years ago) sediments.

The drainage system of the study area is dominated by the Cooper Creek Basin and is discussed further in Section 2.3.

2.3 Surface Water

The surface water drainage system within the study area (Figure 5) is dominated by Cooper Creek Basin, which drains southwest towards Lake Eyre. This Basin comprises almost a quarter of the overall Lake Eyre Basin catchment. During periods of monsoonal rainfall in its headwaters, the flat topography and drainage channel system forms a large floodplain. The surface water flow bottlenecks where Cooper Creek crosses the Queensland-South Australia border.


Cooper Creek is an internal (i.e. no outlet to the ocean) ephemeral river of 1,500 km in length and covering a catchment area of 306,000 km². Water flows vary greatly over time and are predominantly controlled by the occurrence of monsoonal rains in the headwaters of the Cooper Creek drainage system (Kotwicki and Allen, 1998).

Generally, Cooper Creek stream flows are confined to the main channels, but every three to four years flows are sufficient to inundate parts of the Cooper Creek floodplain, via a network of tributary channels. The cyclic nature of flows in Cooper Creek has been reported to correlate with La Nina events, which result in monsoon rains penetrating further into inland Australia (Kotwicki and Allen, 1998). During extended periods of no flow, the Cooper Creek drainage contracts to a series of disconnected, semi-permanent waterholes that form in deeper portions of the river channels, which provide drought refuges for a variety of flora and fauna. The latest large flood event was observed in early to mid 2010 (Figure 6).



Within the study area (largely confined to the Cooper Creek catchment basin), there are also intermittent surface water flows following storm events that cause ponding of surface water on interdune clay pans, predominantly in the dunefield regions and other areas.

There are only a handful of major water storages in the Cooper Creek Basin, with no in-stream dams. There are a number of small weirs for stock and domestic purposes, and a limited number of larger weirs that are mainly used for town water supply including at the northern margin of the study area at Wombunderry. Waterholes are the biggest storages in the basin with some entitlements to divert water to off-stream storages for domestic use. There is no supplemented water supply scheme in the Cooper Creek Basin.



SWQ HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT

SANTOS

TOPOGRAPHY AND DRAINAGE OF THE STUDY AREA

COPYRIGHT

1. Base information copyright MapInfo Australia Pty Ltd
2. ATP/PL tenure supplied by Santos, August 2011
3. Golder Associates 2012a Cooper Basin UWIR Report
4. SRTM - NGA and NASA



LEGEND

- Town/Locality
- Highway/Major Road
- River/Creek
- Tenements within the Santos Project Area
- Study Area
- Groundwater Management Area





FIGURE 5





SWQ HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT

SANTOS

STUDY AREA DURING A FLOOD EVENT (2010)

COPYRIGHT

1. Base information copyright MapInfo Australia Pty Ltd
2. ATP/PL tenure supplied by Santos, August 2011
3. Flood extents provided by Santos, 2011
4. Golder Associates 2012a Cooper Basin UWIR Report



LEGEND

- Town/Locality
- Railway
- Highway/Major Road
- River/Creek
- Tenements within the Santos Project Area
- Study Area
- Flood Area 2010 Extent
- Groundwater Management Area

0 5 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 Kilometres
SCALE (at A4) 1:2,500,000
Coordinate System: GCS GDA 1994

PROJECT: 127666004
DATE: 19/12/2012
DRAWN: FA
CHECKED: RS

FIGURE 6





2.4 Geological Setting

2.4.1 Continental Setting

The study area is located in the south-western portion of the Great Artesian Basin (GAB). The GAB is a hydrogeological basin that underlies approximately one fifth of the Australian continental area and extends beneath a large portion of Queensland, South Australia, New South Wales and the Northern Territory; stretching between the Great Dividing Range to the Lake Eyre depression (Figure 3). The GAB consists of three large sedimentary basins (the Eromanga, Carpinteria and Surat Basins), comprising layered sedimentary sequences up to 3,000 m thick in the deepest portions of the basin. The sub-basins of the GAB unconformably overlay a number of older depositional basins including the Cooper Basin in SWQ (Figure 7).

It has been an historical convention in Queensland's groundwater management framework to include the upper sedimentary sequences of certain older basins underlying the GAB (specifically, the Bowen, Galilee and Cooper Basins) in the broader definition of the GAB groundwater resource. Whilst this convention was adopted for administrative convenience, in a strict geological sense these basins are considered to be distinct and separate from the sub-basins of the GAB.

2.4.2 Regional Geological Setting


The study area is situated over portions of the Eromanga and Cooper Basins in SWQ. The geology within the study area includes a late Carboniferous to Triassic age sequence of interbedded sandstones, coals and siltstones associated with the Cooper Basin, which is unconformably overlain by the Jurassic to Cretaceous sedimentary deposits of the Eromanga Basin (Figure 7).

The Eromanga Basin is the largest of the main sub-basins of the GAB. It contains two major centres of basin subsidence: the Central Eromanga depositional centre and the Poolowanna Trough separated by the Birdsville Track Ridge (Figure 7).

The Cooper Basin is entirely buried below the Eromanga Basin and they are vertically separated by a major unnamed unconformity. Although considered structurally separate sedimentary depositional centres, they are stratigraphically and, to a very limited extent, hydraulically connected. Formations of the Cooper Basin and the GAB have varying nomenclature in stratigraphic successions from one area to another. Habermehl (1986) and others have tried to provide basin-wide correlations between nomenclatures for the GAB. This section adopts the geological nomenclature defined for SWQ by Draper (2002, Figure 8). Reference to "equivalent naming" is required in order to link with the nomenclature used in the QLD GAB regulation.

At the surface, the regional geological maps indicate a predominance of consolidated sediments of the Glendower Formation (Tertiary) or Winton Formation (Cretaceous) on the higher ground structures and also Quaternary alluvial deposits (Figure 9) associated with the Cooper Creek flood plains. The Quaternary surface sedimentation of the Cooper Creek catchment was described by Nanson et al. (2008) as comprising extensive late Quaternary fluvial and aeolian deposits, overlain by thick floodplain and channel mud deposits.

The general stratigraphic sequence for the study area is presented in Table 5.



SWQ HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT

SANTOS

GAB STRUCTURAL GEOLOGY OF THE STUDY AREA

COPYRIGHT

1. Base information copyright MapInfo Australia Pty Ltd
2. ATP/PL tenure supplied by Santos, August 2011
3. Structural geology of GAB, DERM
4. Structural elements of the Cooper and Eromanga Basins digitised from Lowe Young et al 1997
5. Golder Associates 2012a Cooper Basin UWIR Report



LEGEND

- Town/Locality
- Highway/Major Road
- Birdsville Ridge (Approximate Location)
- Structural Trend
- River/Creek
- Geological/Structural Trough
- Tenements within the Santos Project Area
- Study Area
- Cooper Basin
- Barrolka Trough
- Bowen Basin
- Eromanga Basin
- Surat Basin

0 25 50 100 150 200 250 Kilometres
SCALE (at A3) 1:6,500,000
Coordinate System: GCS GDA 1994

PROJECT: 127666004
DATE: 19/12/2012
DRAWN: FA
CHECKED: RS

FIGURE 7



Table 5. Stratigraphic Sequence for the Study Area


WRP Management Units		Litho-stratigraphy					Geological Age	Thickness*****	Santos Current Production Reservoir (oil & Gas)	Hydrogeological Characteristics		
Central GMA16	Warrego West GMA 17	Unit name	Sub-unit	Equivalent Formation in other parts of the GAB **	Deposits environment *	Lithology Description*****						
		Whitula Formation			Fluvial to lacustrine	Interbedded sandstone, siltstone, mudstone and claystone	Tertiary	Maximum of 160 m, confined to downwards	No			
		Marion Formation			Fluvial deposits	Sandstone and quartz pebble conglomerate. Some clasts, silicification		About 8 m, limited geographical extend	No			
		Glendower Formation			Fluvial deposits	Sandstone, silty siltstone, conglomerate and minor mudstone		in QLD, 70 m in average, maximum 145 m ***	No	Aquifer		
		E r o m a n g a B a s i n	Winton Formation			Terrestrial deposition environment. Fluvio-lacustrine.	Cretaceous	Over 400 m in the Cooper region, maximum thickness of 1100 m in the northern Patchawarra Trough	No	Aquifer (possibly limited)		
			Mackunda Formation			Marine environment		Interbedded, partly calcareous very fine-grained sandstone, siltstone and shale in the basin center.	60–120 m thick in the Cooper region	No	Aquifer	
			Allaru Mudstone			Low-energy, shallow marine environment		Mudstone with thin calcareous siltstone and minor thin, very fine-grained sandstone interbeds	From 100 to over 300 m thick, generally being over 200 m in QLD, thinner in outcrop areas.	No	Water bearing	
Central 1	Warrego West 1		Toolebuc Formation		Surat Siltstone	Marine environment		Mudstone	in QLD, 20-45 m thick	No	Confining bed	
			Wallumbilla Formation	Upper Wallumbilla	Coreena Member	Marine environment		Mudstone and siltstone with minor interbeds of fine grained sandstone	in QLD, 200 to over 350 m thick	No	Aquifer	
Lower Wallumbilla	Doncaster Member											
Central 2	Warrego West 2		Cadna-owie Formation	Upper Cadna-owie including the Wyandra Sandstone Member	Cadna-owie Formation, Bungil Formation, Gilbert River Formation	Lowstand system infilling fluvial channels then transgressive systems		Medium to coarse-grained, quartzose to labile sandstone with scattered pebbles	Mainly 60-90 m in QLD. Wyandra Sandstone Member from 3 to 18 m in Queensland. Lower Cadna-owie Formation typically 10–20 m thick around the basin margin, increasing to 75–100 m in the deeper parts of the basin. Maximum thickness of >115 m in the Nappamerri Trough.	Oil (not frequent)	Aquifer	
				Lower Cadna-owie		Transition from terrestrial to marine deposition environment		Siltstone with very fine to fine-grained sandstone interbeds and minor carbonaceous claystone. Pebbly layers, diamictites and coarse breccia layers occur around the basin margin.		No	Confining bed	
Central 3	Warrego West 3		Hooray Sandstone	Murta Formation (including the McKinlay Member)	Hooray Sandstone, Mooga Sandstone, Orallo Formation and Gubberamunda Sandstone	Meandering fluvial, floodplain and lacustrine environment		Thinly interbedded siltstone, shale, very fine to fine-grained sandstone and minor medium and coarse-grained sandstone. A basal siltstone is widespread in the Cooper region.	in QLD, typically between 60-85 m thick	Oil, some gas (not frequent)	Aquifer	
				Upper Namur Sandstone		Meandering braided fluvial systems		Fine to coarse-grained sandstone with minor interbedded siltstone and mudstone. The basal Namur Sandstone, like the Adori Sandstone, has been strongly cemented with diagenetic calcite in places.	in QLD, 50 to 70 m thick in average however can be less or thicker.	Oil (not frequent)		
Central 4	Warrego West 4	Westbourne Formation		Injune Creek Group	Lacustrine deposits (transgression)	Interbedded dark grey shale and siltstone with minor sandstone interbeds	Jurassic	In QLD, 70 to 140 m thick in the Cooper region	Oil (not frequent)	Confining bed		
		Adori Sandstone			Amalgamated braided fluvial sandstone deposited in lowstand system tract.	Well-sorted, subrounded, cross-bedded, fine to coarse-grained sandstone. Calcite cemented zones up to 45 m thick are developed locally in the basal Adori and Namur Sandstones		20 to 130 m thick in the Cooper region (maximum 55 m in QLD)	Oil (not frequent)	Aquifer		
		Birkhead Formation	Upper Birkhead		Meandering to lacustral deposition. Birkhead "lake", largest transgression of the Eromanga Basin.	Interbedded siltstone, mudstone and fine to medium grained sandstone with thin, lenticular coal seams (<0.3 m thick)		in QLD 40-100 m thick, maximum of 110 m. A maximum thickness of >150 m occurs in the Patchawarra and Nappamerri Troughs	oil - Basal Birkhead and Middle Birkhead (scattered)	Water bearing		
Middle Birkhead												
		Lower Birkhead										
Central 5	Warrego West 5	Hutton Sandstone			Erosion then lowstand system	Fine to coarse-grained quartzose sandstone with minor siltstone interbeds		in QLD, 90-210 m thick, maximum of 244 m.	Oil, some gas (not frequent) - mostly in upper part	Aquifer		
Central 6	Warrego West 6	Poolowanna Formation	Upper Poolowanna	Precipice Sandstone	Transgression to highstand systems	Interbedded siltstone, sandstone and rare coal seams. Sandstone beds range from very fine to medium grained, and contain minor pebbles and granules of quartzite and reworked basement.		in QLD, maximum of 165 m		Aquifer		
			Lower Poolowanna		Lowstand (fluvial) and early transgressive system				Oil (not frequent)			
		Cuddapan Formation			High sinuosity fluvial and coal swamp development	Sublabile to quartzose sandstone in lower part, with interbedded siltstone, mudstone and coal in upper part	Triassic	in QLD, mainly 20 m to over 50 m. Restricted geographically.				
MAJOR UNCONFORMITY		MAJOR UNCONFORMITY										
Central 7	Warrego West 7	C o o p e r B a s i n	Nappamerri Group	Tinchoo Formation	Gilpeppee Member	Moolayember Formation		Interbedded dense siltstones and light grey sandstone	Triassic	in QLD, from 125 - 200 m thick, maximum of 260 m. The Gilpeppee Member is generally 45 to 90 m thick.	Gas (not frequent)	Confining bed
					Doonmulla Member			Uniform dense siltstone, with minor coal seams (Gilpeppee Member) and intraclast conglomerate				
Arraburry Formation	Wimma Sandstone Member			Clematis Sandstone	Fine grained quartzose sandstone with minor interbeds of siltstone and mudstone.	Maximum total thickness of 400 m in the Patchawarra Trough. Callamura Member: up to 150 m and more. Panning Member: up to 200 m and more. Wimma Sandstone: 115 m maximum	Gas (not frequent)	Aquifer				
	Paning Member			Rewan Formation	Upward-fining cycles of fine to medium-grained sandstone grading into siliceous mudstone and siltstone units.					Oil (not frequent)	Confining bed	
			Callamurra Member			Siltstone and mudstone, minor sandstone interbeds (Early Triassic).Siderite and cements have formed in siltstone and sandstone beds.			Confining bed			
			Toolachee Formation			Channels deposits	Permian	Up to 190 m	Gas	Aquifer		
			Daralingie Formation			Siltstone and mudstone with interbedded fine to very fine-grained sandstone. Minor coal seams and carbonaceous partings and streaks occur.		in QLD, mostly 15-30 m thick, up to 96 m in Nappamerri Trough		Confining bed		
			Roseneath Shale			Lacustrine deposits		Siltstone, mudstone and minor sandstone.	Up to 100 m, generally 50-80 m thick in QLD		Confining bed	
			Epsilon Formation			Deltaic deposits		Thinly bedded, fine to medium-grained sandstone with carbonaceous siltstone and shale, and thin to occasionally thick (<2-20 m) coal seams.	Maximum thickness of 156 m in the Nappamerri Trough. Mostly over 60 m. Approx. 30-40 m within the lease	Gas	Aquifer	
			Murteree Shale			Mainly lacustrine	Argillaceous siltstone and fine-grained sandstone.	In QLD, mostly less than 50 m thick.		Confining bed		
		Patchawarra Formation			Individual and stacked channels	Interbedded fine to medium-grained, locally coarse-grained and pebbly sandstone, siltstone, shale and coal.	50 to 150 m with up to 550 m in QLD	Gas	Aquifer			
		Tirrawarra Sandstone			Braided channel deposits	Fine to coarse-grained and pebbly sandstone with locally common interbeds of conglomerate and minor interbeds of carbonaceous siltstone, shale and coal.	30-40 m range in QLD, maximum 75 m total thickness	Gas (not frequent)	Aquifer			
		Merrimelia Formation			Glacial sediments deposits, deep glacio-lacustrine sediments	Conglomerate, sandstone, conglomeratic mudstone, siltstone and shale	Late Carboniferous to Early Permian	Maximum 84 m in QLD		Water bearing		


Data sources:
* : Petroleum Geology of South Australia, Volume 2 and 4, http://www.pir.sa.gov.au/petroleum/access_to_data/petroleum_publications/petroleum_geology_of_south_australia
** : GAB WRP, 2007
*** : Australian Stratigraphy Database
**** : Geology of the Cooper and Eromanga Basins, QLD, Draper, 2002



HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT SWQ

Figure 8: Chronology and Stratigraphy of the Cooper and Eromanga Basins (Queensland and South Australia)
Source: Draper, 2002





SWQ HYDRAULIC FRACTURING
RISK ASSESSMENT

SANTOS

SURFACE GEOLOGY


COPYRIGHT

- 1. Base map data copyright MapInfo Australia Pty Ltd
- 2. Geology supplied by the State of Queensland (Department of Mines and Energy), 2007
- 3. Tenure boundaries supplied by Santos, August 2011
- 4. Golder Associates 2012a Cooper Basin UWIR Report



LEGEND

- Study Area
- Town
- Tenements within the Santos Project Area
- Qa-CER
- Q-CER
- Glendower Formation
- Winton Formation
- Mackunda Formation
- Doncaster Member



SCALE (at A3) 1:1,500,000
Coordinate System: GCS GDA 1994

PROJECT: 127666004
DATE: 19/12/2012
DRAWN: FA
CHECKED: RS

FIGURE 9





2.4.3 Local Geological Setting and Petroleum Field Models

The following sections provide a summary of the Cooper Basin and Eromanga Basin geological settings. An overview of the stratigraphy and lithology for the study area is provided in Table 5. Figure 8 provides information on the continuity of the deposition process, and the discontinuities or major unconformities present in the stratigraphic sequence.

2.4.3.1 Cooper Basin Geological Setting and Model

The Cooper Basin comprises a thick late Carboniferous to middle or late Triassic non-marine sedimentary stratigraphic succession within a broad basin shaped setting in the interior of central Australia.

Structurally, the Cooper Basin is one of a number of remnant late Carboniferous to early Permian depositional centres which lay in the Australian interior of the Gondwana Supercontinent. The Cooper Basin differs from the smaller depositional centres by containing an additional sequence that ranges in age from late Permian to middle Triassic and spans the Permo-Triassic boundary without a break in deposition. It also differs as being the only such basin with major oil and gas production (Petroleum Geology of South Australia, Volume 4 - Cooper Basin, PIRSA, 1998). Three major troughs (Patchawarra, Nappamerri and Tanapperra) are identified within the basin, each separated by structurally high ridges.

The Cooper Basin depositional episode was terminated by a period of gentle regional compressional deformation resulting in landmass uplift and sustained erosion within the basin. Sedimentary basin development re-initiated subsequently with the formation of the Eromanga Basin (Section 2.4.3.2) during the Early Jurassic to Late Cretaceous times.

The Cooper Basin contains a succession of fluvio-lacustrine sandstone, shales and coals to a thickness of up to 1,800 m to the south and thinner in the north (up to 600 m thick). The target gas formations in the Cooper Basin lie at depths of 1,500 mbgl to greater than 2,000 mbgl.

The Cooper Basin is subdivided in two major geological groups: the late Carboniferous and Permian Gidgealpa Group and the Triassic Nappamerri Group. The earliest sediments within the Cooper Basin were of glacial origin. The subsequent formations generally consist of interbedded sandstone, coal and shale formations. The Tirrawarra Sandstone represents low sinuosity fluvial to glacial outwash deposits overlain by peat swamp, floodplain and high sinuosity fluvial facies of the Patchawarra Formation. Two lacustrine shale units (Murteree and Roseneath Shales) with intervening fluvio-deltaic sediments (Epsilon and Daralingie Formations) were deposited during a phase of continued subsidence. Early Permian uplift led to erosion of the Daralingie Formation and underlying units from basement highs (SA DPI, 1998).

The upper sequence of the Cooper Basin, the Gilpeppie Member of the Tinchoo Formation is dominated by siltstones and shales. Draper (2002) has mapped the thickness of shales of the Tinchoo Formation in SWQ. The mudstone (both shale and siltstone) thickness ranges from 80 to 160 m in the centre of the Cooper Basin with a maximum thickness of 182 m.

The Tirrawarra Sandstone, Patchawarra Formation, Epsilon Formation and Toolachee Formation (Table 5) are the main gas producers of the Cooper Basin. Minor gas reservoirs are also present in the Tirrawarra Sandstone, the Wimma Sandstone Member of the Arraburry Formation and the Tinchoo Formation. Some oil reservoirs are present in the Panning Member of the Arraburry Formation.

Geological contour maps illustrating the top and thickness of the following formations can be found in APPENDIX C (sourced from UWIR Report, Golder, 2012a). These maps include:

- Depth to the Toolachee Formation
- Depth to the Patchawarra Formation
- Thickness of the Patchawarra Formation
- Thickness of the Toolachee Formation



- Thickness of the shale within the Nappamerri Group.

2.4.3.2 Eromanga Basin Geological Setting and Model

The Jurassic to Cretaceous Eromanga Basin unconformably overlies the older Carboniferous to Permian Cooper Basin. The sedimentary sequences of the Eromanga Basin reach a thickness of up to 2,500 m and were deposited during a period of subsidence subsequent to that of the Cooper Basin. There are two main sub-basin centres in the Eromanga Basin: the *Central Eromanga Depositional centre* and the *Poolowanna Trough* to the west separated by the Birdsville Track Ridge (Figure 7). The top of the Eromanga Basin is also delimited by an unconformity.

The study area for this project is located in the *Central Eromanga Basin*.

The deposits of the Eromanga Basin follow three episodes (and three different origins) of deposition:

- Lower non-marine sediments from early Jurassic to Mid-Cretaceous corresponding to the Poolowanna Formation to the Cadna-Owie Formation. During that period the largest transgression over the Eromanga Basin was the “Birkhead Lake” transgression;
- Marine sediments from mid-Cretaceous to late Cretaceous corresponding to the Wallumbilla Formation to the Mackunda Formation; and
- Upper non marine sediments (fluviolacustrine) of the Winton Formation.

The formations of the Eromanga Basin are a succession of well-defined sandstones, siltstones and mudstones with interbedded minor sandstones and occasional coal seams, as shown in Table 5. The formations of the Eromanga Basin often have an equivalent throughout the GAB. The nomenclature adopted in this section is the SWQ nomenclature as illustrated in Figure 8.

The target oil formations of the Eromanga Basin lie at depths ranging from 700 to 1,200 mbgl.

Geological contour maps for the following formations can be found in APPENDIX C (sourced from UWIR Report, Golder, 2012a):

- Depth to the Winton Formation;
- Depth to the Cadna-Owie Formation;
- Depth to the Hooray Sandstone;
- Depth to the Hutton Formation;
- Depth to the Poolowanna Formation;
- Thickness of the Cadna-Owie Formation ;
- Thickness of the Hooray Sandstone;
- Thickness of the Hutton Sandstone; and
- Thickness of the Poolowanna Formation.

2.4.3.3 Conceptual Geological Cross Sections

A schematic geological cross-section across the Eromanga Basin is presented in Figure 10. The “A-B” section cuts across the main depositional centre of the basin in SWQ. This corresponds to the general location of the study area. As displayed, the upper formations of the Eromanga Basin (from Cadna-Owie and Hooray Sandstone and younger) are continuous across the Basin. Older formations are restricted to areas within sub-basins (these formations or their equivalent may be present in several basins).






Abbreviations commonly used by Santos as stratigraphy markers or reservoir markers, and used in some of the geological figures are summarised in Table 6.

Table 6: Geological Abbreviations for Stratigraphical Markers

Name of Marker	Definition
'C' Horizon	Top Cadna-Owie
'E' Horizon	Top Birkhead Formation
'H' Horizon	Top Hutton Sandstone
'L*' Horizon	Basal Eromanga Unconformity
'PC00' Horizon	Top Toolachee Formation (chrono-marker)
'PU-70' Horizon	Basal Toolachee Formation (chrono-marker and un-named Unconformity)
'VC00' Horizon	Top Patchawarra Formation (chrono-marker)
'VC50' Horizon	Lower Patchawarra Formation (chrono-marker)
'VCxx' - Horizon	Chrono-stratigraphic marker within the Patchawarra Formation
'ZU00' Horizon	Top Pre-Permian (Basement)

A geological conceptual cross section across both the Cooper and Eromanga Basins has been generated in a SW to NE axis across the study area passing through the Barrolka fields (Barrolka Trough). The conceptual geological cross-section is presented in Figure 11.



SWQ HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT

SANTOS

GEOLOGICAL SCHEMATIC CROSS SECTION ACROSS THE GAB EROMANGA BASIN

PROJECT: 127666004
DATE: 19/12/2012
DRAWN: FA
CHECKED: RS

FIGURE 10


COPYRIGHT

- Figure taken from Hydrochemistry and Implied Hydrodynamics of the Cadna-Owie-Hooray Aquifer Great Artesian Basin – BRS, 2000
- Golder Associates 2012a Cooper Basin UWIR Report



Information contained on this drawing is the copyright of Golder Associates Pty. Ltd. Unauthorised use or reproduction of this plan either wholly or in part without written permission infringes copyright. © Golder Associates Pty. Ltd.


Metres



SWQ HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT


SANTOS

GEOLOGICAL CONCEPTUAL CROSS SECTION ACROSS THE STUDY AREA



LEGEND

Litho-stratigraphy			
	Unit name	Sub-unit	
	Tertiary sediments		
Eromanga Basin	Winton Formation		
	Mackunda Formation		
	Allaru Mudstone		
	Toolebuc Formation		
	Wallumbilla Formation	Coreena Member Doncaster Member	
	Cadna-Owie Formation	Wyandra Sandstone member Lower Cadna-Owie	
	Hooray Sandstone	Murta Formation McKinlay Member Namur Sandstone	
	Westbourne Formation		
	Adori Sandstone		
	Birkhead Formation	Upper Birkhead Middle Birkhead Lower Birkhead	
Bass Strait	Hutton Sandstone		
	Poolowanna Formation	Upper Poolowanna Lower Poolowanna	
Cooper Basin	Nappamerri Group	Tinchoo Formation	Gilpepee Shale Doonmulla Member
		Arraburay Formation	Wimma Sandstone Member Panning Member Callamurra Member
			Toolachee Formation
	Gidgealpa Group	Daralingie Formation	
		Roseneath Shale	
		Epsilon Formation	
		Murteree Shale	
		Patchawarra Formation	
		Tirrawarra Sandstone	
		Merrimelia Formation	



Vertical Exaggeration 1:50
PROJECT: 127666004
DATE: 19/12/2012
DRAWN: FA
CHECKED: RS

FIGURE 11





2.4.3.4 Primary Oil and Gas Producing Reservoirs

Oil and gas production in the study area targets sandstone reservoirs in both the Cooper and Eromanga Basins. Conventional gas reservoirs are predominantly present within the Cooper Basin sequence, whereas oil reservoirs present in the Eromanga Basin. The production of oil or gas is related to its deposition (sedimentological and lithological), hydrocarbon maturation (i.e. paleontological and age related) and charge.

Several types of reservoirs can form depending on the “trapping” mechanism for the hydrocarbons (Figure 12). The trapping mechanisms prevent further migration, and result in accumulation, of the hydrocarbon fluids in the sandstone reservoir. The hydrocarbon reservoir trapping mechanisms relevant to the Cooper and Eromanga Basins are shown in Figure 13.




Figure 12: Hydrocarbon 'Traps' Geological Settings




Figure 13: Petroleum Reservoirs Trapping Mechanisms of the Cooper and Eromanga Basins
Source: SA DPI, 1998.



Cooper Basin

Anticlinal and faulted anticlinal traps have been identified as proven exploration targets in the Cooper Basin. The reservoir formations are capped by a series of fine-grained, laterally extensive seals. The predominantly fine-grained formations of the Nappamerri Group act as a regional seal to the Cooper Basin, providing several hundred metres of vertical separation between the primary gas reservoirs of the Cooper Basin and the overlying Eromanga Basin. Deeper in the basin, the Roseneath Shale acts as a regional top seal for the reservoir sands in the Epsilon Formation and the Murteree Shale seals hydrocarbon reservoirs in the Patchawarra Formation. These formations also provide effective barriers to prevent vertical migration of hydraulic fracturing fluids during fracture stimulation treatments of Cooper Basin reservoir formations.

The reservoir formations of interest for Santos in the Cooper Basin (from deepest) include:

- The *Tirrawarra Sandstone* comprises fine to coarse-grained and pebbly sandstone with locally common interbeds of conglomerate and minor interbeds of carbonaceous siltstone, shale and coal. The Tirrawarra Sandstone is 30 to 40 m thick on average in the study area.
- The *Patchawarra Formation* comprises predominantly sandstone beds interbedded with siltstone, shale and coals. The Patchawarra Formation is thickest (up to 680 m) in the Nappamerri Trough, with an estimated maximum thickness of 550 m in the study area (Figure 7).
- The *Epsilon Formation* comprises a series of sandstones, siltstones and shales with minor coals. The maximum reported formation thickness (156 m) occurs in the Nappamerri Trough, however in the study area, the thickness typically ranges from 30 to 40 m.
- The *Toolachee Formation* consists of sandstones, siltstones and shale with thin coal seams and some conglomerates. In the study area the thickness is typically of the order of 25 to 50 m (Draper, 2002).
- Minor oil and gas reservoirs occur in sand units of the Nappamerri Group, but due to its predominantly fine-grained texture (mudstone and shale) it acts as a thick, regional seal to the reservoirs of the Cooper Basin (PIRSA, 1998).

Stimulation events related to gas production in the study area from 2012 to 2016 are planned for the deeper Patchawarra Formation, the Toolachee Formation, and to a lesser extent in formations within the Nappamerri Group.

Eromanga Basin

Trapping mechanisms in the Eromanga Basin are predominantly structural with a stratigraphic component (e.g. Hutton–Birkhead transition, Poolowanna facies, McKinlay Member and Murta Formation). Seals consist of intraformational siltstones and shales of the Poolowanna, Birkhead and Murta Formations. Where these units are absent, potential seals higher in the sequence include the Bulldog Shale and Wallumbilla Formation (SA DPI, 1998).

The reservoir formations of interest for Santos in the Eromanga Basin are (from deepest):

- The *Hutton* and *Poolowanna Formations* are major sandstone formations of the GAB. In the study area, the Hutton Formation is typically 90 to 210 m thick, and the Poolowanna Formation is up to 165 m thick;
- The *Westbourne Formation*, *Adori Sandstone* and *Birkhead Formation*: This group is dominated by shale and mudstone beds with thicknesses up to 140 m for the Westbourne Formation and 110 m for the Birkhead Formation in the study area. Interbedded sandstone layers within the Birkhead Formation comprise the primary oil targets. The Adori Sandstone contains the main sandstone beds of the group and is up to 55 m thick in the study area, and is reported to have a thick calcite-cemented zones (up to 45 m) developed in the base of the unit; and



- The *Cadna-Owie* and *Hooray Formations* consist of permeable sand units interbedded with siltstone, mudstone and shale that form intra-formational seals for hydrocarbon reservoirs. The basal unit of the Hooray Sandstone (the Namur Sandstone) is also strongly cemented.


Stimulation events related to oil production in the study area from 2012 to 2016 are planned (or possible) for: the Murta Formation in the upper Hooray Sandstone, the Middle Birkhead Formation and the Wyandra Sandstone of the upper Cadna-Owie Formation.

2.4.3.5 *Faults and Other Geological Controls*

The structural framework of the Cooper Basin, particularly with regard to faulting is complex in the study area. Santos has undertaken an exercise of mapping (Figure 14; Santos, 2004) to simplify the tectonic features within the basins. The primary purpose of the mapping undertaken by Santos was to identify potential fault conduits (likely to enhance vertical migration of petroleum fluids), fault baffles (likely to prevent lateral migration of petroleum fluid) and identify potential gas targets.

Over the study area, the major episodic faults occurred in the top pre-Permian (basement), the basal Toolachee Formation and the basal Eromanga unconformity. The top pre-Permian faults provide the basin's overall fabric, whereas the younger faults from the basal Toolachee Formation and basal Eromanga unconformity are generally reactivated Permian faults.

In the Eromanga Basin formations, very few regional faults are observed as very little fault movement occurred during deposition of Eromanga Basin sediments. Major faulting events and structural uplifts have occurred within the eastern part of the Eromanga Basin; however they did not structurally affect the part of the Eromanga Basin covered by Santos' SWQ tenements. Subsidence and compaction dominate the structural geology (PIRSA, 2006).



SWQ HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT

SANTOS

SUMMARY OF REGIONAL MAJOR FAULTS (SANTOS 2004)

COPYRIGHT

1. Base information copyright MapInfo Australia Pty Ltd
2. ATP/PL tenure supplied by Santos, August 2011
3. Faults map supplied by Santos (2004)
4. Golder Associates 2012a Cooper Basin UWIR Report



LEGEND

- Town/Locality
- Highway/Major Road
- Tenements within the Santos Project Area
- Basal Toolachee Formation (PU70 Horizon)
- Top Pre-Permian (ZU00 Horizon)
- Basal Eromanga Unconformity

0 10 20 40 60 80 Kilometres

SCALE (at A3) 1:2,500,000

Coordinate System: GCS GDA 1994

PROJECT: 127666004
DATE: 19/12/2012
DRAWN: FA
CHECKED: RS

FIGURE 14





2.4.4 Stress Field Setting

2.4.4.1 Regional Setting

The origin and nature of near surface stress in Australia has been discussed in a number of publications, for example, Brown and Windsor (1990) and Enever and Lee (2000). The total stress at a point in the Earth's crust (including Australia) is generally considered to be made up of the following components:

- Gravity due to the weight of overburden. Gravity also contributes to the horizontal stress due to Poisson's effect;
- Tectonic component, which could be an active or a remnant tectonic stress, from movement of the earth's plates, and generally impacts the horizontal stress field; and
- Thermal and physio-chemical effects.

Analysis of stress in the SWQ study area has been undertaken through in-house services (discussed further under Section 2.4.5.3). The results of these studies are consistent with stress magnitude and orientation produced by broader plate tectonics as indicated on the publicly available Australasian Stress Map (Australasian Stress Map web site, University of Adelaide, Hillis et al., 1999; Hillis and Reynolds, 2003; and Reynolds et al., 2006).

Excerpts of the stress map are presented in Figure 15 and Figure 16 (from the web site, 2012) and illustrate the tectonic contribution to the regional stress field within continental Australia. Australia lies within the Indo-Australian tectonic plate, and undergoes an absolute movement of approximately 7 cm per year to N-NNE. This is reflected in the N-NNE stress direction observed in SE Queensland (e.g. Bowen Basin, Figure 15). However, the Australian intra-plate stress field is highly variable and the maximum stress orientation at Cooper Basin, SWQ, is W-E and approximately perpendicular to the N-NE direction of the Indo-Australian plate. The stress field in Cooper basin appears to mark the apex of a horseshoe-shaped rotation in maximum horizontal stress direction across central eastern Australia (Reynolds, 2005). This is consistent with the project area that was mapped by Santos in 2004, which is discussed further in Section 2.4.5.2.

The minor horizontal stress will be approximately normal (90°) to this, i.e. N-S. The horizontal in situ stress is be can be high and anisotropic and can exceed the vertical stress in some parts of the basin (Reynolds et al, 2006). The latter is an important consideration when hydraulic fracturing pressures are calculated when designing and implementing a fracture event such that it is confidently contained entirely within the reservoir formations (Sections 3.2 and 3.3.5).

2.4.4.2 Basin Stress Regime

The primary stresses within the Cooper-Eromanga basin are vertical overburden stress σ_v , maximum horizontal stress σ_H , and minimum horizontal stress σ_h . The stress regime within the basins are characterised on the assumption that σ_v is a principal stress and therefore, σ_H and σ_h are also principal stresses, where σ_h is the least principal stress. This assumption is considered valid given the relatively flat topography across the basin.

The maximum horizontal stresses, σ_H , in the basin generally follow an east to west orientation, at approximately 101°, as indicated by stress data from borehole breakout testing (Hills et al, 1998; Reynolds et al, 2004). The east-west trending nature of σ_H predominates in the Nappamerri trough, however, regional variations across the basin have been observed. In the Patchawarra Trough σ_H is oriented southeast to north-west; north-east of Gidgealpa σ_H was oriented west-northwest to east-southeast. This clockwise rotation of σ_H from the Nappamerri Trough to the Patchawarra Trough is accepted to be part of the larger stress rotation observed across the Australian continent. The orientation of σ_H does not exhibit significant variation with depth. (Reynolds et al, 2004).

The vertical overburden stress, σ_v is governed by overlying rock mass and the stress gradient does not exhibit significant variation with depth. The σ_v stress gradient is approx. 20.3 MPa/km at 1,000 m depth and approaches approximately 22.6 MPa/km at 3,000 m depth.



The magnitude of σ_h varies significantly across the basin; the σ_h stress gradient ranges from 13.6 MPa/km to 22.6 MPa/km across the basin, with σ_h approaching σ_v in some local areas (Reynolds et al, 2004). σ_h decreases with depth up to approximately 1 km below the surface and then stabilises. At 1 km to 4 km depth σ_h is between 0.6 σ_v to 0.7 σ_v , with σ_h generally approaching the higher end of this range (Hillis et al, 1998). At lower depths σ_h approaches, and may exceed, σ_v , resulting in σ_v becoming the minimum principal stress. (Reynolds et al, 2004).

2.4.4.3 Stress Assumptions and Principal Stresses – General Faulting Regime

On the basis that σ_h is the minimum principal stress, the Cooper-Eromanga basin stress regime is primarily associated with strike-slip faulting ($\sigma_H > \sigma_v > \sigma_h$), normal faulting ($\sigma_v > \sigma_H > \sigma_h$), and transitional strike-slip/reverse faulting ($\sigma_H > \sigma_h \approx \sigma_v$) at depth, where $\sigma_h \approx \sigma_v$. Reverse faulting ($\sigma_H > \sigma_h > \sigma_v$) is not associated with the stress regime in the basin however, at lower depths where $\sigma_h > \sigma_v$ may occur some reverse faulting may exist. (Reynolds et al, 2004).

2.4.4.4 Hydrostatic Stress

Pore pressures within the basin are generally hydrostatic. Overpressures are thought to occur in deeper shalier strata within the basin and have been observed in the Nappamerri Trough from depths of 2.7 km (Hillis et al, 1998). Local under-pressures have also been observed and are attributed to production within the basin (Reynolds et al, 2004). This is of particular importance when considering the impact of depressurising formations during oil and gas production. The implication is that impact translation though the depositional sequences are minimised or negated completely.




Figure 15: Continental Geomechanical Setting – Mean Stress Orientation within Australian Stress Provinces (Hillis and Reynolds, 2003).




Figure 16: Primary Stress Field Distribution for SWQ Queensland (Reynolds et.al, 2006)

2.4.5 Seismic History of the Project Region

2.4.5.1 Vulnerability

The continent of Australia does not demonstrate significant seismic activity, particularly compared to the western US, Japan, and New Zealand. Australia is on the Indo-Australian plate, relatively far from the plate boundaries, reducing the amount of seismic activity affecting the continent. Earthquakes in Australia are generally caused from the release of built-up stress in the interior of the Indo-Australian plate, which is being pushed north (NNE) and is colliding with the Eurasian, Philippine, and Pacific plates. Geosciences Australia (2012) reported that:

- On average 200 earthquakes of magnitude 3.0 or more occur in Australia each year;
- Earthquakes above magnitude 5.5 occur on average every two years; and
- About every five years there is a significant earthquake of magnitude 6.0 or more.

Santos' SWQ tenements are in one of the least seismically active areas on the Australian continent. The closest seismic activity area is the Adelaide region, SA, some 250 km southwest of Cameron's Corner. While more frequent and larger in magnitude earthquakes occur in the Adelaide area, very little impact is experienced within the SWQ tenement area. A study performed in the 1990's found that there is a 90% chance that the *unitless peak ground acceleration* (a term used in civil engineering to estimate forces on structures) will not exceed 0.05 in any 50 year period for this area. This indicates that regardless of the epicentre of any possible earthquake, little ground movement will occur in this region.



2.4.5.2 Local Historical Faults and Potential Seismic Activity

The Santos fault model is shown in Figure 17 (refer to Table 6 for stratigraphical marker abbreviations). This cross section illustrates the major fault and fold structures affecting the Cooper and Eromanga Basin sequences. Of particular note is the deep seated nature of the basement structures, particularly faulting. The major episodic faults occurred in the top pre-Permian (basement), the basal Toolachee Formation and the basal Eromanga unconformity. These generally do not penetrate beyond the Eromanga Basin stratigraphy. The structures are predominantly compressional, and do not have large fault-throws within the Cooper Basin stratigraphy and negligible throws in the Eromanga Basin stratigraphy.

The Santos fault model is shown in Figure 17 (refer to Table 6 for stratigraphical marker abbreviations). The episodic faults provide the basin's overall fabric. The basal Toolachee Formation (PU70) and basal Eromanga unconformity (L*) are generally affected by reactivated Top Pre-Permian (Basement; Zu00) faults. Figure 17 shows the Toolachee formation may be more elastic and does not fracture due to folding. The fault does not extend up through the Eromanga unconformity into the Eromanga Basin.

The episodic faults presented in Figure 17 provide the basin's overall fabric. The basal Toolachee Formation (PU70) and basal Eromanga unconformity (L*) are generally affected by reactivated Top Pre-Permian (Basement; Zu00) faults. Figure 17 shows the Toolachee formation may be more elastic and does not fracture due to folding. The fault does not extend up through the Eromanga unconformity into the Eromanga Basin.




Figure 17: N-S Seismic Section for SWQ Project Area Showing Fault Models

2.4.5.3 Active Seismic Area and Faults

While no major currently or potentially active faults exist near the study area, there is possibly a minor fault within the tenements area. The potential minor fault is 5 to 10 km and is considerably smaller in size than the majority of faults mapped within Australia (Geosciences Australia, 2012). The fault is located within the ATP 766P tenement at approximately latitude and longitude 26.4°S 143.1°E (the north-eastern most tenements in the study area). The closest oil and gas fields are located at 50 to 60 km from the fault zone,



and it is therefore considered highly unlikely that the fault zone would be influenced by hydraulic fracturing activities proposed for the fields. No significant seismic activity has occurred in the vicinity of this possible fault (ATP 766P; Figure 18) since 1950

2.4.5.4 Seismic History of the Cooper Basin Area


This region has experienced intermittent earthquakes of low to moderate magnitude since 1950 in the study area (Table 7). The location of the epicentre of these earthquakes is presented on Figure 18.

The majority of the earthquakes that have occurred since 1950 were approximately 8 to 11 km below the surface, with magnitudes ranging between 2.3 and 4.7 on the Richter scale. The earthquakes were generally located towards the south and western end of the study area.

Table 7: Earthquake Locations and Depths in the Study Area Since 1950

Magnitude	UTC	Latitude	Longitude	Depth (km)*
4.7	28/12/1961	-28.12	141.57	10
3.8	30/03/1963	-27.2	140.9	10
4	31/03/1963	-27.2	140.9	10
3.1	30/01/1985	-26.58	140.94	0
4	23/05/1989	-28.843	143.978	5
3.3	8/08/1989	-27.63	141.52	10
3.4	4/06/1996	-28.972	144.063	0
3.2	30/07/1997	-28.093	142.604	11
3.3	21/02/1999	-28.767	142.962	0
2.7	26/09/1999	-27.985	144.141	0
3.2	3/08/2000	-28.676	143.302	0
3.3	27/02/2001	-28.67	142.082	0
3.2	9/03/2001	-28.604	141.995	8
2.4	23/04/2001	-28.234	143.205	8
2.3	23/09/2002	-26.397	141.928	10

* Where depth is poorly constrained by available seismic data, a default depth of 0 or 10 km may be selected depending on the local earthquake activity in the area (Reference: Geoscience Australia www.ga.gov.au).



SWQ HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT

SANTOS

EPICENTRE AND MAGNITUDE OF EARTHQUAKES IN THE STUDY AREA

COPYRIGHT

1. Base information copyright MapInfo Australia Pty Ltd
2. ATP/PL tenure supplied by Santos, August 2011
3. Golder Associates 2012a Cooper Basin UWIR Report



LEGEND

- Town/Locality
- River/Creek
- Highway/Major Road
- Tenements within the Santos Project Area
- ▭ Study Area

EPICENTRE

Magnitude Range

- <1
- 1-1.9
- 2-2.9
- 3-3.9
- 4-4.9
- 5-5.9
- 6-6.7

0 10 20 40 60 80 100 Kilometres

SCALE (at A4) 1:3,000,000

Coordinate System: GCS GDA 1994

PROJECT: 127666004
DATE: 19/12/2012
DRAWN: FA
CHECKED: RS

FIGURE 18





2.5 Hydrogeology and the Groundwater Resource

2.5.1 Introduction and Setting

The Cooper and Eromanga Basins are chronologically successive stacked basins. Based on strict geological interpretation, the Cooper Basin is considered to be distinct and separate from the GAB, however it has been an historical convention in Queensland to include the upper sedimentary units of the Cooper Basin in the administration of GAB groundwater resources (GAB Resource Operating Plan (ROP), DERM 2007: GAB Water Resources Plan (WRP), DERM 2006). The Eromanga Basin is the largest of the three major sedimentary basins comprising the GAB, and covers the whole of the Cooper Basin. The connection between the two basins is geologically marked by a major unconformity.

Both the Cooper Basin and Eromanga Basin are multi-layered systems comprising alternating layers of sandstone, shale, mudstone and siltstone formations (Section 2.4.3). The sandstone formations of the Eromanga Basin correspond to water bearing formations and aquifer formations; they support a range of beneficial uses such as potable water and stock and domestic supply. In other areas of the Basin (remote from Santos' tenements), they also supply groundwater to springs.

The siltstone, shale and mudstone formations are low permeability rocks and act as aquitards separating aquifer formations (and also as seals for hydrocarbon reservoirs). In the study area, a number of thick, competent and laterally extensive fine-grained formations are present within both the Cooper and Eromanga Basins that are important in providing vertical separation of water and hydrocarbon-bearing formations. Minor sandstone units occasionally occur as interbedded layers within predominantly fine-grained formations and may be capable of providing limited groundwater supply (e.g. <5 L/s), however in the study area water supply development preferentially targets the upper formations of the Eromanga Basin (e.g. the Winton and Glendower Formations).

For management purposes, the GAB has been subdivided into 25 Groundwater Management Areas (GMA) as defined in the *GAB Hydrogeological Framework for the GAB WRP Area* (DERM, 2005); the GMAs relevant to the study area are presented in Figure 19. GMAs are subdivided into groundwater management units (GMU), as represented in Table 5, comprising one or more geological formations with similar hydrogeological properties.

2.5.2 Hydrostratigraphy

As previously described, the formations of the Cooper and Eromanga Basin within the study area comprise a stacked sedimentary sequence of sandstone formations that act as aquifers and hydrocarbon reservoirs, interbedded with fine-grained formations that act as competent and laterally extensive aquitards and seals for hydrocarbon traps. The main aquifer and aquitard units are presented in Table 8. The main aquifer groupings, in terms of production of groundwater, include:

- The aquifers of the Quaternary sediments and Tertiary formations (potential water supply for agricultural and potable water);
- The GAB aquifers of the Eromanga Basin (possible water supply for agricultural and potable water, and produced formation water); and
- The older and deeper aquifers of the Cooper Basin (produced formation water).

The Quaternary and Tertiary deposits are preferentially developed as groundwater resources because they are shallow, accessible and able to yield productive quantities of groundwater to support beneficial uses relevant to the study area (principally, domestic supply and stock watering). In contrast, groundwater resources associated with the deeper aquifers of the Eromanga Basin have had limited development. The deep aquifers of the Cooper Basin are only accessed during the production of gas.

A summary of the groundwater resources within the study area is presented in the following section. A more detailed discussion of the groundwater resources is contained in the UWIR (Golder 2012a).



HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT SWQ

Table 8: Hydrostratigraphy of the Study Area (DERM, 2005)

Table of Hydrostratigraphy of the Study Area (2011m, 2000)					
GMA Unit		Unit name	Sub-unit	Equivalent Formation other parts of the GAB	
	Eromanga Basin	Glendower Formation			
		Winton Formation			
		Mackunda Formation			
		Alluru Mudstone			
Central 1 - Warrego West 1		Toolebuc Formation		Surat Siltstone	
		Wallumbilla Formation	Coreena Member	Wallumbilla Formation	
			Doncaster Member		
Central 2 - Warrego West 2		Cadna-Owie Formation	Wyandra Sandstone Member	Cadna-Owie Formation, Bungil formation, Gilbert River Formation	
			Lower Cadna-Owie		
Central 3 - Warrego West 3		Hooray Sandstone	Murta Formation	Hooray Sandstone, Mooga Sandstone, Orally Formation and Gubberamunda Sandstone	
			Namur Sandstone		
Central 4 - Warrego West 4		Westbourne Formation		Injune Creek Group	
		Adori Sandstone			
		Birkhead Formation	Upper Birkhead		
			Middle Birkhead		
Lower Birkhead					
Central 5 - Warrego West 5		Hutton Sandstone			
Central 6 - Warrego West 6		Poolowanna Formation	Upper Poolowanna	Precipice Sandstone	
	Lower Poolowanna				
MAJOR UNCONFORMITY					
Central 7 - Warrego West 7	Cooper Basin	Nappamerri Group	Tinchoo Formation	Gilpeppie Member	Moolayember Formation
				Doonmulla Member	
			Arraburry Formation	Wimma Sandstone Member	Clematis Sandstone
				Panning Member	Rewan Formation
				Callamurra Member	
		Gidgealpa Group	Toolachee Formation		
			Daralingie Formation ¹		
			Roseneath Shale		
			Epsilon Formation		
			Murteree Shale		
			Patchawarra Formation		
			Tirrawarra Sandstone		
			Merrimelia Formation		



Aquifer
Water Bearing in part
Confining Bed

¹ The Daralingie Formation is considered to be water bearing in some areas of the Cooper Basin but has been classified as a confining bed within this study area.



2.5.2.1 Eromanga Basin

The main GAB aquifers in the study area occur within the Eromanga Basin stratigraphy, and include the Winton Formation, Cadna-Owie Formation, Hooray Sandstone, Hutton Sandstone and Poolowanna Formation (Precipice Sandstone equivalent).

Hydrogeological contour maps are provided (where data was available) in APPENDIX D for the following hydrostratigraphic units. Note that the Quaternary and Tertiary sediment aquifers and the Winton Formation are not administered under the GAB ROP (DERM 2007).

Poolowanna Formation (Central 6 - Warrego West 6)

Also referred to as the Basal Jurassic Formation (older name in the nomenclature), the Poolowanna Formation is the equivalent of the Precipice Sandstone (in SE QLD). No further information is available.

Hutton Sandstone (Central 5 - Warrego West 5)

The Hutton Sandstone is a significant GAB aquifer however its depth in the study area (approximately 2,000 mbgl; refer to Figure 11) has precluded access for water supply development. Based on limited available data, the groundwater flow is expected to be to the southwest (i.e. consistent with the regional flow direction of the major GAB formations).

The water quality of the Hutton Sandstone in the study area cannot be commented upon as produced water quality data was not readily available, and no data was available in the DEHP database.

Westbourne Formation, Adori Sandstone and Birkhead Formation (Central 4 - Warrego West 4)

The Westbourne Formation is considered to be a confining layer of relatively homogeneous characteristics (lacustrine deposits associated with a large transgression). However in the southeast section of the study area, it is possible that a number of private bores are completed in the Westbourne Formation, possibly accessing minor sandstone beds within the formation.

The Adori Sandstone is considered to be an aquifer (at least in part) in the study area, however insufficient information is available to characterise it further. The basal portion of the Adori Sandstone is noted as having a thick calcite cemented zone up to 45 m thick.

The Birkhead formation comprises a succession of non-continuous confining beds and water bearing sandstone units.

Water quality data for these formations are not available in the DEHP database, and were not available in regard to Santos produced water extracted from this formation. Data collected during a Water Bore Baseline Assessment (WBBA) of the study area is limited and not conclusive.

Hooray Sandstone (Central 3 - Warrego West 3)

The Hooray Sandstone is a significant unit in GAB. In the study area it is considered to be a major aquifer. Oil reservoirs and minor gas reservoirs are also contained with this unit. Two sub-units are identified in the Hooray Sandstone:

- The Murta Formation (equivalent formations in other GAB basins include the Mooga and Gubberamunda Sandstones). In the study area it is considered to be a confining bed, the main confining unit being a siltstone bed located at the base of the Murta Formation and found widespread over the Cooper region. Minor oil and gas reservoirs are noted to be present as fine-grained sandstone units capped by intra-formational siltstone and shale seals.
- The Namur Sandstone consists predominantly of fine to coarse grained sand with minor fine-grained interbeds, and is the major water bearing unit of the Hooray Sandstone. Oil can also be present in this unit.



The water quality in the Hooray Sandstone is generally fresh to slightly brackish with electrical conductivity (EC) values (DEHP database) ranging from 675 to 3,930 $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ (or approximately 470 to 2750 mg/L) with a median value of approximately 1,000 $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ (approximately 700 mg/L). This water quality is suitable for potable water supply, and the few available long-term records (i.e. 40 year monitoring period) indicate that water quality has remained consistent over time.

A number of bores within the Hooray Sandstone may be artesian. Groundwater bores for that unit seem to be concentrated to the southeast of the study area (APPENDIX D). No reliable water level and salinity data are available for this formation in the vicinity of Santos' tenements.

According to the available data the groundwater flow direction is towards the southeast (APPENDIX D).

The Hooray Sandstone is considered to yield productive quantities of groundwater, and a town water supply bore is potentially completed with the Hooray Sandstone (to be confirmed as part of continuing field works for the WBBA).

Cadna-Owie Formation (Central 2 - Warrego West 2)

The Cadna-Owie Formation is considered to be a major aquifer of the GAB, and in the study area comprises two sub-units: the upper the Wyandra Sandstone and the Lower Cadna-Owie. The Wyandra Sandstone is considered to be an aquifer however its thickness is limited in SWQ. The Lower Cadna-Owie comprises siltstone and very fine-grained sandstone and is considered to be an aquitard.

The few data points available in the DEHP groundwater database indicate fresh to slightly brackish water quality with the Wyandra Sandstone. Insufficient water level information is available to describe water flows and water levels.

Habermehl (1986 and 1997) defines this unit as non-artesian; however the DEHP groundwater database does identify artesian bores in the Cadna-Owie Formation.

Winton Formation (Central 1 - Warrego West 1)

According to the DEHP database, the Winton Formation is a significant aquifer for the local community that supplies a number of stock and domestic bores. The depth and thickness of the Winton Formation are illustrated in the maps of APPENDIX C. The top of the Winton Formation is approximately 50 mbgl and thickness can reach up to 970 m.

Santos' geology team however dispute the role of the Winton Formation as a significant aquifer in SWQ, and consider it to be water bearing at best. Although the Winton Formation is a significant aquifer in a large area of Queensland, the quality of the Winton Formation as an aquifer appears to diminish westward from central to southwest Queensland and into South Australia (Pers. Comm. N. Lemon, Santos, November 2011). The top and bottom of the Winton are so poorly defined in the subsurface that it is difficult to confirm whether water production currently assigned to the Winton Formation is coming from the overlying Tertiary (Eyre Formation in South Australia) or underlying Mackunda Formation. This situation is supported in SA by the findings of Gravestock and al. (1995).

The Winton Formation directly underlies the Tertiary sediments; some degree of hydraulic connectivity is expected however no data is available to confirm this.

The water quality in the Winton Formation is fresh to brackish with EC values ranging from 900 to 13,000 $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ (approximately 630 to 9,100 mg/L). Groundwater flow in this aquifer is generally to the southwest (APPENDIX D).

Quaternary and Tertiary Alluvium

Quaternary and Tertiary alluvial deposits cover a large proportion of the study area. They are often associated with the very flat structures of the flood plains and are absent where the Winton Formation outcrops.



Cendon et al. (2010) have described the groundwater resources associated with Quaternary sediments of the Cooper Creek basin as comprising predominantly saline water (reported total dissolved solids (TDS) values up to 38,000 mg/L) that occurs within fluvial and aeolian sand deposits that are extensively overlain by thick, low permeability mud deposits. The surficial fine-grained deposits limit recharge to the sand units, even below the waterholes that are present in the main creek channels during extended periods of low (or no) stream flow. Episodic flood events are thought to occasionally scour through the low permeability deposits within major creek channels and provide temporary recharge to the underlying sand beds, resulting in discrete and discontinuous freshwater lenses in the otherwise saline groundwater environment.

Evaluation of water level and water quality data (including major and minor ion chemistry and stable isotope analysis) suggests that the surface water features in the study area do not receive shallow groundwater recharge (Hamilton et al., 2005; Bunn et al., 2006; Costelloe et al., 2007; Cendon et al., 2010). However, they may receive seepage through their basal mud layers to provide limited recharge to the underlying saline groundwater system. The lack of connectivity between surface water systems and shallow groundwater is an important consideration in regards to exposure pathway analysis (as is discussed in corresponding hydraulic fracturing service provider reports).

The Glendower Formation is the main Tertiary formation within the study area. The Glendower Formation consists of consolidated sediments comprising sandstones, sandy siltstones and minor conglomerate and mudstones (Australian Stratigraphic Database, Geosciences Australia). The Australian Stratigraphic Database identifies the Whitula Formation as overlying the Glendower Formation; however, the significance of the Whitula Formation in the study area is unknown.


Groundwater flow in these formations follows topography in the study area and is influenced by outcrop areas of the underlying Winton Formation. As illustrated on the hydrogeological map (APPENDIX D), the hydraulic gradient is very small.

The quality of the Tertiary aquifers is brackish, with EC values ranging from 3,000 to 7,000 $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ (approximately 2,100 to 4,900 mg/L).

2.5.2.2 Cooper Basin

The upper formations of the Cooper Basin are included in the administration of GAB groundwater resources under QLD regulations. This includes the Panning and Wimmera Sandstone Members of the Arrabury Formation, and the underlying Toolachee formation.

Insufficient information is available to provide a detailed description of the hydrostratigraphy of the Cooper Basin formations.



SWQ HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT

SANTOS

GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT AREAS FOR THE STUDY AREA

COPYRIGHT

1. Base information copyright MapInfo Australia Pty Ltd
2. ATP/PL tenure supplied by Santos, August 2011
3. Groundwater Management Area supplied by the State of Queensland (Department of Natural Resources & Water), 2008
4. Golder Associates 2012a Cooper Basin UWIR Report



LEGEND

- Town/Locality
- Highway/Major Road
- River/Creek
- Santos Operated Permits
- Study Area
- Groundwater Management Area

0 10 20 40 60 80 100 Kilometres

SCALE (at A4) 1:3,000,000

Coordinate System: GCS GDA 1994

PROJECT: 127666004
DATE: 19/12/2012
DRAWN: FA
CHECKED: RS

FIGURE 19





2.5.2.3 Observed Reservoir Pressure Data

Formation pressure data is collected by Santos on specific wells. The following formation pressure data was provided by Santos (pers. comm. Owen Davies and Nick Lemon; Santos, 2012).

The hydrostatic pressure of water-bearing stratum is measured during drilling activities by:

- Drill stem test (DST);
- Repeat formation tester (RFT); or
- Formation micro tester (FMT).

Pressure testing is undertaken to assess the likely thickness of the oil or gas column found at any particular depth interval. This is calculated by comparing the pressure in the hydrocarbon-bearing zone with the expected water pressure as predicted by the water pressure-depth line (Figure 20).

Models for predicting the influence of gas and oil, and associated water production at depth require input data on the pressure transmissibility of the strata that separates the target formations (referred to as seals). In the case of SWQ:

- Seals between the Glendower and Winton aquifers; and
- Seals between the Murta, Namur (Hooray) and Hutton Sandstone, from which oil is produced.

Numerous Santos wells have undergone pressure measurements in the Cadna-Owie Formation to establish water pressure-depth lines and this data can be re-assessed to see if depletion from underlying hydrocarbon production zones has influenced the aquifers utilised for water supply. If no depletion is observed in the Cadna-Owie Formation then this provides evidence of the integrity of the cap rock separating the Cadna-Owie Formation from the underlying hydrocarbon reservoirs.

Figure 20 demonstrates how formation pressures are depleted below the predicted water pressure line (the blue dashed line increases in pressure with increasing depth) and are confined within each target formation (yellow layers) by the presence of an overlying aquitard (seal bed, orange layers). This data demonstrates the competence of the confining units in isolating hydrocarbon reservoirs from overlying and underlying aquifers.



HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT SWQ




Figure 20: Observed Tickalara (top) and Iliad Field Pressure with Depth Plots



2.5.3 Groundwater Flow

In general, groundwater flow through the majority of the deeper units of the Eromanga Basin is to the south to southwest. This is consistent with the direction of flow in the major GAB units (Figure 21; BRS, 2000). Potentiometric surface contours for select Eromanga Basin aquifers are presented in APPENDIX D (sourced from the UWIR (Golder, 2012a) based on information available for the study area in the DEHP database). This data supports a southward flow direction but exhibits a high degree of variability which is attributable to the limited data available from the database. Shallower groundwater flow in the Tertiary Formation appears to be influenced by surface topography.




Figure 21: Map of GAB Extent, Regional Flow Paths, Recharge Beds, and Spring Clusters:
The shaded patterns broadly represent the recharge area; arrows represent modelled flow lines after Welsh (2000).
Dashed lines represent spring clusters updated from Habermehl. Source: after Habermehl and Lau (1997).

Structural Influence on Groundwater Flow

Section 2.4.4 presents a summary of the tectonic setting and basin stress regime within the Cooper-Eromanga Basins. The stress regime is primarily associated with strike-slip faulting, normal faulting, and transitional strike-slip/reverse faulting at depth. When taking the observed (and sustained) overpressures into account, this stress regime is predominantly more conducive to tight compressive (non-tensional) fault creation, and as such largely self-sealing fault systems. This would infer the faults are not likely to form conduits for groundwater (or gas or oil) flow. This is supported by pressure profiles and sustained overpressures, such as presented in Figure 20.



2.5.4 Recharge/Discharge

The upper GAB aquifers are recharged by infiltration (rainfall), and leakage from streams into outcropping sandstone formations, mainly on the eastern margins of the GAB along the western slopes of the Great Dividing Range. Regional groundwater flow is from the topographically higher recharge areas around the basin margins towards the lowest parts of the basin in the southwest (Figure 21).

Outcropping areas of the major GAB units, which are considered as the recharge areas for the GAB, do not occur within 300 km of the study area.

Discharge areas in the GAB typically manifest as springs, supplied by leakage to alluvial aquifers (Tertiary-Recent), and discharge to inland lakes and water supply bores. In the study area there are no identified GDEs (Section 2.6.2.4); the only discharge of water is through water supply bores or as a by-product during oil and gas production.

2.5.5 Aquifer and Aquitard Hydraulic Properties

A review of hydraulic parameters was undertaken for the strata in the vicinity of the study area. The hydraulic parameters characterising the formations are presented in Table 9. The data presented in the table are based on field measurements and available published values.

Table 9: Hydraulic Parameters

Basin	Formation	Hydraulic Conductivity (m/d)		Porosity (fraction)
		Min	Max	
Eromanga Basin	Quaternary and Tertiary Alluvium	-	-	-
	Winton Formation	-	-	-
	Mackunda Formation	-	-	-
	Alluru Mudstone	-	-	-
	Toolebuc Formation	-	-	-
	Wallumbilla Formation	-	-	-
	Cadna-Owie Formation	-	-	-
	Hooray Sandstone	4.3×10^{-4}	4.3×10^{-1}	-
	Westbourne Formation, Adori Sandstone and Birkhead Formation	8.0×10^{-7} [2]	2.5×10^{-4} [2]	0.2 [2]
Cooper Basin	Hutton Sandstone	3.5×10^{-1}	9.8×10^{-3}	-
	Poolowanna Formation	1×10^{-7} [2]	3.7×10^{-3} [2]	0.18 [2]
	Tinchoo / Arrabury Formations	-	-	-
	Toolachee Formation	2.0×10^{-3} [1]	4.3×10^{-3}	0.15 0.08 to 0.12 [3]
	Daralingie, Roseneath Shale, Epsilon and Murteree Shale Formations	-	-	-
	Patchawarra Formation	3.3×10^{-4} [1]	3.5×10^{-3} [1]	0.13 0.08 to 0.12 [3]

[1] Gov. of South Australia, Primary Industries and Resources, SA. Petroleum and Geothermal in South Australia – Cooper Basin, 2009.

[2] Alexander, E.M., Reservoirs and Seals of the Eromanga Basin (undated).

[3] Recent information provided by Santos (Santos, 2011a).

Note that insufficient data is available to provide transmissivity, which is a function of the thickness of an aquifer ($T = Kb$).

2.5.6 Groundwater Quality

Groundwater quality data was reported in a metadata table from the UWIR (Golder, 2012a). The metadata table includes both automated database enquiries and manually interpreted data for target formations using



the available depth and construction information. Water quality data extracted from the DEHP database included a total of 772 samples collected from 437 groundwater bores located within the study area. However, only 494 of the samples collected were considered suitable for interpretive use, based on cation-anion balance, and could be assigned to a particular aquifer formation.

Groundwater quality data in the study area was available for the aquifers associated to the following formations:

- Tertiary sediments (10 samples):
- Glendower Formation (31 samples):
- Winton Formation (160 samples):
- Mackunda Formation (16 samples):
- Alluru Mudstone (7 samples):
- Wallumbilla Formation (97 samples)¹;
- Cadna-Owie Formation (20 samples);
- Hooray Sandstone (147 samples);
- Adori Sandstone (1 sample); and
- Hutton Sandstone (5 samples).

Groundwater pH values in the study area ranged from 6.2 to 9.9. The slightly acidic pH (6.2) was associated with groundwater from the *Winton Formation* aquifer. The most alkaline sample was collected from the *Wallumbilla Formation*. For the majority of samples, the pH ranged between 7.5 and 8.5.

Total hardness was calculated from the chemical composition and refers to the sum of calcium and magnesium (expressed in mg/L of CaCO₃). Approximately 49% of samples represent soft groundwater, 16% moderately hard, and approximately 15% of groundwater samples would cause scaling.

2.5.6.1 Water Types of the Study Area Formations

A piper diagram of all groundwater samples within the study area is presented as Figure 22, and piper diagrams for individual formations are presented in Figure 23. The red line represents conservative (non-reactive) mixing of fresh water and sea water. The position of the markers away from the conservative mixing line is an indication of a geochemical reaction. As presented in Figure 22 and Figure 23 the dominant ions are sodium, bicarbonate and chloride, and water types are either sodium-bicarbonate or sodium-bicarbonate-chloride types. Groundwater from the Winton Formation, Wallumbilla Formation, Hooray Sandstone and Tertiary Sediments/Glendower Formation appear to have higher proportion of sodium and magnesium.

2.5.6.2 Total Dissolved Solids

Based on TDS concentrations the majority of the groundwater samples (87%) are slightly brackish (TDS <3,000 mg/L). The rest of the samples from Winton Formation, Wallumbilla Formation, Glendower Formation and Hutton Sandstone are classified as brackish with TDS concentrations in the range of 3,000 to 10,000 mg/L. The most saline sample was collected from the *Winton Formation* aquifer.


A measure of salinity and sodium hazard is presented in a Wilcox plot in Figure 24. Both salinity hazard (C) and sodium hazard (S) are each divided into four classes based on EC values and sodium absorption ratio (SAR): S1 or C1 indicates low sodicity or salinity (respectively) and S4 or C4 indicates high results. Figure

¹ The Alluru Mudstone and Wallumbilla Formation are considered to be confining beds in the study area. Interpretation of water quality and completion formation is based on the target formation interpretations in the DEHP database. It is possible that samples may have been mis-identified.



HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT SWQ

22 indicates that groundwater from the study area plot within a wide range of both sodium and salinity hazard classes. The groundwater from all of the formations from SWQ aquifers fall into high sodicity (S2-S4) and very high salinity classes (C4).




Note: the red grouping highlights a similar water type generally for the upper formations (late Cretaceous to Quaternary), whereas the blue grouping regroups the water samples for the deeper formations of the Eromanga Basin.


Figure 22: Piper Diagram




HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT SWQ




Tertiary Sediments and Glendower Formation




Winton Formation




Mackunda Formation and Alluru Mudstone




Wallumbilla Formation



Cadna-Owie Formation



Hooray Sandstone



Hutton Sandstone

Figure 23: Piper Diagrams of Individual Formations




Figure 24: Wilcox Plot Showing Salinity and Sodicity Hazard Classes.

2.5.7 Groundwater Use (Excluding Produced Water)

Groundwater use is largely for stock and domestic purposes, town and camp water supply is also sourced from groundwater (Figure 25).

There are no large groundwater users albeit for municipal supply in the study area, based on the available data in the DEHP Water Entitlements System (WES) database (previously WERD database). The bores for municipal supply licensed in the WES database are for Eromanga and Thargomindah.

No bores are registered for the facilities of Ballera and Jackson, however Santos operates 104 water production bores.

Groundwater is primarily sourced from the Tertiary formations and the upper GAB formations of the Eromanga Basin. Figure 26 illustrates the distribution of groundwater sources for registered water supply bores within the study area. The geographical distribution of private bores and Santos bores is presented in Figure 27.




Figure 25: Groundwater Use within the Santos Study Area




Figure 26: Target Groundwater Sources for Groundwater Usage in the Study Area



Note: Figure 26 was prepared using the data from the UWIR metadata (Golder, 2012a). A total of 689 bores have information on pump type or are indicated as artesian and have been assumed to be used for groundwater supply. The WES database only provides information for 138 licensed bores in the study area of which 87 are assigned to the Hooray Sandstone aquifer.

Most private properties are expected to have access to their own water supply through stock and domestic entitlements as part of the basic landholder rights to access water. Groundwater use is limited to domestic consumption and cattle farming (not including industrial cattle operations). There is no volumetric groundwater entitlement associated to these licences however it is commonly assumed that those bores extract a maximum of 5 ML/year.

The total volumetric water entitlements in the study area is 2,390 ML/yr for urban and town supply from seven bores; however four of these licensed bores (totalling 900 ML) were listed as “Lapsed/Never Constructed” and/or expired. The total nominal allowance for stock and domestic bores is 635 ML/yr for 127 bores. The total extraction volume for the 135 licensed bores listed in the DEHP database is therefore 2,125 ML/yr (excluding lapsed/non-constructed bores entitlements).

Santos water production associated with oil and gas production (Golder, 2012a) is mostly from the Hutton Sandstone (82% of average annual production), the Birkhead Formation (7.8%) and the oil reservoirs of the Hooray Sandstone (8.6%).

2.5.7.1 Regional Bore Inventory

In parallel with the UWIR (Golder, 2012a) Santos engaged Golder to undertake a Water Bore Baseline Assessment (WBBA) in SWQ (Golder, 2012b; reference no. 117666006-019-R-Rev0). The purpose of the WBBA was to verify the existence and operation of water supply bores in the study area, and where possible to collect water level and quality data. Santos identified 242 water bores within the study area which require assessment according to the following criteria:

- *Priority 1:* within leased areas and inside a 2 km radius of a production bore;
- *Priority 2:* within leased areas and outside a 2 km radius of a production bore;
- *Priority 3:* outside of the established leased areas but within Santos tenement boundaries.

The WBBA works undertaken were generally consistent with the DEHP requirements outlined in the *Baseline Assessment Guideline* (2011), and condition J13 of the draft CSG model conditions for Level 1 EAs, and included assessment of the following information:

- capacity, quality, and water level of existing bores in the vicinity of oil and gas production areas;
- details on bore construction, where available;
- type of infrastructure used to pump water from the bore;
- identifying bores with potential for inclusion in a regional groundwater monitoring network; and
- providing an opportunity for bore owners to have direct communication with a field scientist and Santos Land Access Staff (LAS) and for developing positive relationships with these groundwater users.

To date, 89 bores have been located within leased areas (*Priority 1* and 2 bores). Of these, only eight active water supply bores were confirmed within Santos tenements. Details are presented in Table 10 and Figure 27. Refer to the WBBA (Golder 2012b) for a detailed description of field observations.



Table 10: Summary of WBBA Priority 1 and 2 bores Observed to be used by Third Parties (assumed private landowners)

Santos Priority	Bore Name	DEHP RN	Santos' Permit	Measured Water Depth (m btoc)	Bore Depth (mbgl) (source: DEHP database)	Target Aquifer (source: DEHP database)*
1	Palara Bore	6057	PL 59	-	243.80	(no data)
1	Mt Margaret No 14	9096	PL 170	-	129.60	Winton Formation
1	Walla Wallan Bore 5	6373	PL 295	15.40	156.70	(no data)
2	Mt Margaret No 20	10565	PL 295	-	89.00	(no data)
2	Cherry Cherry Bore	6369	PL 39	-	285.40	(no data)
2	Tarbat Job No 1947	12036	PL 295	30.40	209.80	Winton Formation
2	Grahams Bore	14955	PL 110	-	94.80	Glendower Formation
-	Moon Road Field Bore	0**	ATP 259P	-	-	-

Notes:

* Data extracted from the DEHP database (bore depth and target aquifer) is considered to be indicative only, as the original data source is unknown and was not confirmed with field measurements.

** Bore not observed in database records. Referred to as "Moon Field Road Bore" in WBBA.

Significant data gaps have been identified between the DEHP database (used in preparing the UWIR), Santos records and the actual existence of bores (Refer to Section 4.8 of the WBBA). Active bores were also observed not to have corresponding DEHP registration numbers. In general, reliable historic and bore construction records were limited and records indicating the aquifer in which bores are screened were not available.

The Golder UWIR indicates that oil and gas production may produce groundwater drawdown in some locations within the study area. Two bores of "*special interest*" (in addition to the eight identified private bores) were identified within the affected areas:

■ 5032: Whim Well

Coordinate location visited; however, the bore was not observed and the DEHP records could not be verified. The bore is recorded in the WES database to target the Hooray Sandstone to approximately 30 m depth. However, the geological contour maps in APPENDIX C indicate the depth to the top of the Hooray sandstone is at least 1,300 mbgl.


■ 5033: Coothero Water Bore

This bore is located in the *Central Project Area*, outside of the established leased areas but within Santos tenement boundaries (i.e., *Priority 3*; location shown on Figure 27). The bore was visited and a groundwater sample was collected. The surface completion of the bore (valve head) suggested that it was artesian; however no pressure gauge was present to record a piezometric level. This bore is reported to target the Hooray Sandstone at 1,165 m depth in the WES database, which is vertically within 200 m of hydrocarbon reservoirs in which hydraulic fracturing may occur. There are no other construction records associated with this bore. Bore uses may include road maintenance and stock watering (based on observations at the site); however this has not yet been confirmed.

The locations of the eight identified private bores and the two bores of special interest are shown within the Santos tenements, namely the *Eastern Project Areas* (oil production) and *Central Project Areas* (gas



production) on Figure 27. The locations of these bores in proximity to the hydraulic fracturing activities are discussed further in Section 3.5.



Information contained on this drawing is the copyright of Golder Associates Pty. Ltd. Unauthorised use or reproduction of this plan either wholly or in part without written permission infringes copyright. © Golder Associates Pty. Ltd.

SWQ HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT

SANTOS

GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF GROUNDWATER USE

COPYRIGHT

1. Base information copyright MapInfo Australia Pty Ltd
2. ATP/PL tenure supplied by Santos, August 2011
3. Groundwater Management Area supplied by the State of Queensland (Department of Natural Resources & Water), 2008
4. Golder Associates 2012a Cooper Basin UWIR Report



LEGEND


- Town/Locality
- Highway/Major Road
- River/Creek
- Tenements within Central Project Area
- Tenements within Eastern Project Area
- Tenements within Western Project Area
- Additional Lease Area
- Study Area
- Groundwater Management Area
- Santos bores
 - Unknown
- DERM
 - Quaternary
 - Tertiary Sediments
- Glendower Formation
- Winton Formation
- Mackunda Formation
- Allaru Mudstone
- Wallumbilla Formation
- Coreena Member
- Doncaster Member
- Cadna-Owie Formation
- Hooray Sandstone
- Adori Sandstone
- Hutton Sandstone
- Main Range Volcanics
- Unknown
- WBBA Bores

0 5 10 20 30 40 50 Kilometres
SCALE (at A3) 1:1,500,000
Coordinate System: GCS GDA 1994

PROJECT: 127666004
DATE: 19/12/2012
DRAWN: FA
CHECKED: RS

FIGURE 27







2.6 Environmental Values in the Study Area

2.6.1 Introduction

For the purpose of this study, environmental values (EVs) relate to surface water or groundwater resources within the study area and are defined as “those qualities of the waterway that make it suitable to support particular aquatic ecosystems or human use” (Environmental Protection (Water) Policy, 2009, referred to as EPP Water, 2009). The EPP 2009 provides guidelines on determining the environmental value that should be considered for a particular project site or area, which follow the framework set out in *Appendix H* of the *Queensland Water Quality Guidelines 2006* (QWQG 2006).

Terrestrial environmental values of the study area, defined as the terrestrial ecosystems (flora and fauna) present within the study area, have also been considered, with information obtained from the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (SEWPaC) Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia (IBRA), and the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Protection (EPBC) Act Protected Matters Search Tool.

2.6.2 Environmental Values of Groundwater

The EVs relevant to groundwater resources in the study area include:

- Town water supply;
- Stock and domestic water supply;
- Sandstone aquifers of the GAB; and
- Groundwater Dependant Ecosystems (GDEs).

2.6.2.1 Town Water Supply

Groundwater is a common potable water source for many inland arid to semi-arid areas of Australia, especially where productive, good quality aquifers are present at reasonably shallow depths. Use of groundwater in the region is further encouraged by the low average rainfall, which is significantly exceeded by the pan evaporation potential (Section 2.1).

Municipal water supply accounts for most of the larger licensed groundwater allocations across the study area. Municipal water supply bores identified in the WES database are licensed to extract from the Hooray Sandstone.

2.6.2.2 Stock and Domestic Water Supply

Groundwater is an important resource for stock and domestic water supply for many inland areas of Australia, especially where productive, good quality aquifers are present at reasonably shallow depths.

Groundwater supply development by the local communities predominantly targets the Glendower and Winton Formations (according to the DEHP database), and to a lesser extent the deeper formations of the Eromanga Basin. The WBBA undertaken by Golder (2012b) identified eight private water supply bores in use from a total list of 242 *Priority 1* and 2 bores within the Santos tenements (Section 2.5.7.1).

Groundwater for stock and domestic supply is considered to be an important environmental value in the study area.

2.6.2.3 Sandstone Aquifers of the Great Artesian Basin

The main GAB aquifers present within the study area (Section 2.5.2.1) are the Winton Formation, Cadna-Owie Formation, Hooray Sandstone, Hutton Sandstone and Poolowanna Formation (Precipice Sandstone equivalent). The sandstone formations of the Cooper Basin are not considered by the regulator to fall within the definition of “sandstone aquifers of the GAB”.

In the study area, only the upper aquifers within the stratigraphic sequence are of interest to the local community (Section 2.5.7). The deeper aquifers are not economically viable for use as domestic supply due



to the drilling costs to access them. As such, the Hutton and Poolowanna Sandstone aquifers are not used by the community with the possible exception of a couple of oil and gas exploration bores converted to private bores.

Any activity interfering with recharge to the aquifer may impact on the greater GAB. However, outcropping areas considered as the recharge regions of the major GAB units do not occur within 300 km of the study area.

2.6.2.4 Groundwater Dependant Ecosystems

GDEs can be defined as those ecosystems whose ecological processes and biodiversity are wholly or partially reliant on groundwater. There is currently no national GDE database, however, the *Environmental Water Requirements of Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems* report prepared by Sinclair Knight Merz Pty Ltd (SKM; 2001) provides an overview of key threatened GDEs in Australia and the framework for assessing environmental water provisions for GDEs. The extent of GDE dependency on groundwater can range from being marginally or episodically dependent to being entirely dependent on groundwater.

Examples of GDEs include:

- Springs and associated aquatic ecosystems in spring pools;
- Aquatic ecosystems in rivers and streams that receive groundwater baseflow;
- Terrestrial vegetation supported by shallow groundwater;
- Wetlands, which are often established in areas of groundwater discharge; and
- Aquifers and caves, where stygofauna (groundwater-inhabiting organisms) reside.

The potential presence of GDEs in the study area was assessed from literature sources (DERM, 2005 and 2007; Fensham and Fairfax, 2005) and public databases (e.g. Queensland wetlands project, Queensland spring database, EPBC Act Protected Matters database). The results of the GDE evaluation in the study area are presented in Figure 29 and are summarised below:

- No discharge springs (according to the GAB registers) are located within the *Project Areas* or within the vicinity of proposed hydraulic fracturing activities. The nearest GAB discharge spring is located 95 km southeast of Santos tenements, and 150 km east of the nearest tenement proposed for hydraulic fracturing (Figure 29);
- No GAB recharge springs or watercourse springs have been registered within the study area;
- The *Cooper Creek Basin Wild River Area Summary: Natural Values Assessment* (DERM, 2010) concludes that “the persistence of waterholes in the Cooper Creek is largely influenced by surface water flows and evaporation, with little inputs from groundwater”. This is supported by published peer-reviewed research into the surface water – groundwater connectivity of Cooper Creek waterholes, as discussed in Section 2.3 and 2.5.2.1. As a consequence the Cooper Creek drainage system, including the associated watercourses and waterholes, is *not* classified as a GDE;
- Within the study area, one listed wetland of international significance and 11 wetlands of national significance were identified (Table 12). The Ramsar-listed Currawinya Lakes is located in the southeastern corner of the study area, more than 170 km from the closest Santos lease and is not considered further in this report. Of the nationally important wetlands, two are located (partially) within Santos tenement boundaries, two are within 10km of a Santos tenement boundary, and the rest are 30 km or more from tenement boundaries. Similar to the discussion of the groundwater dependency of waterholes above, it is considered that the wetlands in this region are likely to be sustained by episodic flood events or surface water from the semi-permanent waterholes, as the relatively deep and saline water table aquifer characteristic of the study area is unlikely to sustain the wetlands. Further discussion of the wetlands is provided in Section 2.6.3.1; and



- Nearby national parks include the Lake Bindegolly National Park, west of the town of Thargomindah and the large Innamincka Recreation Reserve in SA, which do not have registered GDEs.

In summary, according to the GDE databases and literature referenced above, the only registered GDEs within the study area are discharge springs located more than 95 km from Santos tenements. These have not been considered further in this report.

2.6.2.5 Proximity of Oil and Gas Targets to Overlying and Underlying Aquifers

The key aquifers identified in the study area are considered to be the following: the Tirrawarra Formation, Patchawarra Formation, Epsilon Formation, Toolachee Formation and Wimmera Sandstone of the Cooper Basin; and the Poolowanna Formation (Precipice Sandstone equivalent), Hutton Sandstone, Hooray Sandstone, Cadna-Owie Formation, Winton Formation in the Eromanga Basin (refer to Section 2.5.2).

The general ranges of stratigraphic thickness that separate the aquifers from the nearest hydrocarbon reservoirs are also presented in Table 11.

The average offset between the base of the Hutton Sandstone and the top of the Permian gas reservoirs is between 200 to 300 m, with most of the intervening stratigraphy consisting of very low permeability mudstones and shales. For economic reasons landholder bores will generally access the shallowest beneficial use aquifer, typically being the Glendower and Winton Formations in the study area. The vertical offset between these aquifers and the top of the gas-bearing Permian interval is of the order of 1,400 m to 1,800 m for the Glendower Formation and between 1,000 m to 1,500 m for the Winton Formation.

Across the study area, the typical depth range between the Glendower Formation and the Cadna-Owie Formation in which the shallowest oil reservoirs are present is of the order of 500 m to 1,400 m, and between 400 m to 800 m for the Winton Formation.

Table 11: Stratigraphic Thickness between Hydrocarbon-Bearing Formations and Aquifers

Basin	Stratigraphic Unit	Relative to Nearest Potential Oil/Gas Target Formation	Vertical Distance
Eromanga	Winton Formation (GAB)	Wyandra Oil (Upper Cadna-Owie)	400 – 800 m
	Cadna-Owie Formation (GAB)		0 – 90* m
	Hooray Sandstone (GAB)	Murta Oil (Upper Hooray)	0 – 85* m
	Hutton Sandstone (GAB)	Middle Birkhead Oil (Birkhead Formation)	40 - 80 m
	Poolowanna Formation (GAB)		140 – 220 m
	Wimmera Sandstone (GAB)	Wimmera Gas (Nappamerri Grp)	140 – 200 m
Cooper	Wimmera Sandstone (GAB)	Toolachee Gas (Gidgealpa Group)	0 – 115* m
	Toolachee Formation (CB)		0 – 190* m
	Epsilon Formation (CB)	Patchawarra Gas (Gidgealpa Group)	<180**
	Patchawarra formation (CB)		<50**
	Tirrawarra Formation (CB)		0 – 150 *
			0 - 40 m

GAB = Great Artesian Basin (Eromanga Sub-basin, Triassic-Cretaceous), CB = Cooper Basin (Permian-Triassic).

* maximum thickness of unit (where the nearest gas or oil unit is a sub-unit of the aquifer).

** Maximum (uncertain due to lack of information)

In Table 11, where aquifer formations also contain hydrocarbon reservoirs the vertical range between the aquifer and reservoir formation is indicated as zero up to the maximum thickness of the formation. The water-bearing zones are separated from hydrocarbon reservoirs by intra-formational seals; however there is not enough information available to discretise the internal stratigraphy of these formations. Where petroleum



activities (including fracturing) occur within a formation that hosts both aquifers and hydrocarbon reservoirs, the lateral distance of the water supply bores accessing the aquifer to Santos' tenements was considered.

According to the DEHP database and the interim results of the WBBA program, groundwater supply development in the vicinity of Santos' tenements is limited to the Glendower and Winton Formations, and to a lesser extent the Hooray Sandstone. The minimum vertical offset between these aquifers and the shallowest hydrocarbon reservoirs (oil reservoirs of the Cadna-Owie Formation) is 400 to 800 m, which includes the low permeability formations of the Wallumbilla Formation and Allaru Mudstone, which form a thick, competent and regionally extensive seal between the Cadna-Owie Formation and the shallower aquifers.

The closest beneficial use bore to the Santos tenements targeting the Hooray Sandstone in the DEHP database records is the Whim Well (not observed during the WBBA), located 20 km from the closest tenement with hydraulic fracturing activities proposed (Figure 27). The closest *observed* bore, the Coothero Bore, which has a DEHP database recorded depth of 1,165 m, is at least 25 km from the closest tenement proposed for hydraulic fracturing (gas production in the *Western Project Area*) and more than 80 km from the closest tenement with activities proposed at a similar depth (i.e. oil production from the Hooray Sandstone in the *Eastern Project Area*).

2.6.3 Environmental Values of Surface Water

Specific EVs for the watercourses within the study area are not defined within the EPP (Water) 2009 and there are no detailed local plans relating to environmental values for the catchments.

Based on the land uses present within the catchment area the EVs which would apply to watercourses within the Cooper Creek Catchment are:

- Protection of aquatic ecosystems;
- Recreation and aesthetics: primary recreation with direct contact, and visual appreciation with no contact; and
- Cultural and spiritual values.

The Santos draft EMPs for the Project Areas discuss the cultural and spiritual values of the study area. These are summarised in the UWIR (Golder 2012a). The EMPs identify three sites of Aboriginal cultural heritage significance related to surface water within or in close proximity to the study area. These are the Nappapetheria Waterhole, Johnson Channel Area and Cunnavalla Area, and are listed in the Register of the National Estate (RNE).

2.6.3.1 Aquatic Ecosystems

The EVs associated with aquatic ecosystems comprise two inter-related aspects:

- The intrinsic value of aquatic ecosystems, habitat and wildlife in waterways and riparian areas – for example, biodiversity, ecological interactions, plants, animals, key species (such as waterfowl or frogs) and their habitat, food and potable water; and
- Waterways that include perennial and intermittent surface waters, groundwater, tidal and non-tidal waters, lakes, storages, reservoirs, dams, wetlands, swamps, marshes, lagoons, canals, natural and artificial channels and the bed and banks of waterways.

As discussed in Section 2.3, water flows in the Cooper Creek vary greatly over time. The Cooper Creek drainage channel system is predominantly ephemeral. Every three to four years a major flood event occurs (Figure 6) and during extended periods of no flow, the Cooper contracts to a series of semi-permanent waterholes, which provide drought refuges for a variety of flora and fauna.

Cooper Creek Basin, the largest catchment in the Lake Eyre region, has been declared as a *Wild River area*. DEHP defines *Wild River areas* as river ecosystems which are relatively untouched by development and are therefore in near natural condition, with all, or almost all, of their natural values intact. These areas may



include threatened plants, birds and marine and estuarine species. Hence, the aquatic ecosystems associated with the waterholes and billabongs that form between flood events are considered to be of high ecological value.

Wetlands

For the purpose of this study, wetlands are defined as areas of permanent or periodic/intermittent inundation, with water that is static or flowing fresh, brackish or salt (Wetlandinfo, 2012). Wetlands must have one or more of the following attributes:

- at least periodically, the land supports plants or animals that are adapted to and dependent on living in wet conditions for at least part of their life cycle; or
- the substratum is predominantly undrained soils that are saturated, flooded or ponded long enough to develop anaerobic conditions in the upper layers; or
- the substratum is not soil and is saturated with water, or covered by water at some time.

The Queensland Wetland Program identifies eleven wetlands of ecological importance and one Ramsar Wetland (Commonwealth of Australia, 2010) within the study area. These wetlands and their proximity to Santos' tenements are summarised in Table 12.

Table 12: Identified Wetlands of National and International Significance in the Study Area

Wetland Name	Reference Number	Area (ha)	Approximate Distance to Santos SWQ Tenement
International Importance ¹			
Currawinya Lakes ¹	43	151,300	130 km E of ATP 1063P
National Importance ²			
Cooper Creek – Wilson River Junction	QLD027	63,925	Within ATP 259P, PL131 and PL150
Bulloo Lake	QLD024	83,227	Within ATP 1063P
Cooper Creek Swamps – Nappa Merrie	QLD026	106,311	5 km W of 259P
Lake Yamma Yamma	QLD037	86,548	10 km NW of ATP 752P
Lake Bullawarra	QLD031	1,287	30 km S of ATP 636P
Nooyeah Downs Swamps Aggregation	QLD041	6,241	30 km S of ATP 636P
Lake Cuddapan	QLD033	1,704	50 km NW of ATP 752P
Cooper Creek Overflow Swamps – Windorah	QLD025	124,853	50 km NE of ATP 259P
Lakes Bindegolly and Toomaroo	QLD125	9,677	60 km SE of ATP 636P
Quilpie (Bulloo River FP) water holes	QLD167	30	90 km E of ATP 766P
Mitchell Swamp	QLD170	500	110 km NE of ATP 776

1. List of Wetlands of International Importance of the Ramsar Convention

2. A Directory of Nationally Important Wetlands in Australia (Environment Australia, 2001)

Ecological Investigation of the Study Area

The unpredictable flow regime and spatially complex environment has created a distinctive ecology, with the Cooper Creek Catchment (Section 2.3) providing important habitats for a range of species, especially in times of flood.

Most species of aquatic fauna are well adapted to the extreme flood-drought regime prevailing in the region. Life cycles are completed rapidly during favourable conditions, and temperature, salinity and oxygen tolerances are often high. Several species are highly dependent upon the refuge habitat provided by permanent waterholes for survival during the long droughts that regularly occur in the region.



A brief overview of the biology of the study area, as evidenced from the field surveys undertaken to better understand the implications of the Commonwealth EPBC Act 1999 (Carpenter and Armstrong, 2001 and 2002; Santos 2003), is summarised below:

- **Aquatic Flora:** No rare or threatened species of aquatic flora have been recorded from the waterways in the oil and gas fields;
- **Aquatic Macroinvertebrate Communities:** Several species of crustaceans inhabit the creeks and waterholes of the Cooper Basin. They are dependent upon permanent water for survival, and generally retreat to permanent waterholes during droughts. Some species however, can survive for prolonged periods, buried in the dry bed of creeks and waterholes. Species include freshwater crabs, the common yabby, shield shrimps, freshwater shrimps and freshwater mussel;
- **Fish Communities:** Most of the fish species within the study area can tolerate a large range of water quality conditions. golden perch, mosquito fish, western carp-gudgeon and central Australian catfish are tolerant species that can live in water characterized by low DO levels, high salinity and relatively high turbidity;
- **Waterfowl:** Sixteen species of waterbird were surveyed near water holes along the flood plain. These include the pink eared duck, glossy ibis and brolga. Brolga is a large silvery-grey waterbird with a red face and nape and is listed as vulnerable. It inhabits shallow lakes, swamps, wet grasslands and dry land adjacent to these areas.

2.6.3.2 *Recreational Values*

The Cooper Creek Catchment is a popular recreational fishing destination. Fishing for golden perch and catching common yabby are popular within the study area in:

- the waterholes of the Bulloo River at Thargomindah;
- the Wilson River at Nockatunga; and
- Cooper Creek, in the channel country (Bulloo Shire Council, 2012).

The portion of the Cooper Creek system in South Australia, downstream of Cooper Basin, is a popular destination for tourists from all over the world. With only a few permanent waterholes in South Australia section of the Cooper Creek system, fish must survive droughts by colonising as many temporary waterholes as possible during the Cooper Creek catchment flood events (Section 2.3).

2.6.3.3 *Proximity of Santos Tenements to Surface Water with Environmental Values*

The proximity of Santos tenements and proposed petroleum activities to surface water EVs are described below:

- **Aquatic Ecosystems** – The proximity of aquatic ecosystems to Santos' tenements are described in detail in Section 2.6.3.1 and illustrated in Figure 29. Cooper Creek, which has been declared as a *Wild River Area*, is largely influenced by surface water flows and evaporation, with negligible contribution from groundwater. Waterholes and billabongs occur throughout the Cooper Creek floodplain and channel complex, some of which coincide directly with Santos tenements;
- **Wetlands** – As indicated in Table 12 reveals that two of the identified wetlands (Cooper Creek – Wilson River Junction and Bulloo Lake) are within boundaries of Santos' tenements in the *Central* and *Western Project Areas*. None of the wetlands are located within a reasonable radius (>75 km) of the *Eastern Project Area* tenements where hydraulic stimulation activities are currently proposed for oil production (refer to 1.3.1). Stimulation activities for gas production are proposed in the *Western Project Areas* PL131 and ATP 259P which coincide with the location of Cooper Creek – Wilson River Junction. It



should be noted that hydraulic fracturing activities may be completed within any tenement boundary over the life of the Project;

- **Recreational Values** – The Cooper Creek catchment and downstream Lake Eyre are popular recreational fishing destinations. The proximity to popular fishing spots from Santos activities are listed below:
 - Bulloo River at Thargomindah is 55 km from the Santos tenement boundaries, and 90 km to the closest active lease area;
 - The Wilson River at Nockatunga is located within ATP 267P in the *Central Project Area* where there are currently no active leases. The distance of this location from the closest active lease area is 16 km; and
 - Cooper Creek flows (episodically) through the active *Western Project Area* tenements.

These wetlands, waterholes and rivers with ecological and recreational values are identified and spatially managed in a DEHP GIS database of Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs), a copy of which was provided to Santos for all of their tenements. The ESAs form a routine part of the constraints analysis in the planning of all Santos well leases and associated disturbance proposals in SWQ. Prior to any greenfield disturbance, or subsequent re-disturbance, a Santos Environmental Advisor or external ecologist inspects the site for potential environmental impact. The resultant assessment, and any recommendations for mitigation, is managed via the Santos *Environmental Approval Request Tracking Form* (EART). Approval conditions must be accepted by the relevant project proponent prior to any physical works occurring.

2.6.4 Terrestrial Environmental Values

For the purpose of this assessment, terrestrial environmental values are considered to comprise the native flora and fauna of the study area. Based on information obtained from the SEWPaC IBRA (online at: <http://www.environment.gov.au/parks/nrs/science/bioregion-framework/ibra/index.html>), three biogeographical regions cover the study area, as follows:

- Channel Country, which covers the central portion of the study area and is characterised by vast braided, flood and alluvial plains surrounded by gibber plains, dunefields and low ranges. Native vegetation is predominantly mitchell grass, gidgee and spinifex, and various weeds are known to exist in the area. The region is predominantly used for stock grazing (approximately 91%) and is home to several invasive animals. Native species are abundant and include red, eastern, and western grey kangaroos, with various marsupials and reptiles adapted to the variable ecosystems there present;
- Mulga Lands, which covers the eastern portion of the study area and is characterised by flat to undulating plains with outcrops of low ranges and tablelands. The dominant native vegetation types are mulga and eucalypt woodland, with some weed species well established particularly where grazing occurs. The region is predominantly used for stock grazing (approximately 94%) and is home to several invasive animals, but also supports an assemblance of diverse native species; and
- Simpson Strzelecki Dunefields, which covers the southwest corner of the study area and comprises long parallel sand dunes, fringing dunefields, extensive sand plains, ephemeral watercourses and salt pans. Vegetation is predominantly spinifex hummock grasslands with sparse acacia shrublands and some narrow river red gum and coolibah riverine woodlands. The region is partially used for stock grazing (approximately 49%) and is home to several invasive animals, as well as highly adapted native species.


A study area specific report generated from the interactive EPBC Act Protected Matters Search Tool (<http://www.environment.gov.au/epbc/pmst/index.html>) indicated matters of national environmental significance, as follows:

- Threatened species including 5 birds, 1 fish, 6 small and medium sized mammals, 1 reptile and 8 plants;



- Migratory species including 3 marine birds, 2 terrestrial birds and 6 wetland birds;
- Listed species including 9 birds;
- Indicative and registered indigenous and historic areas;
- Reserves and wetlands; and
- Invasive plant and animals.

It is considered that some of these terrestrial environmental values could be in close proximity to Santos hydraulic fracturing activities. Consistent with before mentioned procedures, prior to greenfield disturbance, or subsequent re-disturbance, a Santos Environmental Advisor or external ecologist inspects the site for potential environmental impact. The resultant assessment, and any recommendations for mitigation, is managed via the Santos Environmental Approval Request Tracking Form (EART). Approval conditions must be accepted by the relevant project proponent prior to any physical works occurring.



SWQ HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT

SANTOS

ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREAS IN TENEMENTS WITHIN THE SANTOS STUDY AREA

COPYRIGHT

1. Base map data copyright MapInfo Australia Pty Ltd
2. Geology supplied by the State of Queensland (Department of Mines and Energy), 2007
3. Tenure boundaries supplied by Santos, August 2011
4. Golder Associates 2012a Cooper Basin UWIR Report



LEGEND

- Study Area
- Nationally Important Wetland
- Ramsar Site
- Secondary Road/Track
- Town/Locality
- GAB ROP Discharge Spring
- GAB ROP Recharge Spring
- Tenements within the Santos Project Area
- Constraint Areas
- ESA (Primary)
- ESA (Secondary)
- River/Creek

0 12.5 25 50 75 Kilometres

SCALE (at A3) 1:2,100,000

Coordinate System: GCS GDA 1994

PROJECT: 127666004
DATE: 19/12/2012
DRAWN: FA
CHECKED: RS

FIGURE 29





3.0 HYDRAULIC FRACTURING PROCESS

3.1 Introduction

The description of the hydraulic fracturing process is covered under the following headings:

- Description of the oil-bearing units and the oil they contain;
- Description of the gas-bearing units and the gas they contain;
- Purpose of the hydraulic fracturing process;
- Description of the hydraulic fracturing process;
- How is hydraulic fracturing carried out;
- Infrastructure and equipment used;
- Stages of hydraulic fracturing;
- Assessment techniques for determining extent of stimulation activities;
- Practices and procedures used to ensure fracture remains in target zone;
- Program for wells to be fractured;
- Frequency of hydraulic fracturing;
- Distribution of wells fractured to date and to be fractured;
- Location of landholders active bores; and
- Chemical constituents in acid and hydraulic fracturing package.

3.2 Well Design and Hydraulic Fracturing - General Considerations

Prior to considering the practice of hydraulic fracturing to enhance conventional oil and gas well production, two important matters require addressing in accordance with the requirements anticipated of the EA conditions that will apply to new areas proposed for production, namely:

- Comparison to *international best practice* – the procedures employed by Santos' and its contractors follow a design philosophy predicated on the guidance, specifications and recommended practices of the American Petroleum Institute (API), considered to represent international best practice;
- *Well mechanical integrity and surveillance* – the procedures employed by Santos' and its contractors for mechanical integrity and surveillance follow a design philosophy with international best practice. Practices for ensuring well mechanical integrity consist of a robust surveillance plan, which includes;
 - *Well integrity checks including casing pressure surveys, downhole isolation checks (where applicable), casing top-ups with inhibited fluid and casing pressure tests.*
 - *Operator surveillance involving quarterly casing pressure surveys and visual inspections.*
 - *Wellhead maintenance requiring valve function testing and maintenance.*
 - *Cement integrity involving acoustic logging and casing pressure tests.*

3.2.1 Comparison to International Best Practice

Within Australia and the world, the oil and gas industry is reliant on a number of experienced hydraulic fracturing contractors.



These contractors, along with operating companies, have developed and defined industry best practices in the field of hydraulic fracturing. These practices have been transferred to applicable operations in Australia.

These practices have been developed over 60 years using experience and technological innovation. These experiences and practices are communicated and shared via academic training, professional and trade associations, extensive literature and documents and, importantly, industry standards and recommended practices.

The industry best practice guidelines, arising from this body of knowledge, experience and leading edge research, are distilled in a series of guidance documents published by the API. It should be noted that API Technical Reports (TRs) and Recommended Practices (RPs) are not legal requirements and the use of these documents is voluntary. The key guidance documents relevant to the contractors operations in the SWQ oil and gas fields of the Cooper Basin include:

- API Guidance Document HF1, *Hydraulic Fracturing Operations – Well Construction and Integrity Guidelines*
- API Guidance Document HF2, *Water Management Associated with Hydraulic Fracturing*
- API Guidance Document HF3, *Practices for Mitigating Surface Impacts Associated with Hydraulic Fracturing*
- API Specification 5CT/ISO 11960, *Specification for Casing and Tubing*
- API Specification 6A/ISO 10423, *Specification for Wellhead and Christmas Tree Equipment*
- API Specification 10A/ISO 10426-1, *Specification for Cements and Materials for Well Cementing*
- API Recommended Practice 10B-2/ISO 10426-2, *Recommended Practice for Testing Well Cements*
- API Recommended Practice 10B-3/ISO 10426-3, *Recommended Practice on Testing of Deepwater Well Cement Formulations*
- API Recommended Practice 10B-4/ISO 10426-4, *Recommended Practice on Preparation and Testing of Foamed Cement Slurries at Atmospheric Pressure*
- API Recommended Practice 10B-5/ISO 10426-5, *Recommended Practice on Determination of Shrinkage and Expansion of Well Cement Formulations at Atmospheric Pressure*
- API Recommended Practice 10B-6/ISO 10426-6, *Recommended Practice on Determining the Static Gel Strength of Cement Formulations*
- API Specification 10D/ISO 10427-1, *Specification for Bow-Spring Casing Centralizers*
- API Specification 10D-2/ISO 10427-2, *Recommended Practice for Centralizer Placement and Stop Collar Testing*
- API Recommended Practice 10F/ISO 10427-3, *Recommended Practice for Performance Testing of Cementing Float Equipment*
- API Technical Report 10TR1, *Cement Sheath Evaluation*
- API Technical Report 10TR2, *Shrinkage and Expansion in Oil Well Cements*
- API Technical Report 10TR3, *Temperatures for API Cement Operating Thickening Time Tests*
- API Technical Report 10TR4, *Technical Report on Considerations Regarding Selection of Centralizers for Primary Cementing Operations*
- API Technical Report 10TR5, *Technical Report on Methods for Testing of Solid and Rigid Centralizers*
- API Specification 13A /ISO 13500, *Specification for Drilling Fluid Materials*
- API Recommended Practice 13B-1/ISO 10414-1, *Recommended Practice for Field Testing Water-Based Drilling Fluids*
- API Recommended Practice 13B-2/ISO 10414-2, *Recommended Practice for Field Testing Oil-based Drilling Fluids*
- API Recommended Practice 45, *Recommended Practice for Analysis of Oilfield Waters*
- API Recommended Practice 53, *Blowout Prevention Equipment Systems for Drilling Operations*
- API Recommended Practice 65, *Cementing Shallow Water Flow Zones in Deep Water Wells*



- API Recommended Practice 65-2, *Isolating Potential Flow Zones During Well Construction*
- API Recommended Practice 90, *Annular Casing Pressure Management for Offshore Wells*

The hydraulic fracturing contractors operating in Australia and used by Santos currently follow the intent and detail of these guidance documents as they apply to the site-specific conditions for each hydrocarbon bearing field. In conjunction with these activities, other hydraulic fracturing technologies are also being used, such as use of pneumatic techniques (gases, such as CO₂) to fracture the sandstone hydrocarbon reservoirs. The process of researching alternate methods is an ongoing process, and descriptions and results of trialled alternative methods will be provided as the findings become available and are considered field-ready.

3.2.2 Well Mechanical Integrity and Integrity Testing

3.2.2.1 Background

One of the major controls in providing a high degree of protection to the Cooper and Eromanga aquifers is through robust well design, well construction, and scheduled integrity checks throughout the lifecycle of the well i.e. from production to abandonment. Quality control procedures are implemented through the material selection, sourcing process, installation as well as maintenance and checks to ensure the casing and seals are adequate barriers for hydraulic isolation.

A properly designed production well provides full containment of hydrocarbons within its internal casing and/or completion conduit from the subsurface to the surface and affords:

- Protection of groundwater resources;
- Protection to the environment; and
- A safe working and operable environment.

Full containment is achieved by cementing in place multiple strings of steel casing and installing mechanical plugs or packers after a well is drilled to depth. The primary objective of the well design is to prevent communication with aquifer systems and cross flow of fluids (gas, oil and water) between sedimentary layers. Of particular note is that important casing design parameters are factored to ensure that the well's integrity is maintained during the high treatment pressures imparted during fracture stimulation. Examples of specified casing parameters include pipe weight, metallurgy, burst and yield pressures.

In addition to the subsurface well construction, the surface well head integrity is of equal importance to ensure hydrocarbon containment. A properly designed wellhead ensures that the control measures (or barriers) are in place for well production, but more critically, that the well can be secured and isolated in events such as an uncontrolled release of hydrocarbons to atmosphere. Santos has embedded Standards and Procedures (EHSMS 11.5, AIMS and PESP 9.1, Santos 2009) to ensure that integrity controls and measures have been performed prior to hydraulic fracturing. Typically, this would involve running a cement bond log to check the quality of the cement and/or pressure testing of the internal and annular sides of the well.

The hydrocarbon reservoirs are accessed through perforations in the steel casing and cement sheaths opposite the respective reservoir zones, with the produced oil and gas contained within the well casing all the way to the surface. This *containment* and barrier philosophy along with continued zonal isolation is what is meant by the term "well integrity." Should an issue with casing be identified, fracture stimulation is postponed until the well is remediated. If remediation of the well is physically or economically unfeasible, the well is completed without fracture stimulation or plugged and abandoned to regulatory specifications.

Routine integrity checks are scheduled while the well is on production in accordance with the well design, well plan, and permit requirements, until such time that the well is abandoned.

NOTE: The discussion of well integrity has been drawn from discussions and information provided by Santos, and supplemented by information directly sourced from API HF1 (API, 2009). The reader is urged to consult this document for a detailed description of the well completion process.



3.2.2.2 *Drilling and Well Completion*

Drilling a typical oil or gas well consists of several cycles of drilling, running casing (steel casing for well construction), and cementing the casing in place to ensure isolation. In each cycle, steel casing is installed in sequentially smaller sizes inside the previous installed casing string. The last cycle of the well construction is well completion, which can include perforating (creating holes in the steel casing) and hydraulic fracturing or other stimulation techniques depending on the well type and formation characteristics.

The main stages of drilling and completing a well comprise:

- Lease preparation;
- Rigging up of major drilling equipment (e.g. tanks, pumps, rig, draw works, hydraulic and power packs);
- Drilling the surface hole;
- Cementing in place the surface casing;
- Installation of the Bradenhead and Blow Out Preventor (BOP);
- Running in to continue drilling in the production hole to depth;
- Petrophysical logging of the open borehole section;
- Cementing in place the production casing;
- Securing the well and rig release;
- Cased hole logging (for well integrity);
- Installation of wellhead or Frac Tree;
- Perforation of the first zone in preparation for hydraulic fracturing;
- Hydraulic fracture stimulation and initial flowback of well;
- Installation of artificial lift (if necessary);
- Installation of the final completion design;
- Installation of production well head, flowlines and telemetry;
- Well on production;
- Monitoring of well's production and integrity checks; and
- Rehabilitation of surrounding well's lease

3.2.2.3 *Selection and Sourcing of Casing Materials*

To ensure long term casing integrity, Santos has developed detailed specifications for all well casings and well completion materials. The casing materials are specifically rated to handle hydraulic fracturing treatments at Permian depths and pressures. Parameters such as yield and burst pressures are specified and triaxial load modelling are sometimes performed to ensure that the well's integrity is maintained during the high treatment pressures applied during fracture stimulation and for the lifecycle of the well.

All materials are inspected by Santos and the contractors prior to installation to ensure compliance with the Santos specifications. A similar process of inspections and testing are utilised throughout the drilling and casing installation program. This testing and inspection is discussed in the sections below.



3.2.2.4 Logging the Borehole

All of Santos oil and gas wells are routinely logged with tools to obtain specific information on the hydrocarbon bearing reservoirs. The results of these logs are used as important indicators that aid in fracture target selection.

Open-hole Logging

Once the production hole/reservoir section is drilled to final depth, open-hole logging tools are run on wireline to obtain petrophysical information. A typical suite of electric logging tools would include the following:

- *Gamma Ray*: a receiver tool that detects natural radiation from rock. The main isotopes of thorium, potassium, and uranium can indicate the presence of clay mineralogy;
- *Laterolog*: tools which measure the resistivity of the fluids contained in the rock. This is used as an indication of water bearing zones. Higher resistivity values can be an indication of hydrocarbon bearing zones;
- *Spontaneous Potential (SP log)*: measures the salinity contrast between mud filtrate and formation water. This data can be used to assess permeability and potentially some information on lithology;
- *Density Tool*: measures the bulk density of the rock and indicates the presence of porosity;
- *Neutron Tool*: a source/receiver tool which measures rock porosity;
- *Caliper Tool*: measures hole diameter and can provide an indication of borehole geometry. Useful in terms of planning for casing running and cementing design; and
- *Sonic Tool*: a source/receiver tool measuring the transit time of acoustic waves passing through the rock. This data can be used as an indicator of porosity but is primarily used for geomechanical calculations, including minimum horizontal stress. This is a key value required in hydraulic fracture stimulation design.

Logging produces detailed information on the rock formations drilled and the water and hydrocarbons they might contain. This assists with installation of casing strings to the correct depth in order to achieve the well design objectives and to properly achieve the isolation benefits of the casing and cement sheath.

Many other types of logging tools are available and may be run on a case specific basis such as cased hole evaluation logs in place of open hole logs.

Cement Integrity (Cased-hole) Logging

After cementing the casing in place (refer to Section 3.2.2.5), “cased-hole” logs can be run inside the casing to validate the quality and integrity of the cement sheath bond to the casing. Typically, these logs include the following:

- gamma ray (described previously);
- casing collar locator (CCL; a magnetic device that detects the casing collars); and
- cement bond log (CBL), segmented bond tool (SBT) and variable density log (VDL) that measures the acoustic properties of the cement sheath and the quality of the cement bond or seal between the casing and the formation.

The CBL-VDL or SBT is an acoustic device that can detect cemented or non-cemented casing. These acoustic devices work by transmitting a sound or vibration signal, and then recording the amplitude of the arrival signal. Casing that has no cement surrounding it (i.e. free pipe) will have large amplitude acoustic signal because the energy remains in the pipe. Casing pipe that has a good cement sheath (fills the annular space between the casing and the formation) will have a much smaller amplitude signal since the casing is “acoustically coupled” with the cement and the formation causing the acoustic energy to be absorbed.



Santos uses experienced contractors to identify the key features of the cement operation to ensure the integrity of the cement seal for each casing pipe sheath. The cased-hole logs are also useful when the well is perforated to position the perforating guns with respect to the formations (by comparing with the gamma-ray response of the open-hole log and the CBL).

Santos most commonly uses the CBL-VDL or SBT cement evaluation logs to evaluate cement integrity, however other types of cement evaluation tools are available and, depending on the situation, are considered as a part of the cement evaluation program.

A key result of the cased-hole logging program is to know the exact location of the casing, casing collars, and quality of the cement relative to each other and relative to the subsurface formation locations. This ensures that the well drilling and construction is adequate and achieves the desired design integrity and longevity objectives. It is also used to provide information in subsequent surveys of well integrity and seals over the production life of the production well.

3.2.2.5 Casing Design

A casing completion design is prepared by the engineering team based on: rock cuttings and/or borehole core retrieved from the drilling of the well hole; information gained from geophysical logging of the borehole; the regional geological model; reservoir analysis; and the history of nearby wells. Historical problems encountered in the area (lost returns, irregular hole erosion, poor hole cleaning, poor cement displacement, etc.) are considered during the design process. A typical casing design is illustrated in Figure 30.

The basis of the site-specific design for the casing construction emphasises barrier performance and zonal isolation (including aquifer, low quality groundwater and poor ground isolation), as well as gas and oil production efficiency. It includes wellbore preparation, mud removal, casing pipe running (Section 3.2.2.6), and cement placement (Section 3.2.2.7) to provide barriers that prevent fluid and gas migration and well leakage. The well design process also includes contingency planning to mitigate the risk of failure due to unforeseen events.

The casing design process also accommodates analysis of those factors which determine the hydraulic fracturing outcomes. These include defining the optimal location and orientation of perforations such that the zone of hydraulic fracturing is contained entirely within the target hydrocarbon-bearing formations. The latter involves the assessment of borehole core, porosity analysis, fracture orientation and density testing, joint orientation, bedding plane analysis and stress field analysis.

3.2.2.6 Casing Completion

The first borehole drilled is for installing the conductor pipe (Figure 30). This is followed by drilling a series of sequentially deeper boreholes for installation of the various casing pipes as follows: surface casing, intermediate casing (if necessary), and the production casing. Specific considerations for each of these casing strings are presented below. It is important to note that the shallow portions of the well have multiple concentric strings of steel casing installed.

- The *conductor casing* stabilises the surficial sediments from the drilling action of subsequent drilling phases (prevents the loose soils from caving into the borehole), and is cemented into place to ensure an appropriately robust seal (up to ground level). It also serves to isolate the surface water table and perched aquifers, if present;
- The *surface casing* is typically installed to protect the shallow formations (weathered or unconsolidated rock layers) and to stabilise the well from the later drilling phases of deeper sections of the borehole. This portion of the well completion can extend from 30 m to 60 m depth. This casing pipe is also cemented into place to ensure an appropriately robust seal, with cementing taking place from bottom to top to ensure an effective seal. The surface casing is designed to achieve all regulatory requirements for isolating groundwater and also to contain pressures that might occur during the subsequent drilling process;



- The *intermediate casing* pipe may be installed to isolate deeper aquifer systems (if present), for example, the Wallumbilla Formation may be cased off to reduce the risk of impact to this layer. As with the shallower casing strings, this casing pipe is also cemented into place to ensure an appropriately robust seal, again with cementing taking place from bottom to top to ensure an effective seal. A formation pressure integrity test is performed immediately after drilling out of the intermediate casing;
- After the production hole is drilled and logged, *production casing* pipe is lowered to the total depth of the borehole and cemented in place (total depth is typically 10 m to 20 m below the base of the lowermost hydrocarbon-bearing unit, but not penetrating the underlying aquifer systems, if present). The purpose of the production casing is to provide the final isolation between the hydrocarbon reservoirs and all other overlying formations, and for containing and pumping the various fluids used to hydraulically fracture the target zones from the surface into the producing formation without affecting the shallower layers penetrated by the well. It also houses the downhole production pumping equipment (oil wells) when the well becomes operational. During the operational phase of the well, its most important function is internally containing the hydrocarbons produced from the oil and gas units.

The production casing pipe is pressure cemented, from bottom to top, to achieve robust and effective isolation of the well from the various subsurface layers (aquifers and aquitards alike):

- Prior to perforating and hydraulic fracturing operations, the production well casing is pressure tested. This test should be conducted at a pressure that is greater than what is expected during fracturing and operations, to ensure that the casing integrity is adequate. A CBL, VDL and/or other diagnostic tools are run to establish that the cement integrity is satisfactory for the completion and operational conditions designed for the wells life (see Section 3.2.2). Remedial cementing operations are implemented if there is evidence of inadequate cement integrity; and
- Santos is increasingly moving to *deviated* and potentially *horizontal* production wells to reduce the oil and gas fields' footprint (multiple horizontal wells from a single surface location, thereby, reducing the cumulative surface impact of the production operation). Selection and use of these techniques is in its infancy and trials are currently underway.

Casing pressure tests are carried out at each stage to ensure integrity of the casing pipe for further drilling or operational conditions. These tests are conducted at pressures that will determine whether the casing integrity is adequate to meet the well design and construction objectives.

3.2.2.7 Cementing

Cement types, additives and mixes are higher quality materials produced specifically for oil and gas operations. Materials are selected and designed to address site-specific conditions relevant to a particular well. Cement mixtures and installation techniques are employed to provide a robust seal that isolates the well from the surrounding formations, and protects the well materials from potentially aggressive groundwater or formation conditions. The cements are not typical building/construction cements, but are tailored cements designed for use in well construction and the subsurface conditions encountered.

Cement is placed using appropriate centralising equipment to completely surround the casing pipe to create a hydraulic seal against the rock face of the borehole, thereby achieving pipe integrity. Effective isolation of the well pipe from the various subsurface formations requires complete and even annular filling and tight cement interfaces with the formation and casing.

Following the casing design, these materials selection and cement procedures are typically implemented at Santos well casing completion sites:

- Computer simulation and completion planning is carried out to optimise cement placement procedures;
- Santos drilling contractors are selected based on their reputation, and their adherence to industry best practice methods and regulatory requirements. Importantly, as it affects cementing, they are required to use established, effective drilling practices to achieve a uniform, stable well borehole with the desired hole geometry. Additionally, they are required to satisfy Santos health-safety-environmental (HSE)



requirements with regard to their personnel and equipment. They are required to ensure that their cementing equipment provides adequate mixing, blending, and pumping of the cement in the field;

- Santos drilling contractors are required to ensure that the drilling fluid selection is appropriate for the designed well and the geologic conditions likely to be encountered, and present a low risk to the environment;
- Site drilling and cementing equipment are selected to adequately achieve the well design that will meet the well design objective and ensure effective isolation;
- Santos drilling contractors are required to employ casing pipe centralisers to help centre the casing pipe within the borehole and provide for good mud removal and cement placement, especially in critical areas, such as hydrocarbon-bearing zones, and groundwater aquifers;
- Santos cementing contractors are required to use appropriate cement testing procedures to ensure cement slurry quality and designs are adequate. These include implementation of appropriate cement slurry quality controls - with testing to measure the following parameters depending on site-specific geological and groundwater quality conditions:
 - slurry density;
 - thickening time;
 - fluid loss control;
 - free fluid;
 - compressive strength development;
 - fluid compatibility (cement, mix fluid, mud).
 - sedimentation control;
 - expansion or shrinkage characteristics of the set cement;
 - static gel strength development;
 - mechanical properties (e.g. Young's Modulus, Poisson's Ratio, elastic/compressibility characteristics); and
- Cement design may include placement in two stages, using a "lead" cement of lower density and a "tail" cement of higher density and compressive strength.


Appropriate setting times are adhered to ensure that the cement seals are optimal prior to further drilling, hydraulic fracturing and/or operational testing. The cement is tested using specific quality assessment and quality control (QA/QC) procedures such as circulation testing and logging as outlined in Section 3.2.2.4.

3.2.2.8 *Well Completion Design*

The final well completion is not typically run until after fracture stimulation, although there are situations where it is run before the well is stimulated. Completions design is the process of running in of a separate piece of pipe or conduit in the already cased well. This pipe is secured with mechanical packers above the producing zones and is usually performed with a separate Completions/ Work Over Rig. The purpose of the final completion string is to allow the hydrocarbons to produce from it, but on a well integrity perspective, it acts as the secondary barrier control such that if the primary barrier (being the casing) fails, there is not an uncontrolled release of hydrocarbon to surface.

Information contained on this drawing is the copyright of Golder Associates Pty. Ltd. Unauthorised use or reproduction of this plan either wholly or in part without written permission infringes copyright. ©Golder Associates Pty. Ltd.

J:\hyd\2012\127666004_SWQLD_HFRA_Adelaide\Technical Doc\CADD\FIGURES\127666004-011-R-F030-REV0.cdr



Key	
	Aquifer
	Water Bearing
	Confining Bed
	Gas Accumulation
	Oil Accumulation

Source: Stratigraphy and scale based on DMITRE, 2012. Road map for unconventional Gas Projects in South Australia. Energy Resources Division, April 2012.



CLIENT		SANTOS		PROJECT		SWQ HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT					
DRAWN		HC		DATE		16.11.2012					
CHECKED		RS		DATE		19.12.2012					
SCALE		VERTICAL SCALE: AS SHOWN		HORIZONTAL SCALE: N.T.S.		A3		PROJECT No.		DOC No.	
								127666004		011	
								DOC TYPE		R	
								FIGURE No.		F030	
								REV No.		0	
										FIGURE 30	



3.3 Description of the Hydraulic Fracturing Process

3.3.1 Introduction

This section describes the process of hydraulically fracturing a conventional oil or gas well, including:

- Description of the reservoir formations and the hydrocarbons they contain;
- Purpose of the hydraulic fracturing process;
- Description of the hydraulic fracturing process;
- Infrastructure and equipment used;
- Stages of hydraulic fracturing;
- Assessment techniques for determining extent of stimulation activities;
- Practices and Procedures used to ensure fracture remains in target zone;
- Program for wells to be fractured;
- Frequency of hydraulic fracturing;
- Distribution of wells fractured to date and to be fractured; and
- Chemical constituents in hydraulic fracturing fluid systems.

3.3.2 Description of Hydrocarbon Reservoir Formations in the Study Area

3.3.2.1 Conventional Gas

Conventional gas is mostly methane and is produced predominantly from stacked sands of the Toolachee and Patchawarra Formations (Gidgealpa Group), which lie within the Cooper Basin. The fluvial sandstone reservoirs are separated by shales and coals, which act as intra-formational seals (refer to detailed stratigraphy in Section 2.4). Minor gas production also occurs from other sediments within the Gidgealpa Group (e.g. the Epsilon Formation), from various localised sediments within the overlying Nappamerri Group (also part of the Cooper Basin) and from the Hutton Sandstone (within the Eromanga Basin). Generally, however, the Nappamerri Group shales act as a regional top-seal for gas.

The gas is predominantly stored as free gas within pore spaces in the sandstone reservoirs. Much of the porosity found in sandstone reservoirs is preserved primary intergranular porosity. The sandstone reservoirs often have low permeabilities (usually of the order of 1 to 10 milliDarcies, equivalent to a hydraulic conductivity range of 10^{-2} to 10^{-3} m/d), such that fracture stimulation is essential in order to achieve economic flow-rates and production volumes. Under the natural confining pressure of a typical reservoir the gas exists in a near liquid state.

A key element that distinguishes conventional gas production from CSG production is that conventional sandstone reservoirs do not require the depressurisation of the target beds (with respect to groundwater). When a conventional gas well is completed with its final production string, pressure drawdown (i.e. differential pressure between the reservoir and wellbore) is created by opening up the well to the gathering system. Gas is then able to flow by virtue of the conductive path to the well via the formation's permeability. In general, most gas reservoirs naturally deplete through a gas expansion drive mechanism. In contrast to the drive mechanisms associated with oil reservoirs and unconventional coal bed methane reservoirs, the drive mechanism in conventional gas reservoirs are such that gas will move from high pressure in the reservoir to low pressure at surface without the aid of mechanical lifting devices.

3.3.2.2 Conventional Oil

The conventional oil reservoirs in the study area are associated with sandstone formations of the Eromanga Basin. The oil is present in discontinuous oil reservoirs within interbedded sandstones beds or larger



sandstone formations (in the sandstone units of the Cadna-Owie, Hooray Sandstone and Birkhead formations); with reservoirs typically comprising structural and sedimentary traps (Section 2.4.3.4).

The sandstone reservoirs are generally interbedded with shales, mudstones, siltstones and coals, which act as intra-formational seals. The primary oil reservoir formations are separated by low permeability formations comprising shale-mudstones-siltstones-sandstone assemblages of the Eromanga Basin, themselves situated at depth within a thick sequence of highly variable sedimentary rock types (Table 5).

The porosity found in oil sandstone reservoirs is preserved primary intergranular porosity. Water and oil commonly occur together, having a film of water separating the pore boundaries from the oil. Oil reservoirs that lack a film of connate water at pore boundaries can occur but are rare.

Oil production wells generally do not free flow, so gas lift is typically used to aid oil or condensate production. The produced water is separated from the oil and treated and is typically used in water flooding activities to restore and maintain reservoir pressure and enhance production (Figure 28; Golder, 2012a).

3.3.3 Purpose of the Hydraulic Fracturing Process

Hydraulic fracturing is employed in the petroleum industry to improve the production efficiency of many gas and oil producing wells. This is achieved by creating an area of increased conductivity within the reservoir. This increased reservoir contact, through a highly permeable fracture, creates an efficient pathway for the flow of gas and oil. In the majority of cases, the low permeability nature of the hydrocarbon bearing reservoirs are too tight to produce from at economic rates and without this increased flow potential many of the gas wells within the Cooper Basin could not sustain economic flow rates.

Santos include conventional fracture stimulation as part of the final completion process. Once the production casing is cemented, cement evaluation has occurred, and a frac tree is installed at the surface; the fracturing operation can begin. Perforations are placed across the required interval of the reservoir formation and the surface fracturing equipment is rigged up and tied-in to the well.

Production wells may be subject to multiple fracturing events during the completion process. In order to produce from all of the reservoirs intersected by a well, Santos uses methods to selectively isolate and individually fracture each hydrocarbon-bearing zone. As a result, a typical gas well will have more than one fracturing treatment and the current average is about six treatments per well. The typical Santos oil well will rarely have more than one fracturing treatment due to the limited number of oil reservoirs and the fact that oil-bearing formations are not as dependent on fracturing to be commercially viable.

The subsequent sections describe fracture design and the fracturing process.

3.3.4 Fracture Treatment Design Considerations

As discussed in detail in Section 3.2, drilling, open hole and cased hole logging of the reservoir section provides information useful in the hydraulic fracture design process. Data is acquired providing information on reservoir parameters, as well as lithology variations and stress contrast from layer to layer. All of this data is used within an industry accredited stimulation software to develop an optimal design.

The basis of well specific design is to exploit the reservoirs through an optimal number of fracture stages, fracture length, fracture conductivity, and fracture height within the targeted reservoir formation. A number of considerations influence the final design for each fracture design:

- Depth and thickness of the target zone;
- Lithology of target and bounding layers;
- Minimum horizontal stress across all layers (target and bounding);
- Thickness of the 'seals' (aquitard layers) above and below the target reservoir formation;
- Porosity and permeability;



- Pore fluid saturations (percentage of pore volume occupied by each fluid e.g. oil, gas or water);
- Pore fluid properties (e.g. density, water salinity);
- Well performance data, including flow rates, formation pressure and produced fluid properties;
- Formation boundaries (as identified from seismic data);
- Bulk density, elastic properties and compressibility;
- Bedding planes, jointing and mineralisation;
- Thickness of underlying formations and rock strength; and
- Stress field analysis to determine the maximum principle stress direction and the minimum principle stress direction.

The completion design process accommodates detailed analysis of these parameters to specify a hydraulic fracture design that provides containment within the target formation. The hydraulic fracture design models can model the fracture geometry; including fracture length and fracture height based on the geomechanical rock properties input into the model. The models do not predict the fracture orientation; however, Santos has regional stress information that is used to predict the fracture orientation across the basins. There is an increased use of micro-seismic sensing within the industry to monitor fracture orientation. Santos has experience with this technology and may consider additional projects in the future.

Hydraulic fractures are designed to provide an optimal geometry within the formation of interest. A complete layer description, including lithology, stress contrasts between layers, and reservoir parameters is input into the fracturing simulator. Various pumping schedules are input to evaluate the simulated fracture geometry. Economics are optimised by designing a treatment that maintains the fracture height within the target formation. Fracture propagation into non-reservoir units will result in sub-optimal economics. Growth into non-reservoir units can have two outcomes: Firstly, the fluids and proppant are wasted and the hydrocarbon production may be reduced due to poor placement of proppant; secondly, there is a risk of fracturing into a water bearing interval which could lower production due to liquid loading. This would lead to an expensive workover to shut off the water production.

As discussed in Section 2.4.4, at the local scale, the regional stress field (magnitude and orientation) will be affected by discontinuities in the rock mass such as faults. The magnitude of horizontal stress will also be influenced by the geotechnical properties of the layered sedimentary rocks. The stiffer, more brittle rock layers, such as sandstone, have a low apparent fracture toughness (i.e. requires relatively little energy to fracture) compared to shale which is considered ductile (high apparent fracture toughness) and requires relatively large quantities of energy to fracture. Sandstones are porous and permeable in nature and have a significantly higher permeability compared with the overlying shale.

Hydraulic fracturing is initiated with hydraulic pressure applied to the rock, through the perforations, such that the rock fails in tension against the minimum horizontal stress. With continued fluid injection, the fracture will continue to propagate in the direction of maximum horizontal stress. The fracture will also grow in height until a higher stress boundary is encountered. This stress contrast will prevent the fracture height growth to continue until the pressure in the fracture exceeds the barrier stress. Bottom hole fracturing pressures, at the depth of Cooper Basin reservoirs, can be of the order of 50 MPa to 80 MPa depending on depth of the reservoir rock being fractured and its geomechanical properties. Fractures within the basin, at the depths of the reservoir sands, are expected to be near vertical and orientated parallel to the major horizontal in-situ stress direction. Fracture height growth is likely to truncate along a low shear strength plane such as the top of the sedimentary layer. Alternatively, if a fracture propagates from a brittle (sandstone) layer into a formation that is ductile (shale often exhibits plastic properties), extra energy would be required to continue the fracture propagation. Consequently, contrasts in apparent fracture toughness form effective fracture height barriers.



In multi-target production wells, casing isolations are used to isolate the fracture pressures to the targeted reservoir rock and to limit the potential for fracturing of sequences above and below the target intervals. Two techniques are commonly used by Santos within the Cooper Basin. The first technique referred to as “plug and perf”, uses composite bridge plugs to mechanically isolate stages prior to perforating the next sand above. The second technique uses coiled tubing with the ability to mechanically isolate a stage below and jet perforate the next stage above, prior to fracturing.

3.3.5 Hydraulic Fracturing Process Description

Hydraulic fracturing uses specially designed fluids, primarily consisting of water and sand or ceramic proppant, mixed on the surface. The fluids are injected into the well and through the perforations into the reservoir formation (‘pay zone’ in Figure 31), to create the hydraulic fracture. A typical well head used to inject into and control the well, during fracturing operations, is illustrated in Figure 31.




Figure 31: Typical Hydraulic Fracturing Wellhead Fixture (Source: Economides and Martin, 2007).

As discussed above, the hydraulic fracturing process occurs under high hydraulic pressures in order to physically fracture the reservoir rock. The hydraulic fracturing fluids are injected through perforations (10 to 20 mm diameter holes created with jet perforating) in the well casing pipe. The hydraulic fracturing fluids are injected from the surface via the wellhead or frac tree (Figure 31). A simplified schematic of the created fracture geometry is indicated in Figure 32. A hydraulic fracture in deep reservoirs, similar to the Cooper Basin, will propagate laterally from the well in a vertical plane, based on the in-situ stresses. Common dimensional terminology for hydraulic fractures includes fracture half length (x_f) and fracture height (h_f) and propped width (w_f).




Figure 32: Conceptualised Shape of Hydraulic Fracturing Zone of Influence (source: Economides and Martin, 2007)

The intent of hydraulic fracture stimulation is to place a highly conductive channel into the reservoir, to increase the flow capacity. Typically used in low permeability reservoirs, that can not sustain economic production, it can be analogous to increasing the effective wellbore radius. This increase in flow area will increase the production rates and, in some cases, can contact additional reserves. A number of steps make up the hydraulic fracturing process:

- 1) Perforate the interval to be fracture stimulated. The perforations are through jet perforating or abrasive jetting with coiled tubing and sand to jet holes through the casing and cement;
- 2) Pre-frac injection test with shut-down and decline to evaluate near wellbore entry friction, fracture gradient, fluid leakoff, and minimum horizontal stress. This stage is not always included;
- 3) Main fracture treatment; consisting of pad volume, slurry stages with increasing proppant concentrations, and flush stage to displace last slurry stage to the perforations. On occasion a pre-pad stage including weak hydrochloric acid to assist with remediating near wellbore entry friction may be pumped ahead of the pad stage;
- 4) Prepare to mechanically isolate the fracture stage completed, if a multi-stage well completion;
- 5) Perforate the next stage to be fracture stimulated and repeat the process in 2 to 4 above until final stage is completed; and
- 6) Flowback well to clean up injected fluids and monitor hydrocarbon production.

The following sections describe some of the specialised equipment required for hydraulic fracturing and a further description on some of the various stages of the treatment.

3.3.6 Infrastructure and Equipment Used

Within SWQ hydraulic fracturing is used on both oil and gas reservoirs. For the most part the process is the same. The differences may involve slight fluid formulation changes due to temperature variations with depth and some variation on the equipment used. Smaller oil reservoir fracture treatments usually use less pumping horsepower and less fracturing fluid and proppant, and therefore require a smaller set-up than gas reservoir treatments (refer to Figure 33 for a typical equipment set up). Deeper gas reservoirs usually require variations in the fracturing fluid due to higher bottom-hole temperatures and higher in-situ stresses. The higher stresses mean that higher horsepower is usually required.

Santos uses two methods to pump and isolate fracture stages within multiple target gas wells within the Cooper Basin. The first method, referred to as “plug and perf”, uses wireline-conveyed jet perforating across each reservoir target. Sands are hydraulically fractured sequentially, one at a time, from the bottom of the



well upwards. Between each pumping sequence a mechanical bridge plug is set above the sand completed to isolate the sand while fracturing the next sand above.

- Another technique is to use coiled tubing assisted annular fracturing which can be used to provide a conduit for “pin-point fracturing”. Coiled tubing is run into the well to the deepest target. The bottom-hole assembly incorporates a jetting assembly which allows for low concentration sand slurry to be pumped into the coil and exit this assembly with high velocity. The jet created, along with the abrasive properties, will cut holes or slots into the casing and cement. These provide access to the reservoir similar to what jet perforating accomplishes. The hydraulic fracturing treatment is then pumped into the coiled tubing / casing annulus to initiate and propagate the fracture. The other function of the coiled tubing is to include a packer as part of the bottom-hole assembly that can be used to isolate the fractured formation while fracturing the next formation/target above. Figure 33 indicates the coiled tubing equipment, which may or may not be required on the actual treatment. Some further descriptions of equipment are provided below:
- **‘Clean Fluids’ Pit or Turkey’s nest** – on site, a pre-dug lined pit (turkey’s nest) provides temporary clean water storage for use in the hydraulic fracturing process. Source water is generally trucked from a nearby water supply bore or recycled water from a nearby production facility. Small dosages of biocide are added to control algal growth particularly under warm and stagnant conditions. Often in smaller fracture treatments (e.g. oil wells), the volume of source water is small enough that the use of turkey’s nests is not required and the source water is stored and treated in tanks instead.
- **Sand Trailer Unit** – a large, multi-compartment trailer that holds proppant (sand or ceramic material) required for the treatment. When proppant is required, a conveyor system distributes proppant from the compartments to the downhole blender.
- **Blender Units** – In general, two different blending units are used: A pre-gel blender; and a downhole blender. The pre-gel blender combines the source water with additives required for the base stimulation fluid (also known as “linear gel”) and proportions all required additives to provide the final fracturing fluid. The downhole blender unit then proportions proppant to the fracturing fluid to provide the proppant concentrations specified in the fracture design. The final fracturing fluid, without proppant, is referred to as the “clean fluid”. The final fracturing fluid, with proppant added, is referred to as “slurry”. Most of the fracturing fluids used within the Cooper Basin for the main fracturing treatment are cross-linked fluids to assist with fracture geometry and proppant transport. In small fracture jobs for oil wells, the linear gel is “batched mixed” in tanks and negates the use of the pre-gel blender, thus reducing the overall equipment footprint on site. Chemicals are precisely, measured controlled and recorded by the blender throughout the hydraulic fracturing treatment.
- **Hydration Units** – The hydration unit is generally situated between the pre-gel and downhole blenders and serves to prepare the linear gel for crosslinking. Water from the pond or tank is pumped to the hydration unit where a polymer, such as guar gum, is proportioned into the water. A sufficient residence time is available for the polymer to hydrate and provide sufficient viscosity for the fluid designed. The final result is the base gel, or linear gel, for the final fracturing fluid.
- **High Pressure Pumps** – reciprocating triplex or quintaplex pumps that receive low pressure fracturing fluid from the downhole blender and inject these fluids at sufficiently high pressure into the well during the hydraulic fracturing process.
- **Control or Data Acquisition Unit** – telemetry from all units are connected to a central control room during the hydraulic fracturing treatment. Treatment parameter data, including surface and bottom-hole pressure, pumping rate, chemical rate and fluid density, are monitored, recorded and plotted. Treatment supervisors and a Santos representative monitor and control the treatment to ensure that the treatment is pumped according to design.
- **‘Coil Tubing’ Unit** – a Coiled Tubing unit (CTU) has many uses within Santos operations but is not always required as part of a hydraulic fracturing operation. On some occasions the fracture treatments



are placed using coiled tubing assisted annular fracturing, as opposed to “perf and plug” completions. The coiled tubing can be used in place of wireline jet perforating by jetting holes through the casing and cement using abrasive jetting. Once the perforations are jetted, the coiled tubing is left inside the well and the fracturing treatment is pumped down the coiled tubing / casing annulus. Part of the coiled tubing bottom-hole assembly allows a mechanical barrier to be set which protects a fractured interval below, while pumping a fracture treatment in a subsequent target above. Following a treatment, the coiled tubing is pulled up to the next interval and the abrasive jetting procedure is repeated.

- **Lined Flare Pit** – A higher walled (thicker) poly lined flare pit is constructed as part of lease preparation. This pit is used to receive flowback fluids during fracturing operations and during the initial clean-up phase after the fracturing operation. Typically, after the initial clean-up phase the flowback is diverted to a separator to separate the various phases and capture any hydrocarbons into tanks. The ability to unload the Frac fluid immediately after it has undergone treatment is considered one of the most crucial stages because poor or delayed clean up may hinder the well's ability to produce at economic rates. Santos is currently evaluating alternative technologies to manage flowback operations.



HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT SWQ




Figure 33: Diagrammatic layout of a typical hydraulic fracturing operation on a conventional oil or gas well lease (Saxon Rigs 182, 183 and 184)*.



3.3.7 Stages of Hydraulic Fracturing

3.3.7.1 Hydraulic Fracture Event Design

Hydraulic fracturing events are individually designed in detail as part of the well completions design process described in Section 3.2. The design input parameters are described in that section.

Key to a successful and contained hydraulic fracture event is the inclusion of detailed fracture modelling and fracture monitoring by Santos Fracture Stimulation Engineers and its contractor of each targeted reservoir zone using computer modelling methods.

Design outcomes include:

- Equipment requirements based on expected treating pressures and pump rates;
- Fracturing fluid type and volumes required;
- Volumes of water required on location to be available for designed treatment;
- Proppant types and volumes required;
- Simulated hydraulic fracture geometry and expected treating pressure;
- Fluid pumping schedule describing stage volumes, rates, and proppant concentration;
- Shut-down and flowback procedures; and
- Site preparations and logistics for material supply and accessory equipment required.

3.3.7.2 Stage Perforation/Jetting

To provide communication between the wellbore and the reservoir, perforations are required. In wireline deployed perforation, these are created using charges. Alternatively, perforations are created using a CTU, where low concentrations of an abrasive sand slurry are used to create holes of much lower shot density.

The length of the perforated interval is determined by the thickness of the sand layer to be hydraulically fractured. A typical perforated interval across a given sand layer is 3 m in length; however, this interval can vary between 0.3 m to 6 m or more. The perforations within the interval are placed at varying shot densities, or shots per metre. Typical perforation or shot densities are 9 shots per meter (spm) to 20 spm. The perforation diameter will vary based on the method of perforating, as well as other variables, but typical dimensions are 10 mm to 25 mm in diameter.

The preference for deploying one method over another depends on several factors, the main ones being: resource availability; number of zones to be fractured in the well; efficiency and cost.

3.3.7.3 Pre-Treatment

In some formations, the initial breakdown can create significant near wellbore pressure (NWBP) drop and can be calculated from Minifrac results (Section 3.3.7.4). This can be caused by various conditions, but can result in difficulties placing the proppant volumes and concentrations designed for. This NWBP loss needs to be remediated in some cases prior to pumping the main treatment. One method is to use a small volume of dilute hydrochloric acid (15% wt/wt HCl acid) as a pre-flush to the main treatment. Typical volumes of acid ahead of the main treatment are of the order of 1,000 to 1,500 L of acid. Any acid soluble materials, in the near wellbore area, are removed and an improved connection between the wellbore and the reservoir is created. However, acid pre-treatments are not routinely required and many hydraulic fracturing treatments are performed without pre-treatment. If hydraulic fracturing is undertaken in deep gas reservoirs, a dilute acid is commonly used as a pre-fracturing treatment. This is primarily to reduce friction pressure for future pumping operations by improving access through the perforations to the reservoir. It is carried out after completion of the well casing and 'well screen' perforations, but prior to hydraulic fracturing.



3.3.7.4 Minifrac

A Minifrac is a small volume injection of clean fluid (such as friction reduced water or linear gel) into the perforated or jetted holes for the purpose of ascertaining design related parameters such as NWBP, frac gradient, treatment rate, treatment pressures and fluid leakoff signatures. These parameters can influence a design change in the main treatment and in cases where high NWBP is encountered, warrant an acid pre-treatment.

3.3.7.5 Corrosion Inhibitor

Weak acids are corrosive to metals and the corrosion rate increases with higher temperatures. On any acid treatment, a corrosion inhibitor is added to protect against any corrosion of the casing during the pumping operation. This ensures that the well integrity is maintained by applying a protective coating on the surface of the casing. The concentration of the corrosion inhibitor is based on lab testing with the same material at downhole temperature conditions for a given period of time. Typical corrosion inhibitor concentrations used are 2% by volume or 20 L inhibitor per m³ of acid blend.

The acid is mixed into a surface tank prior to pumping. The mixing procedure is controlled while mixing all the chemicals from bundled containers. The order of mixing is to add the fresh water to the tank, add the additives including the corrosion inhibitor and then the concentrated acid (32% hydrochloric acid, HCl). The total blend will be the required volume of acid at a concentration of 15% HCl. This acid blend is pumped directly into the well using a single high pressure pump.

3.3.7.6 Pad Volume Injection

The hydraulic fracturing process is initiated by pumping a designed volume of the fracturing fluid without proppant, referred to as the “pad”. This fluid is carefully prepared using the equipment described in Section 3.3.6. Prior to pumping into the well, the base gel is prepared and tested using specific QA/QC procedures. The main polymer used for Cooper Basin hydraulic fracturing is a guar derivative (Figure 34) which is combined with bore water in the pre-gel blender, providing the base gel viscosity. Programmed and automated control systems are used to maintain the fluid properties during the pumping of the treatment. Fluid sampling occurs during the treatment to ensure that the fluid maintains the desired properties.

The purpose of the pad volume is to create the fracture area required to receive the designed proppant volume. Once the pad volume is pumped, and without shutting down the pumps, the proppant is added to the downhole blender and proportioned into the fracturing fluid. The concentration of proppant increases through each stage as designed within the hydraulic fracture simulator. The fracturing fluid with proppant is referred to as “slurry” and the proppant concentration is measured up to the maximum designed concentration in kg/m³.

The pad fluid comprises a mix of water (typically 99.5% by volume) and is usually comprised of groundwater obtained from nearby water bores or formation water. A mix of water and guar gum, together with a number of additives such as crosslinkers, buffers, and breakers, make up the crosslinked fracturing fluid.



Figure 34: Example of a typical slurry gum constituent: Guar Gum – illustrating its native form, seed form, splits and powder

**** Note:** Guar gum is a vegetable product which is ground into a powder and used to create a viscous liquid for hydraulic fracturing. Source: Economides and Martin, 2007

The gum (Figure 35) is allowed to hydrate in a baffled tank, referred to as the Hydration Unit, for several minutes prior to being pumped to the downhole blender. The base gel viscosity of the fluid is typically in the region of 30 to 40 centipoise (cp), depending on the specific fluid designed.

Subsequently, additives including cross-linkers, buffers, breakers, and surfactants are added at the downhole blender to provide a suitable fluid for transporting proppant into the hydraulic fracture.

At this point, the guar gum and associated ingredients comprise approximately 0.050% by volume of the pad volume. The viscosity of the crosslinked fluid will vary with time and temperature but typical designs will provide a fluid with viscosities in the several hundreds of centipoise (Figure 35). This viscosity is required to propagate the fracture and to transport proppant well into the created fracture. Following the treatment, this fluid viscosity will break back to close to water viscosity due to added breakers and the bottom hole temperature.



Figure 35: Example of Typical Stages of Gum (Guar) Cross-linking to Achieve 300 cp. Source Economides and Martin, 2007.



The pump rate or rate of injection on a hydraulic fracturing treatment is based on the design factors discussed in Section 3.2.2 and will vary depending on the reservoir. Typical Cooper Basin injection rates range from 15 bbl/min (2.4 m³/min) to 35 bbl/min (5.6 m³/min). Surface treating pressures can range from 5,000 psi (35,000 kPa) to 11,000 psi (76,000 kPa).

At the initial stage of injection, the pressure will increase until a breakdown of the formation occurs. This is evident by a drop in the injection pressure and signals that the hydraulic fracture has been initiated. Pumping of the pad volume will continue at the designed rate, in order to promote the designed fracture geometry. Once the pad volume is pumped, the injection of the slurry stages begins without interruption to the treatment.

3.3.7.7 Slurry Volume Injection

Following the injection of the pad volume, the proppant stages are pumped according to the design. Proppant addition begins at low concentrations and is staged up to the final designed concentration which is specific to the formation being fracture stimulated. Typical proppant concentrations will range from 0.5 lb/gal (60 kg/m³) to 8 lb/gal (1000 kg/m³).

Proppants used in hydraulic fracturing range from graded quartz sand to higher strength ceramic proppants (refer to Figure 36 and Figure 37). The strength of these materials increases based on the material, with ceramic being much stronger than quartz sand. Ceramic proppant is most often used in the Cooper Basin due to the high effective closure stresses. Proppant grain size varies and is also chosen based on the required conductivity for the specific fracture design. Each size and type of proppant has a number of specifications that must be met for consistency with API conditions.




Figure 36: Typical 20-40 Grade Sand used in Hydraulic Fracturing (Source Economides and Martin, 2007.)



Figure 37: Typical Sand-Guar Gum fluid mix (Source Economides and Martin, 2007).

Once the final slurry stage is pumped on surface, the final flush stage is pumped. The flush stage is a linear gel fluid (non crosslinked) and is used simply to displace the last stage of slurry down to the perforations. This leaves the wellbore volume free of any proppant and has all proppant placed within the fracture. It is just as important not to over displace the proppant away from the wellbore. Once this flush or displacement volume has been pumped, the high pressure pumps are shutdown and the main fracturing treatment is considered complete.

Breaker compounds are added at progressively increasing concentrations throughout the pad and slurry stages. The breaker comprises an oxidizing compound or enzyme that breaks the crosslink sites, as well as



the long chain polymers. The end result is a fluid with lower viscosity that can be easily flowed back from the fracture to assist with clean-up. The “break time” is designed to coincide with the known pump time at reservoir conditions plus some additional time to ensure the treatment is pumped to completion. An unbroken fluid will restrict the ability for the fracture to clean up and hydrocarbon production will be impaired.

The duration of the hydraulic fracturing treatment is dependent on the specified volumes to be pumped and the rate at which the treatment is pumped.

The above procedure is carried out for each target zone (pay zone) in the reservoir formations. In the case of Santos’ oil reservoirs, this typically equates to one target zone per well. In the case of gas reservoirs the number of sands or fracture stages can range from 1 stage to 10 stages in a single well, depending on the reservoirs contacted during the drill.

A typical Cooper Basin hydraulic fracturing treatment may use from 40,000 gallons (150 m³) to 100,000 gallons (400 m³) of water for the main fracturing treatment. The required volume is dependent on the size of the treatment required for the particular formation to be stimulated. The amounts of proppant required typically range from 40,000 lb (18 tonne) to 200,000 lb (90 tonne) and, again, is dependent on the specific formations being stimulated.

3.3.7.8 Flush Volume

As discussed above, a flush stage or displacement stage is pumped at the end of the treatment to ensure that all of the proppant is within the fracture and not within the wellbore. On occasion, proppant placement is restricted due to near wellbore width restrictions. If this restriction completely blocks the entry of proppant, the pressure rises quickly and terminates the treatment. This termination is referred to as a “screenout” and requires the wellbore to be cleaned out to enable production of the well.

3.3.7.9 Flowback

The fluid used to create the fracture and place the proppant will restrict the ability of the well to clean up and produce hydrocarbons. As mentioned, the use of breakers and reservoir temperature will assist with viscosity reduction. With the fluid viscosity reduced to near water (1 cp), the well is allowed to flowback to reduce the amount of leak off into the formation. Often recovered fluid volumes are in the range of 30% to 60% of the total volume pumped. This is usually enough to allow the well to flow on its own energy or with assistance from artificial lift.

Light condensate entrained in the flowback fluid is often removed with a vacuum truck and taken to a nearby oil facility. The clean-up of conventional oil zones is often bypassed due to the fact that artificial lift systems are installed as part of the final completions program. These lift systems include typical installation beam pumps which can lift both the oil and fluid out of the well.

Flowback fluids are directed either into lined pits or tanks and, if required, separators are used to separate water, condensate, and gas for separate handling. Santos is constantly reviewing new technologies for surface handling of fluids and disposal. At the time of writing, Santos has considered making stage wise improvements towards an eventual replacement of Lined Flare Pits. An example of this includes a trial of specially designed flowback tanks.

After the well has been equipped with all the required completion and gathering equipment, the well is put on production. Production continues for the life of the well, with produced water (groundwater, condensation and frac fluid) over that period ranging less than 1 ML up to 30 ML for gas wells, increasing to a maximum of approximately 340 ML for oil wells. This flow is likely to flush all the available (mobile) components of the original hydraulic fracturing fluid which may remain in the formation *after* flowback.

3.3.7.10 Hydraulic Fracture Treatment Monitoring

As described in Section 3.3.4, the hydraulic fracture for each reservoir layer is modelled using an industry accepted hydraulic fracture simulator. Based on the final pumping schedule from the optimized design, a predicted fracture geometry and expected pressures are available.



During the treatment key parameters such as surface, bottom hole and annular treatment pressures, proppant concentrations, volume of injected fluid and fluid additives are monitored live from the Frac Van as well as at Santos' offices. The modelled pressures are compared with the actual pressures. The overall pressure response can provide useful information in evaluating the fracture growth and containment. A contained fracture will exhibit a pressure profile different from an uncontained fracture. The mechanical properties of the interbedded sandstones, shales coals mean that horizontal propagation of the fracture network dominates. Treatment parameters are used with the hydraulic fracture model, following the treatment, to achieve a history match and predict the actual fracture geometry.

Live monitoring allows for potential problems (surface or downhole) to be identified and corrected quickly. In the event that a problem develops on the surface (e.g. leak in line, pumps shut down), the use of live monitoring as a control measure for early detection can prevent the problem from escalating. An example of live monitoring applied to downhole conditions is if pressure communication is seen between the annulus of the well and inside of the well, the well's integrity may have been breached and the treatment is stopped immediately.

Santos has trialled in South Australia the use of advanced monitoring techniques such as micro-seismic monitoring, which can be used to evaluate fracture azimuth and fracture half length. This additional information can be used to further calibrate the fracturing model predictions. The additional cost of this technology precludes the use on every treatment, and will be evaluated as the technology is better understood.

Microseismic monitoring involves the use of a string of sensitive receivers ("geophones") in one or more nearby wells to detect and locate in 3D space the releases of energy associated with the propagation of the hydraulically-induced fractures. Figure 38 shows an example of a side-view of the locatable microseismic events that were detected during the multi-stage fracture stimulation of Cowralli-10 (in South Australia), with the positions of the events colour-coded by frac stage. The viewpoint for the figure is at approximately the same depth as the upper frac stages (shown in red, mid-blue and grey), and it can be seen that the fracture propagation is predominantly horizontal, with the coals being effective at confining the vertical propagation of the fractures. All of the locatable microseismic events for each frac stage were contained within the formation that was being stimulated. Figure 39 shows a map view of the locatable microseismic events; these are shown in red, and the ellipses around each well show the expected (modelled) fracture-extents. The modelling and actual results show good agreement, although in practice the fractures seem to have propagated horizontally slightly less far than expected. The technique has limitations, in that it requires at least one pre-existing nearby well (within approximately 500 - 700 m) to use for the monitoring, and it is also expensive, meaning that the use of the technique is necessarily selective.

The use of radioactive tracers (as impregnated beads) involves incorporating a different short half-life radioactive isotope into the proppant slurry for each stage, and then monitoring for the distribution of each of these isotopes along the wellbore after the fracture treatment. However, there are presently no plans to use radioactive materials in SWQ, should this alter Santos will comply with all applicable legislative requirements concerning their use, storage and disposal.




Figure 38: Lateral View of the Locatable Microseismic Events during Monitoring of Multi-Stage Fracture Stimulation of Cowrali-10 (South Australia)




Figure 39: Map View of the Locatable Microseismic Events During Monitoring of Multi-stage Fracture Stimulation of Cowralli-10 and Cowralli-12 (SA).

3.3.7.11 Timing of Hydraulic Fracturing Process

The hydraulic fracturing of a typical conventional oil well takes two to three days to complete a treatment. The fracturing of a deep gas well with multiple stages can require anywhere from five to ten days to complete the hydraulic fracturing operation. The flowback period can extend from three to ten days depending on the reservoir and clean up profile.

At the end of the clean up phase, Santos completions engineers install the production tubing and associated completion equipment such as packers, nipple profiles, tubing hanger, and the production tree.

3.4 Program for Wells to be Fractured

3.4.1 Frequency of Hydraulic Fracturing

Selected wells will be fractured prior to being brought into production, involving the various tasks described previously. At the time of writing, Santos has indicated that approximately 14 oil wells are proposed for fracturing in the Eastern Project Area. There are approximately 52 gas wells proposed for fracturing in the Western Project Area, of which 13 conventional gas wells are existing (7% of total currently producing wells). The potential wells scheduled for hydraulic fracturing are expected to occur over the period 2012 to 2016. However, the program of wells is *indicative* only and prone to change.



During the life of the well, the formation may be re-fractured at a later date, which would essentially be a repeat of the initial fracturing process.

3.4.2 Distribution of Completed and Scheduled Fracturing Locations


Oil and gas wells that have been fractured to date are listed in APPENDIX F and presented in Figure 40. Since 1987, a total of 275 hydraulic stimulations have been completed within 192 wells (not all producing) in the SWQ. Golder understands that there have been no recorded incidents associated with these activities. Indicative wells that are scheduled for fracturing until 2016 are presented in Figure 41 and are provided in APPENDIX G


According to information provided by Santos, the well spacing varies between the oil and gas well heads, from 400 m in the oil fields, up to tens of kilometres in the gas fields. Santos is moving toward “Pad” wells, where multiple deviated wells emanate from a single wellsite. Proposed deviated gas wells for the Santos project are listed in APPENDIX F and include “DEV” in the well name. These are generally shown as clusters on Figure 41 within tenements (e.g. Baryulah Gas, PL131).

It should be noted that for a variety of reasons (including but not limited to future production performance and access-related issues such as the flooding of the Cooper Creek system), the geographic distribution of the forward fracturing programme is frequently reviewed and is subject to change, although the overall number of fracture stimulations is likely to remain similar to that outlined here.

Queensland legislation regarding notice of intent and reporting of activities allows for flexibility to change the program of wells to be fractured. According to the Petroleum and Gas regulations, 2004 (PGGD-03, s35, and subsections s35A and S46A) the holder of a petroleum tenure must lodge a notice prior to activity commencement with the Department of Natural Resources and Mines (DNRM), followed by a notice of completion after activities have ended. These notices must be distributed to the landholder and land occupier. A detailed hydraulic fracturing activities completion report must then be lodged no later than two months after activities have been carried out including a hydraulic fracturing fluid statement and if any material environmental harm has occurred (relevant to the definitions of the EPA 1994).

Santos proposes to copy DEHP on the notification of fracturing operations on the same timescales as required by the above DNRM legislation. Adjustments to the locations or schedule of future fracturing activities will be managed in the context of the outcomes of this risk assessment.





SWQ HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT

SANTOS

POTENTIAL OIL AND GAS HYDRAULIC FRACTURING LOCATIONS 2012 – 2016

COPYRIGHT

1. Base information copyright MapInfo Australia Pty Ltd
2. ATP/PL tenure supplied by Santos, August 2011
3. Groundwater Management Area supplied by the State of Queensland (Department of Natural Resources & Water), 2008
4. Golder Associates 2012a Cooper Basin UWR Report



LEGEND

- Groundwater Management Area
- BORE FORMATION
- Hooray Sandstone
- Winton Formation
- Glendower Formation
- ▲ Santos Bores
- Unknown
- Town/Locality
- River/Creek
- Highway/Major Road
- Study Area
- Tenements within the Santos Project Area
- Potential Oil Well
- Potential Gas Well

0 5 10 20 30 40 50 Kilometres

SCALE (at A4) 1:2,250,000

Coordinate System: GCS GDA 1994

PROJECT: 127666004
DATE: 19/12/2012
DRAWN: FA
CHECKED: RS

FIGURE 41





3.5 Location of Landholders Active Bores

The locations of licensed water bores relative to the Santos tenement boundaries are discussed in Section 2.5.7.1 and are presented in Figure 27. The results of the WBBA completed to date (Section 2.5.7.1) identified eight active private bores and two additional *special interest* bores. The vertical proximity of the target petroleum formations to aquifers utilised for private or commercial/industrial water supply is discussed in Section 2.6.

The proximity of the identified water supply bores to the proposed hydraulic fracturing locations is presented in Figure 41 and the distances are listed in Table 13 (refer to Sections 2.4.3 and 2.6.2 for the stratigraphic thickness ranges separating hydrocarbon-bearing formations from aquifers).

The active landholder bores in the oil fields of the *Eastern Project Area* range from approximately 3 to 10 km from the closest proposed oil well. The upper-most formation proposed for hydraulic fracturing is the Wyandra Sandstone (Upper Cadna-Owie). The closest bore, Mt Margaret No 14, targets the shallower Winton formation for stock purposes. At this location the vertical separation between the Winton Formation and the Wyandra Sandstone is at least 750 m, including the low permeability mudstones of the Wallumbilla and Toolebuc Formation and the Allaru Mudstone (Section 2.5).

The active landholder bores within, or near, the gas fields of the *Western Project Area* range from approximately 25 to 90 km from the closest proposed hydraulic fracturing location. The upper-most target proposed for hydraulic fracturing are formations within the Nappamerri Group. The closest bore is the Whim Well, which was not observed during the WBBA, but is recorded to access groundwater from the Hooray Sandstone (WES database). The vertical distance between the Hooray Sandstone and the Nappamerri group at this location is greater than 600 m.

The Coothero Bore was observed during the WBBA, and according to DEHP, targets the Hooray Sandstone for stock water. The Coothero Bore and is located more approximately 44 km from the closest proposed location for gas production, and more than 80 km from the closest location proposed for oil production from the Hooray Sandstone.

Table 13: Distance of Active Landholder Bores in the Study Area to the Closest Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Location

Project Area	Bore Name	DEHP RN	Distance	Target Aquifer
Eastern	Mt Margaret No 14	9096	3 km	Winton Formation
	Walla Wallan Bore 5	6373	5 km	(no data)
	Mt Margaret No 20	10565	3 km	(no data)
	Cherry Cherry Bore	6369	10 km	(no data)
	Tarbat Job No 1947	12036	8 km	Winton Formation
Western	Palara Bore	6057	12 km	(no data)
	Grahams Bore	14955	87 km	Glendower Formation
	Whim Well *	6304	25 km	Hooray Sandstone
	Moon Road Field Bore	0**	81 km	-**
Central	Coothero Bore *	23569	44 km	Hooray Sandstone

* Bores of 'special interest' as described in Section 2.5.7.1

** Bore not observed in database records. Referred to as "Moon Field Road Bore" in WBBA.



4.0 CONCLUSIONS

4.1 Environmental Setting

Santos operates conventional gas and oil fields across petroleum tenements within an approximately 30,000 km² portion of Southwest Queensland. The operations are divided into three sub-areas of interest: *Western, Central and Eastern Project Areas*. These project areas and the land immediately surrounding the Santos tenement boundaries comprise the Santos SWQ *study area*. The terrain in the study area is generally characterised by low undulating topography (hills and ridges) between the drainage channel systems of the Cooper Creek. The area is sparsely developed, and generally comprises rural communities and homesteads that are largely engaged in pastoralism.

It is within the stratigraphy that comprises the Eromanga Basin and the underlying Cooper Basin that oil and gas reservoirs are located which contain the proposed target formations for hydraulic fracturing. A detailed description of key geological and hydrogeological features is provided in the text, including geological models for the study area, target hydrocarbon-bearing sandstone formations (oil in the Eromanga Basin formations at depths ranging from 700 to 1,200 m below ground level (mbgl); and gas in the Cooper Basin formations at depths of 1,500 to greater than 2,000 mbgl), their hydraulic characteristics, adjacent aquifers and aquitards, structural features including faults and fracture characteristics (and their potential to behave as barriers or conduits), regional and local seismicity characteristics, aquifer environmental values and the location of groundwater users.

In terms of the environmental setting, this document has provided specific information which addresses the requirements anticipated of the EA conditions regarding hydraulic fracturing that will apply to new areas proposed for production.

Specific inclusions addressing consent conditions are located within the logical flow of the description of the existing environment in the Santos SWQ petroleum field areas, with the specific information located as follows:

- a geological model of the field to be stimulated including geological names, descriptions and depths of the target producing reservoir(s) (Sections 2.4 and 2.5);
- naturally occurring geological faults (Sections 2.4.3.5 and 2.4.5);
- seismic history of the region (e.g. earth tremors, earthquakes) (Section 2.4.5);
- proximity of overlying and underlying aquifers (Section 2.6);
- description of the depths that aquifers with environmental value(s) occur, both above and below the target producing reservoir (Section 2.6);
- description of overlying and underlying formations in respect of porosity, permeability, hydraulic conductivity, faulting and fracture propensity (Sections 2.4.4 and 2.5.5);
- consideration of barriers or known direct connections between the target producing formation and the overlying and underlying aquifers (Section 2.4.3);
- the environmental values of groundwater in the area (Section 2.6);
- locations of landholders' active groundwater bores (Section 2.5.7); and
- groundwater transmissivity, flow rate, hydraulic conductivity and direction(s) of flow (Sections 2.5.3, 2.5.4 and 2.5.5);

Based on understanding of the environmental setting, this qualitative risk assessment considered the key environmental values as follows:



Groundwater environmental values:

- Town water supply;
- Stock and domestic water supply;
- Sandstone aquifers of the GAB; and
- Groundwater Dependant Ecosystems (GDEs).

Surface water environmental values:

- Protection of aquatic ecosystems;
- Recreation and aesthetics: primary recreation with direct contact, and visual appreciation with no contact; and
- Cultural and spiritual values.

Terrestrial environmental values:

- Protection of flora and fauna, particularly small mammals, reptiles and birds with a greater the potential to come into contact with flowback water in Flare Pits.

The report considered the applicable environmental values in the context of the proposed fracturing activities within the study area.

4.2 Hydraulic Fracturing Process Description

A detailed description of the hydraulic fracturing process was provided in Section 3.0; with an emphasis on the safeguards inherent in the planning and implementation of fracturing events to ensure that the fracturing fluid and proppant are delivered (and maintained) within the target formation. The specific information required in the EA consent conditions can be found in the following sections:

- practices and procedures to ensure that the stimulation activity(ies) is designed to be contained within the target gas producing formation (Sections 3.3.4 and 3.3.7);
- provide details of where, when and how often stimulation is to be undertaken on the tenures covered by this environmental authority (Section 3.4);
- a description of the well mechanical integrity testing program (Section 3.2.2);
- process control and assessment techniques to be applied for determining extent of stimulation activity(ies) (e.g. microseismic measurements, radioactive tracers, modelling etc.) (Sections 3.3.4 and 3.3.7); and
- a process description of the stimulation activity to be applied, including equipment and a comparison to best international practice (Sections 3.2.1 and 3.3).

4.3 Summary

Based on the available geological information for the study area, the following key points are noted:

- The DEHP database and the interim results of the WBBA program indicate that groundwater supply development in the vicinity of Santos' tenements is limited to the Glendower and Winton Formations, and to a lesser extent the Hooray Sandstone. The minimum vertical offset between the Glendower and Winton Formations and the shallowest hydrocarbon reservoirs (oil reservoirs of the Cadna-Owie Formation) is 400 to 800 m, which includes the low permeability formations of the Wallumbilla Formation and Allaru Mudstone, which form a thick, competent and regionally extensive seal between



the Cadna-Owie Formation and the shallower aquifers. The vertical offset to gas reservoirs is much greater (1,000 m to 1,800 m).

- Within formations that host both aquifers and hydrocarbon reservoirs (e.g. Hooray Sandstone), the water-bearing zones are separated from hydrocarbon reservoirs by intra-formational seals. However there is not enough information available to discretise the internal stratigraphy of these formations. Where petroleum activities (including fracturing) occur within a formation that hosts both aquifers and hydrocarbon reservoirs, the lateral distance of the water supply bores accessing the aquifer to Santos' tenements was considered.
- The closest beneficial use bore to the Santos tenements targeting the Hooray Sandstone in the DEHP database records is the Whim Well, which is indicated as being located 20 km from the closest tenement with hydraulic fracturing activities proposed (the existence of this bore was unable to be confirmed during the WBBA). The closest observed bore, the Coothero Bore, is at least 25 km from the closest tenement proposed for hydraulic fracturing and more than 80 km from the closest tenement with activities proposed at a similar.

Based on the available site setting information for the study area, the following key points are noted:

- Cooper Creek, which has been declared as a Wild River Area, is largely influenced by surface water flows and evaporation, with negligible contribution from groundwater. Waterholes and billabongs occur throughout the Cooper Creek floodplain and channel complex, some of which coincide directly with Santos tenements.
- Two of the identified wetlands (Cooper Creek – Wilson River Junction and Bulloo Lake) are within boundaries of Santos' tenements in the Central and Western Project Areas. None of the wetlands are located within a reasonable radius (>75 km) of the Eastern Project Area tenements where hydraulic stimulation activities are currently proposed for oil production. Stimulation activities for gas production are proposed in the Western Project Areas PL131 and ATP 259P which coincide with the location of Cooper Creek – Wilson River Junction. It should be noted that hydraulic fracturing activities may be completed within any tenement boundary over the life of the Project.
- The Cooper Creek catchment and downstream Lake Eyre are popular recreational fishing destinations. Popular fishing spots include Bulloo River at Thargomindah, Wilson River at Nockatunga and Cooper Creek flows (episodically).

Based on the provided Santos hydraulic fracturing process information, the following key points are noted:

- Buffers to be assigned during establishment of well leases between petroleum operations and potential "environmentally sensitive areas" identified through database review and site-specific ecological assessment where warranted.
- The procedures employed by Santos' and its contractors follow a design philosophy predicated on the guidance, specifications and recommended practices of the American Petroleum Institute (API), considered to represent international best practice.
- The procedures employed by Santos' and its contractors for mechanical integrity and surveillance follow a design philosophy with international best practice. Practices for ensuring well mechanical integrity consist of a robust surveillance plan.
- OH&S procedures are implemented during hydraulic fracturing operations to prevent workers from direct contact with chemicals during spills and when handling flowback water or sediments. Golder understands that there has not been a recordable spill since hydraulic fracturing commenced in 1987.
- Santos operational procedures monitor fracture design to stay within the target formation.



- Santos implement spill containment procedures during operations to prevent migration of and exposure to chemicals.
- Fencing is installed around Flare Pits to prevent access by trespassers, livestock and large native fauna. Signs also indicate that well leases are work zones to be accessed by authorised personnel.
- Engineering and operational controls (grading of well leases, stormwater controls and maintenance of a 300 mm freeboard within the Flare Pits) are in place to limit the potential for uncontrolled surface releases of flowback water to the environment.
- As a minimum Flare Pits are lined, and fluid storage and containment methods will be improved, to prevent seepage of flowback water into the underlying aquifer.
- Sediments and fluids contained within Flare Pits are removed via vacuum truck techniques.



5.0 REFERENCES

Alexander, E.M., Reservoirs and Seals of the Eromanga Basin (undated).

API Specification 5CT/ISO 11960, Specification for Casing and Tubing.

API Specification 6A/ISO 10423, Specification for Wellhead and Christmas Tree Equipment.

API Specification 10A/ISO 10426-1, Specification for Cements and Materials for Well Cementing .

API Recommended Practice 10B-2/ISO 10426-2, Recommended Practice for Testing Well Cements.

API Recommended Practice 10B-3/ISO 10426-3, Recommended Practice on Testing of Deepwater Well Cement Formulations.

API Recommended Practice 10B-4/ISO 10426-4, Recommended Practice on Preparation and Testing of Foamed Cement Slurries at Atmospheric Pressure.

API Recommended Practice 10B-5/ISO 10426-5, Recommended Practice on Determination of Shrinkage and Expansion of Well Cement Formulations at Atmospheric Pressure.

API Recommended Practice 10B-6/ISO 10426-6, Recommended Practice on Determining the Static Gel Strength of Cement Formulations.

API Specification 10D/ISO 10427-1, Specification for Bow-Spring Casing Centralizers.

API Specification 10D-2/ISO 10427-2, Recommended Practice for Centralizer Placement and Stop Collar Testing.

API Recommended Practice 10F/ISO 10427-3, Recommended Practice for Performance Testing of Cementing Float Equipment.

API Technical Report 10TR1, Cement Sheath Evaluation.

API Technical Report 10TR2, Shrinkage and Expansion in Oil Well Cements.

API Technical Report 10TR3, Temperatures for API Cement Operating Thickening Time Tests.

API Technical Report 10TR4, Technical Report on Considerations Regarding Selection of Centralizers for Primary Cementing Operations.

API Technical Report 10TR5, Technical Report on Methods for Testing of Solid and Rigid Centralizers.

API Specification 13A /ISO 13500, Specification for Drilling Fluid Materials.

API Recommended Practice 13B-1/ISO 10414-1, Recommended Practice for Field Testing Water-Based Drilling Fluids.

API Recommended Practice 13B-2/ISO 10414-2, Recommended Practice for Field Testing Oil-based Drilling Fluids.

API Recommended Practice 45, Recommended Practice for Analysis of Oilfield Waters.

API Recommended Practice 53, Blowout Prevention Equipment Systems for Drilling Operations.

API Recommended Practice 65, Cementing Shallow Water Flow Zones in Deep Water Wells.

API Recommended Practice 65-2, Isolating Potential Flow Zones during Well Construction (provides guidance on well planning, drilling and cementing practices, and formation integrity pressure testing).

API Recommended Practice 90, Annular Casing Pressure Management for Offshore Wells.



Australian and New Zealand Environment Conservation Council (ANZECC) and Agriculture and Resource Management Council of Australia and New Zealand (ARMCANZ) (2000). Australian and New Zealand Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality for protection of aquatic ecosystems and stock watering.

BRS, 2000, Radke B.M, Ferguson J., Cresswell R.G, Ransley T.R, Habermehl M.A, Hydrochemistry and implied hydrodynamics of the Cadna-Owie-Hooray Aquifer Great Artesian Basin, Bureau of Rural Sciences, Canberra.

Bulloo Shire Council, 2012. Our Community: Sport and Recreational Facilities – Fishing. Accessed at: <http://www.bulloo.qld.gov.au>.

Bunn, S.E., Thoms, M.C., Stephen, K.H., Capon, S.J., 2006. Flow variability in dryland rivers: boom, bust and the bits in between. *River Research and Applications*, 22, 179–186.

Bureau of Meteorology (BOM) (2012). Climate Data Windorah Station 038024. Accessed at: <http://www.bom.gov.au>.

Carpenter G. and Armstrong D. (2001) Biological survey – Ballera Region – Cooper Floodplain. Produced by Social & Ecological Assessment Pty Ltd. Unpublished report prepared for Santos Ltd.

Carpenter G. & Armstrong D. (2002) Field investigation of fauna listed in the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act, 1999 – Dunefields, Undulating Downs and Dissected Residuals, Ballera South West Queensland. Social & Ecological Assessment Pty Ltd. Unpublished report prepared for Santos Ltd.

Cendon, D.I., Larsen, J.R., Jones, B.G., Nanson, G.C., Rickleman, D., Hankin, S.I., Pueyo, J.J., Maroulis, J., 2010. Freshwater recharge into a shallow saline groundwater system, Cooper Creek floodplain, Queensland, Australia. *Journal of Hydrology*, 392, 150-163.

Costelloe, J.F., Shields, A., Grayson, R.B., McMahon, T.A., 2007. Determining loss characteristics of arid zone river waterbodies. *River Research and Applications*, 23, 715–731.

Commonwealth of Australia, 2010. Ramsar Wetlands of Australia. Produced by Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts, April 2010.

Department of Environment and Heritage Protection (DEHP) (2010). Regional Ecosystems, updated April 2010. Accessed at: <http://www.ehp.qld.gov.au/ecosystems/>

Department of Environment and Resource Management (DERM) (2005) GAB Hydrogeological Framework for the GAB WRP Area, QLD Department of Environment and Resource Management.

DERM (2007) Great Artesian Basin Resource Operations Plan (GAB ROP), Queensland.

DERM (2010) The Cooper Creek Basin Wild River Area Summary: Natural Values Assessment, QLD Department of Environment and Resource Management.

Draper, J.J. (Editor), 2002, Geology of the Cooper and Eromanga Basins, Queensland. Queensland Mineral and Energy Review Series, Queensland Department of Natural Resources and Mines.

Economides, M.J. and Martin, T. (2007). Modern Fracturing, Enhancing Natural Gas Production. Energy Tribune Publishing Inc.

Enever, J. R. & Lee, M. F. 2000. On the Prediction of Rock Stress. Proceedings of GeoEng2000, Melbourne, Technomic Publishing.

Environment Australia, 2001. A Directory of Important Wetlands in Australia, Third Edition. Environment Australia, Canberra.

Fensham, RJ and Fairfax, RJ, 2003. Spring wetlands of the Great Artesian Basin, Queensland, Australia, *Wetland Ecology and Management*, vol. 11, pp. 343–362.



Fensham and Fairfax, 2005. The Great Artesian Basin Water Resource Plan: Ecological Assessment of GABsprings in Queensland.

Geosciences Australia (2012), Surface Geology of Australia (1:1M scale dataset) A3 map.

Gibson, E., Strudwick, D and P. Walker (1997). Draft National Framework for Ecological Risk Assessment of Contaminated Sites, Victorian Environment Protection Authority (VIC EPA),

Golder (2012a). Underground Water Impact Report for Santos Cooper Basin Oil and Gas Fields (ref. no. 117636010-3000-001-Rev1, dated 20 December 2011).

Golder (2012b). Regional Water Bore Baseline Assessment Report (Priority 1 & 2 Bores) (ref. no. 117666006-019-R-Rev0, dated 29 May 2012)

Golder (2012c) Santos Cooper Basin Oil and Gas Fields, Southwest Queensland – Interim Groundwater Monitoring Plan (ref. no. 127666003-002-R-Rev2, dated 30 July 2012).

Government of South Australia, Primary Industries and Resources, SA (2009) Petroleum and Geothermal in South Australia – Cooper Basin.

Gravestock DI, Benbow MC, Gatehouse CG and Krieg GW 1995. Eastern Officer Basin. In JF Drexel and WV Preiss eds, The geology of South Australia, Volume 2, The Phanerozoic, Bulletin 54. Geological Survey of South Australia, pp. 35–41.

Habermehl, M.A. (1986). Regional groundwater movement, hydrochemistry and hydrocarbon migration in the Eromanga Basin. In: Gravestock, D.I., Moore, P.S. and Pitt, G.M. (Eds), Contributions to the geology and hydrocarbon potential of the Eromanga Basin. Geological Society of Australia. Special Publication, 12:353–376.

Habermehl MA and Lau JE 1997, Hydrogeology of the Great Artesian Basin (Map at scale 1:2500000), Australian Geological Survey Organisation, Canberra.

Hamilton, S.K., Bunn, S.E., Thoms, M.C., Marshall, J.C., 2005. Persistence of aquatic refugia between flow pulses in a dryland river system (Cooper Creek, Australia). *Limnology and Oceanography*, 50, 743–754.

Hillis, R. R., Meyer, J. J., and Reynolds, S.D., 1998. The Australian Stress Map. *Journal of the Geological Society of London*, 157, p 915-921. Accessed at: <http://www.asprg.adelaide.edu.au/asm/>

Hillis, R. R. and Reynolds, S. D. (2003). In-Situ Stress Field of Australia. *Geological Society of Australia Special Publication* 22, p 43-52.

Hillis, R. R., Enever, J. R. & Reynolds, S. D. 1999. In situ Stress Field of Eastern Australia. *Australian Journal of Earth Sciences*, 46, pp. 813-825.

Kotwicki, V., Allan, R., 1998. La Niña de Australia-Contemporary and palaeohydrology of Lake Eyre. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, 144, 265–280.

Nanson, G.C., Price, D.M., Jones, B.G., Maroulis, J.C., Coleman, M., Bowman, H., Cohen, T.J., Pietsch, T.J., Larsen, J.R., 2008. Alluvial evidence for major climate and flow regime changes during the middle and late Quaternary in eastern central Australia. *Geomorphology*, 101, 109–129.

PIRSA, Cooper Basin, 1998, The petroleum geology of South Australia, Volume 4, Cooper Basin (Gravestock).

PIRSA, Eromanga Basin, 2006, The petroleum geology of South Australia, Eromanga Basin, Volume 2, PIRSA.

Reynolds, S.D., Mildren, S.D., Hillis, R.R., and Meyer, J.J., 2004, The in situ stress field of the Cooper Basin and its implications for hot dry rock geothermal energy development: PESA Eastern Australian Basins Symposium II, p. 431-440. Reynolds, S., Mildre, S., Hillis, R., Meyer, J., Flottman, T. (2006). Cooper Basin Stress Map. Australian School of Petroleum, Accessed at: <http://www.asprg.adelaide.edu.au/asm/>



SA DPI, 1998. Cooper-Eromanga Basin – Exploration opportunities Blocks CO98A-K. Primary Industries and Resources SA, Report book 98/00029.

Santos 2004, Cooper Basin, Review of Regional Petroleum Potential. Santos 2009. PE Operations Standard procedures (PEOSP's): Section 9 Procedures for Well Integrity, Procedure 9.1 Well Integrity Schedule and Reporting. Santos Approved Procedure, Rev 1, November 2009.

Santos (2009). Drilling operations manual – Onshore Australia and CSG Drilling. April 2009 Rev 4.0. Santos Limited, April 2009.

Santos (2011 a), Extract from DEEDI Presentation, Power Point Presentation, 28 July 2010.

Santos (2011b). Environmental Management Plan for the South West Queensland Eastern Project Area, 2011.

Santos (2011c). Environmental Management Plan for the South West Queensland Central Project Area, 2011.

Santos (2011d). Environmental Management Plan for the South West Queensland Western Project Area, 2011.

SKM, 2001 (Sinclair Knight Merz Pty Ltd). Environmental Water Requirements of Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems, Environmental Flows Initiative Technical Report Number 2, Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra State of Queensland, 2009. Environmental Protection (Water) Policy 2009.

Torgersen, T., M.A. Habermehl, F.M. Phillips, David Elmore, Peter Kubik, B. Geoffrey Jones, T. Hemmick, and H.E. Gove. (1991). Chlorine 36 dating of very old groundwater 3. Further Studies in the Great Artesian Basin, Australia. Water Resources Research, vol. 27, no. 12, 3201-3213. UNECE (2009) Globally Harmonised System (GHS) of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals. Revision 3. Part 4 Environmental Hazards and Annex 9 Guidance on hazards to the aquatic environment.

URS, 2010, Water Flooding Impact Assessment: Further Information to Support Assessment of Potential Impacts of Water Flooding in PL295 USEPA, 2004. Characteristics of Coalbed Methane Production and Associated Hydraulic Fracturing Practices (Chapter 3). *In*: Evaluation of Impacts to Underground Sources June 2004 of Drinking Water by Hydraulic Fracturing of Coalbed Methane Reservoirs. June 2004.

Welsh WD 2000, GABFLOW: A steady state groundwater flow model of the Great Artesian Basin, Bureau of Rural Sciences, Canberra.



Report Signature Page

GOLDER ASSOCIATES PTY LTD

BMC/RS/KB/LBJ/rs,srs

A.B.N. 64 006 107 857

Please log details for signature use every time you access this file thanks

Name	Date	Document Identification No
	01/08/2008	087623082 Invoice SYD04370
	01/08/2008	077623082_invoice 6 cover letter.doc
	01/08/2008	marketing\dwe cover letter.doc
	12/08/2008	077623128 001 I rev0.doc
	13/08/2008	reporting\077623114 002 r rev1 final.doc
	29/8/08	http://golderportal/cws/corporateservices/gaimgs/gaimgsaustralia/scanned signatures/lange_jorstad_signature.doc
	01/09/2008	http://golderportal/cws/corporateservices/gaimgs/gaimgsaustralia/scanned signatures/lange_jorstad_signature.doc
	02/09/2008	Invoice SYD04423
	3/9/08	http://golderportal/Cws/CorporateServices/GAIMGs/GAIMGsAustralia/Scanned signatures/Lange_Jorstad_signature.doc
	25/09/2008	087622085_sds_badgerys creek\087622085 008 r rev0 2000 groundwater study final.doc
	17/10/2008	http://golderportal/cws/corporateservices/gaimgs/gaimgsaustralia/scanned signatures/lange_jorstad_signature.doc
	20/10/2008	http://golderportal/cws/corporateservices/gaimgs/gaimgsaustralia/scanned signatures/lange_jorstad_signature.doc
	20/10/2008	Invoice SYD04503
	16/12/2008	http://golderportal/cws/corporateservices/gaimgs/gaimgsaustralia/scanned signatures/lange_jorstad_signature.doc
	19/01/2009	http://golderportal/cws/corporateservices/gaimgs/gaimgsaustralia/scanned signatures/lange_jorstad_signature.doc
	19/01/2009	http://golderportal/cws/corporateservices/gaimgs/gaimgsaustralia/scanned signatures/lange_jorstad_signature.doc
	05/02/09	http://golderportal/cws/corporateservices/gaimgs/gaimgsaustralia/scanned signatures/lange_jorstad_signature.doc
	27/02/09	http://golderportal/cws/corporateservices/gaimgs/gaimgsaustralia/scanned signatures/lange_jorstad_signature.doc
	03/04/09	http://golderportal/cws/corporateservices/gaimgs/gaimgsaustralia/scanned signatures/lange_jorstad_signature.doc
	21.04.09	http://golderportal/cws/corporateservices/gaimgs/gaimgsaustralia/scanned signatures/lange_jorstad_signature.doc
	29/04/2009	http://golderportal/cws/corporateservices/gaimgs/gaimgsaustralia/scanned signatures/lange_jorstad_signature.doc
	13/05/2009	http://golderportal/cws/corporateservices/gaimgs/gaimgsaustralia/scanned signatures/lange_jorstad_signature.doc
	21.05.09	http://golderportal/cws/corporateservices/gaimgs/gaimgsaustralia/scanned signatures/lange_jorstad_signature.doc



APPENDIX A

Regulatory Consent Conditions

Environmental Protection Act 1994
Level 1 Environmental Authority
Chapter 5A petroleum activity

Permit¹ Number: PEN1000XXXXX

DRAFT Coal Seam Gas Model Conditions
FOR REFERENCE AND DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Under section 310M of the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* this permit is issued to:

Principal Holder:

[Insert Registered Company Name]
[Insert Registered Company Address]
[Insert ACN]

Joint Holder(s):

[Insert Joint Holder Name 1]
[Insert Joint Holder Name 2]
[Insert Joint Holder Name 3]

in respect to carrying out a level 1 chapter 5A activity(ies) as per Section 23 of the *Environmental Protection Regulation 2008* on the relevant resource authorities listed below:

Project Name	Relevant Resource Authority(ies)

This environmental authority takes effect from [insert date of effect].

The anniversary date of this environmental authority is [insert date of environmental authority].

This environmental authority is subject to the attached schedule of conditions.

Date

[Insert Delegate Name]

Delegate of Administering Authority
Department of Environment and Heritage Protection

¹ Permit includes licences, approvals, permits, authorisations, certificates, sanctions or equivalent/similar as required by legislation administered by the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection.

Additional advice about the approval

1. This approval is for the carrying out the following level 1 chapter 5A activity(ies):

Schedule 5 of the Environmental Protection Regulation 2008	
2.	A petroleum activity authorised under the <i>Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Act 1982</i>
3.	A petroleum activity that is likely to have a significant impact on a Category A or B environmentally sensitive area
4.	Extending an existing pipeline by more than 150 km under a petroleum authority
5.	Constructing a new pipeline of more than 150 km under a petroleum authority
6.	A petroleum activity carried out on a site containing a high hazard dam or a significant hazard dam
7.	A petroleum activity involving injection of a waste fluid into a natural underground reservoir or aquifer
8.	A petroleum activity, other than a petroleum activity mentioned in items 1 to 7, that includes 1 or more chapter 4 petroleum activities for which an aggregate environmental score is stated, namely: <div style="background-color: #e0e0e0; padding: 5px; margin: 10px 0;"><i>[Insert each ERA number and full description including threshold for the purposes of determining the aggregate environmental score and the correct annual fee relevant to the application]</i></div> <p>For example:</p> <p>ERA 8 – Chemical storage 10 cubic metres to 500 cubic metres of chemical or dangerous goods class 3 or class 1 or class 2 combustible liquids under AS1940.</p> <p>ERA 15 – Fuel burning operation using equipment capable of burning at least 500 kg per hour of fuel.</p> <p>ERA 60(1)(D) – Waste disposal facility (any combination of regulated waste, general waste and limited regulated waste – and < 5 tonne untreated clinical waste if in a scheduled area) >200,000t / year.</p> <p>ERA 63(2)(A) – Sewage treatment 21 to 100 EP.</p>

2. This approval pursuant to the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* does not remove the need to obtain any additional approval for this activity which might be required by other State and / or Commonwealth legislation. Other legislation administered by the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection for which a permit may be required includes but is not limited to the:

- *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2003*
- *Queensland Heritage Act 1992*
- Contaminated land provisions of the *Environmental Protection Act 1994*
- *Forestry Act 1959*
- *Nature Conservation Act 1992*
- *Water Act 2000*
- *Water Supply (Safety and Reliability) Act 2008*

<<To be deleted>> Under the provisions of the Strategic Cropping Land Act 2011, an environmental authority application (included an amendment application) can not be issued until a protection decision or compliance certificate has been decided.

Applicants are advised to check with all relevant statutory authorities and comply with all relevant legislation.

3. This environmental authority does not authorise environmental harm unless a condition contained in this environmental authority explicitly authorises that harm. Where there is no condition, the lack of a condition shall not be construed as authorising harm.
4. This approval, issued under the *Environmental Protection Act 1994*, for the carrying out of a level 1 petroleum activity(ies) is not an authority to impact on water levels or pressure heads in groundwater aquifers in or surrounding coal seams. There are obligations to minimise or mitigate any such impact under other Queensland Government and Australian Government legislation.
5. Terms defined in Schedule M of this environmental authority are **bolded** in this document. Where a term is not defined in this environmental authority, the definition in the *Environmental Protection Act 1994*, its regulations and Environmental Protection Policies, then the *Acts Interpretation Act 1954* then the Macquarie Dictionary then the *Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004* or its regulations must be used in that order.
6. This environmental authority does not authorise the taking of protected animals or the tampering with an animal breeding place as defined under the *Nature Conservation Act 1992* and its regulations.
7. The Duty to Notify is a requirement contained in the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* which applies to all persons. The duty to notify arises where a person carries out activities and becomes aware of the act of another person arising from or connected to those activities which causes or threatens serious or material environmental harm. If a person carries out a carrying out a chapter 5A activity, such as coal seam gas activities, the law requires that person to notify the administering authority where:
 - the activity negatively affects (or is reasonably likely to negatively affect) the water quality of an aquifer; or
 - the activity has caused the unauthorised connection of two or more aquifers.For more information about the Duty to Notify, refer to section 320A of the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* and/or the guideline, *The Duty to Notify of Environmental Harm* (EM467), published by the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection.
8. This environmental authority consists of the following schedules

**SCHEDULE J WELL CONSTRUCTION, MAINTAINANCE AND HYDRAULIC
FRACTURING ACTIVITIES4**

SCHEDULE J WELL CONSTRUCTION, MAINTAINANCE AND HYDRAULIC FRACTURING ACTIVITIES

Drilling Activities

- (J1) **Oil based drilling muds** must not be used in the carrying out of the petroleum activity(ies).
- (J2) **Synthetic oil-based drilling muds** must not be used in the carrying out of the petroleum activity(ies).
- (J3) Drilling activities must not result in the connection of the target gas producing formation and another aquifer.
- (J4) Practices and procedures must be in place to detect, as soon as practicable, any fractures that have or may result in the connection of a target formation and another aquifer as a result of drilling activities.

Hydraulic Fracturing Activities

- (J5a) **Hydraulic fracturing** activities are not permitted.

Where a risk assessment is not submitted as part of the Environmental Management Plan accompanying the environmental authority application, hydraulic fracturing will not be authorised and condition (J5a) applies, otherwise delete condition (J5a).

- (J5b) Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons or products that contain polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons must not be used in **hydraulic fracturing** fluids in concentrations above the **reporting limit**.
- (J6) **Hydraulic fracturing** activities must not negatively affect water quality, other than that within the **stimulation impact zone** of the target gas producing formation.
- (J7) **Hydraulic fracturing** activities must not cause the connection of the target gas producing formation and another aquifer.
- (J8) The holder of this authority must ensure the internal and external mechanical integrity of the well system prior to and during **hydraulic fracturing** such that there is:
 - (a) no significant leakage in the casing, tubing, or packer; and
 - (b) there is no significant fluid movement into another aquifer through vertical channels adjacent to the well **bore** hole.
- (J9) Practices and procedures must be in place to detect, as soon as practicable, any fractures that cause the connection of a target gas producing formation and another aquifer.

<<To be deleted>> Detection measures will need to be determined through the risk assessment and could include microseismic monitoring, tracer analysis and water quality signature analysis. Such measures will be required to be outlined in the Environmental Management Plan accompanying the application.

Stimulation Risk Assessment

- (J10) Prior to undertaking **hydraulic fracturing** activities, a risk assessment must be developed to ensure that **hydraulic fracturing** activities are managed to prevent environmental harm.
- (J11) The stimulation risk assessment must address issues at a relevant geospatial scale such that changes to features and attributes are adequately described and must include, but not necessarily be limited to:
 - (a) a process description of the **hydraulic fracturing** activity to be applied, including equipment and a comparison to best international practice;
 - (b) provide details of where, when and how often **hydraulic fracturing** is to be undertaken on the tenures covered by this environmental authority;
 - (c) a geological model of the field to be stimulated including geological names, descriptions and depths of the target gas producing formation(s);

- (d) naturally occurring geological faults;
- (e) seismic history of the region (e.g earth tremors, earthquakes);
- (f) proximity of overlying and underlying aquifers;
- (g) description of the depths that aquifers with environmental values occur, both above and below the target gas producing formation.
- (h) identification and proximity of **landholders' active groundwater bores** in the area where **hydraulic fracturing** activities are to be carried out;
- (i) the environmental values of groundwater in the area;
- (j) an assessment of the appropriate **limits of reporting** for all indicators relevant to **hydraulic fracturing** monitoring in order to accurately assess the risks to environmental values of groundwater;
- (k) description of overlying and underlying formations in respect of porosity, permeability, hydraulic conductivity, faulting and fracture propensity;
- (l) consideration of barriers or known direct connections between the target gas producing formation and the overlying and underlying aquifers;
- (m) a description of the well mechanical integrity testing program;
- (n) process control and assessment techniques to be applied for determining extent of **hydraulic fracturing** activities (e.g. microseismic measurements, modelling etc);
- (o) practices and procedures to ensure that the **hydraulic fracturing** activities are designed to be contained within the target gas producing formation;
- (p) groundwater **transmissivity**, flow rate, hydraulic conductivity and direction(s) of flow;
- (q) a description of the chemicals used in **hydraulic fracturing** activities (including estimated total mass, estimated composition, chemical abstract service numbers and properties), their mixtures and the resultant compounds that are formed after **hydraulic fracturing**;
- (r) a mass balance estimating the concentrations and absolute masses of chemicals that will be reacted, returned to the surface or left in the target gas producing formation subsequent to **hydraulic fracturing**;
- (s) an environmental hazard assessment of the chemicals used including their mixtures and the resultant chemicals that are formed after **hydraulic fracturing** including:
 - (i) toxicological and ecotoxicological information of chemicals used;
 - (ii) information on the persistence and bioaccumulation potential of the chemicals used;
 - (iii) identification of the **hydraulic fracturing** fluid chemicals of potential concern derived from the risk assessment;
- (t) an environmental hazard assessment of use, formation of, and detection of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in **hydraulic fracturing** activities;
- (u) identification and an environmental hazard assessment of using radioactive tracer beads in **hydraulic fracturing** activities;
- (v) an environmental hazard assessment of leaving chemicals used in **stimulation fluids** in the target gas producing formation for extended periods subsequent to **hydraulic fracturing**;
- (w) human health exposure pathways to operators and the regional population;
- (x) risk characterisation of environmental impacts based on the environmental hazard assessment;
- (y) potential impacts to landholder bores as a result of **hydraulic fracturing** activities;

- (z) an assessment of cumulative impacts, spatially and temporally of the **hydraulic fracturing** activities to be carried out on the tenures covered by this environmental authority; and
- (aa) potential environmental or health impacts which may result from **hydraulic fracturing** activities including but not limited to water quality, air quality (including suppression of dust and other airborne contaminants), noise and vibration.

<<To be deleted>> Conditions (J10) and (J11) can be deleted from the environmental authority in the event the applicant has submitted a Stimulation Risk Assessment with the application and to the satisfaction of the administering authority. In this event, amend condition (J12) to include the Stimulation Risk Assessment's reference details and date.

- (J12) The stimulation risk assessment must be carried out for every well to be stimulated prior to **hydraulic fracturing** activities being carried out at that well.

<<To be deleted>> Condition (J12) provides flexibility to the applicant to develop risk assessments for each well or develop one overarching stimulation risk assessment providing that one document covers all relevant and site specific matters for each of the wells.

Water Quality Baseline Monitoring

- (J13) Prior to undertaking any **hydraulic fracturing** activity, a baseline **bore** assessment must be undertaken of the water quality of:
- (a) all **landholders' active groundwater bores** (subject to access being permitted by the landholder) that are spatially located within a two (2) kilometre horizontal radius from the location of the **hydraulic fracturing** initiation point within the target gas producing formation; and
 - (b) all **landholders' active groundwater bores** (subject to access being permitted by the landholder) in any aquifer that is within 200 metres above or below the target gas producing formation and is spatially located with a two (2) kilometre radius from the location of the **hydraulic fracturing** initiation point; and
 - (d) any other **bore** that could potentially be adversely impacted by the **hydraulic fracturing** activity(ies) in accordance with the findings of the risk assessment required by conditions (J10) and (J11).
- (J14) Prior to undertaking **hydraulic fracturing** activities at a well, there must be sufficient water quality data to accurately represent the water quality in the well to be stimulated. The data must include as a minimum the results of analyses for the parameters in condition (J15)).

<<To be deleted>> Condition (J14) allows for flexibility regarding pre-hydraulic fracturing monitoring of water quality in a well. In the event that there is not sufficient water in a well prior to hydraulic fracturing, coal seam gas companies may use monitoring data from another unstimulated well or bore which is in the vicinity and which accurately represents the water quality in the well to be stimulated.

- (J15) Baseline bore and well assessments must include relevant **analytes** and physico-chemical parameters to be monitored in order to establish baseline water quality and must include, but not necessarily be limited to:
- (a) pH;
 - (b) electrical conductivity [$\mu\text{S/m}$];
 - (c) turbidity [NTU];
 - (d) total dissolved solids [mg/L];
 - (e) temperature [$^{\circ}\text{C}$];
 - (f) dissolved oxygen [mg/L];
 - (g) dissolved gases (methane, chlorine, carbon dioxide, hydrogen sulfide) [mg/L];

- (h) alkalinity (bicarbonate, carbonate, hydroxide and total as CaCO₃) [mg/L];
- (i) sodium adsorption ratio (SAR);
- (j) anions (bicarbonate, carbonate, hydroxide, chloride, sulphate) [mg/L];
- (k) cations (aluminium, calcium, magnesium, potassium, sodium) [mg/L];
- (l) dissolved and total metals and metalloids (including but not necessarily being limited to: aluminium, arsenic, barium, borate (boron), cadmium, total chromium, copper, iron, fluoride, lead, manganese, mercury, nickel, selenium, silver, strontium, tin and zinc) [µg/L];
- (m) total petroleum hydrocarbons [µg/L];
- (n) **BTEX** (as benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, ortho-xylene, para- and meta-xylene, and total xylene) [µg/L];
- (o) polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (including but not necessarily being limited to: naphthalene, phenanthrene, benzo[a]pyrene) [µg/L];
- (q) sodium hypochlorite [mg/L];
- (r) sodium hydroxide [mg/L];
- (s) formaldehyde [mg/L];
- (t) ethanol [mg/L]; and
- (u) gross alpha + gross beta or radionuclides by gamma spectroscopy [Bq/L].

Stimulation Impact Monitoring Program

- (J16) A Stimulation Impact Monitoring Program must be developed prior to the carrying out of **hydraulic fracturing** activities which must be able to detect adverse impacts to water quality from **hydraulic fracturing** activities and must consider the findings of the risk assessment required by conditions (J10) and (J11) that relate to **hydraulic fracturing** activities and must include, as a minimum, monitoring of:
- (a) the **stimulation fluids** to be used in **hydraulic fracturing** activities at sufficient frequency and which sufficiently represents the quantity and quality of the fluids used; and
 - (b) flow back waters from **hydraulic fracturing** activities at sufficient frequency and which sufficiently represents the quality of that flow back water; and
 - (c) flow back waters from **hydraulic fracturing** activities at sufficient frequency and accuracy to demonstrate that 150 % of the volume used in **hydraulic fracturing** activities has been extracted from the stimulated well; and
 - (d) all **bores** in accordance with condition (J13).
- (J17) The Stimulation Impact Monitoring Program must provide for monitoring of:
- (a) **analytes** and physico-chemical parameters relevant to baseline bore and well assessments to enable data referencing and comparison including, but not necessarily being limited to the **analytes** and physico-chemical parameters in condition (J16); and
 - (b) any other **analyte** or physico-chemical parameters that will enable detection of adverse water quality impacts and the inter-connection with a non-target aquifer as a result of **hydraulic fracturing** activities including chemical compounds that are actually or potentially formed by chemical reactions with each other or coal seam materials during **hydraulic fracturing** activities.
- (J18) The Stimulation Impact Monitoring Program must provide for monitoring of the **bores** in condition (J16)(d) at the following minimum frequency:
- (a) monthly for the first six (6) **months** subsequent to **hydraulic fracturing** activities being undertaken; then

- (b) annually for the first five (5) **years** subsequent to **hydraulic fracturing** activities being undertaken or until **analytes** and physico-chemical parameters listed in condition (J15)(b), (J15)(n) – (J15)(u) are not detected in concentrations above baseline bore monitoring data on two (2) consecutive monitoring occasions.

<<To be deleted>> Monthly monitoring required by condition (J18)(a) may need to be extended beyond six (6) months depending on the outcomes of the risk assessment and the transmissivity of groundwater in the area.

- (J19) The results of the Stimulation Impact Monitoring Program must be made available to any potentially affected landholder upon request by that landholder.

<<To be deleted>> There may be variations to the Stimulation Impact Monitoring in the event that a risk assessment for hydraulic fracturing activities is submitted to the administering authority with the application which includes sufficient data to demonstrate the quality and quantity of the stimulation fluids to be used in hydraulic fracturing activities. To reduce the suite of impact monitoring parameters in condition (J15), monitoring results of these parameters as sampled from on site hydraulic fracturing activities must be included. To vary the requirements of conditions (J16) – (J19), the risk assessment must include, for example:

- *comprehensive characterisation data from replicate sampling of batch samples of stimulation additive mixtures intended to be used in hydraulic fracturing; and*
 - *monitoring results of stimulation fluid blends as sampled at low pressure pumps associated with hydraulic fracturing activities;*
 - *monitoring results of flow back waters;*
 - *relevant current MSDS's for all additives to be used in stimulation fluids;*
 - *whole effluent or direct toxicity assessments of additives and/or stimulation fluids;*
 - *an assessment of all monitoring data and toxicity assessments against known water quality guidelines, including US EPA Drinking Water guidelines.*
-



APPENDIX B

Limitations



LIMITATIONS

This Document has been provided by Golder Associates Pty Ltd ("Golder") subject to the following limitations:

This Document has been prepared for the particular purpose outlined in Contract No.884285 between the client and Golder and no responsibility is accepted for the use of this Document, in whole or in part, in other contexts or for any other purpose.

The scope and the period of Golder's Services are as described in Contract No.884285 between the client and Golder, and are subject to restrictions and limitations. Golder did not perform a complete assessment of all possible conditions or circumstances that may exist at the site referenced in the Document. If a service is not expressly indicated, do not assume it has been provided. If a matter is not addressed, do not assume that any determination has been made by Golder in regards to it.

Conditions may exist which were undetectable given the limited nature of the enquiry Golder was retained to undertake with respect to the site. Variations in conditions may occur between investigatory locations, and there may be special conditions pertaining to the site which have not been revealed by the investigation and which have not therefore been taken into account in the Document. Accordingly, additional studies and actions may be required.

In addition, it is recognised that the passage of time affects the information and assessment provided in this Document. Golder's opinions are based upon information that existed at the time of the production of the Document. It is understood that the Services provided allowed Golder to form no more than an opinion of the actual conditions of the site at the time the site was visited and cannot be used to assess the effect of any subsequent changes in the quality of the site, or its surroundings, or any laws or regulations.

Any assessments made in this Document are based on the conditions indicated from published sources and the investigation described. No warranty is included, either express or implied, that the actual conditions will conform exactly to the assessments contained in this Document.


Where data supplied by the client or other external sources, including previous site investigation data, have been used, it has been assumed that the information is correct unless otherwise stated. No responsibility is accepted by Golder for incomplete or inaccurate data supplied by others.

This Document is provided for sole use by the Client for the purpose of our contract and in accordance with Clause 17.1. Except as otherwise agreed in writing, no responsibility whatsoever for the contents of this Document will be accepted to any person other than the Client and any use which a third party makes of this Document, or any reliance on or decisions to be made based on it, is the responsibility of such third parties. Golder accepts no responsibility for damages, if any, suffered by any third party as a result of decisions made or actions based on this Document.



APPENDIX C

Geological Contour Plans



SWQ HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT

SANTOS

GEOLOGICAL CONTOUR MAP: WINTON FORMATION

COPYRIGHT

1. Base information copyright MapInfo Australia Pty Ltd
2. ATP/PL tenure supplied by Santos, August 2011
3. Golder Associates 2012a Cooper Basin UWIR Report



LEGEND

- Geology Data Point
- Town/Locality
- Depth to Winton Formation (m)
- River/Creek
- Santos Operated Permits


Thickness of Winton Formation (m)
High : 970
Low : 1

0 5 10 20 30 40 50 Kilometres
SCALE (at A3) 1:2,500,000
Coordinate System: GCS GDA 1994

PROJECT: 127666004
DATE: 27/09/2012
DRAWN: FA
CHECKED: RS

APPENDIX C1





SWQ HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT

SANTOS

GEOLOGICAL CONTOUR MAP: HOORAY FORMATION

COPYRIGHT

1. Base information copyright MapInfo Australia Pty Ltd
2. ATP/PL tenure supplied by Santos, August 2011
3. Golder Associates 2012a Cooper Basin UWIR Report



LEGEND

- Geology Data Point
- Town/Locality
- Depth to Hooray Sandstone (m)
- Highway / Major Road
- River/Creek
- Santos Operated Permits


Thickness of Hooray Sandstone (m)
High : 595
Low : 1.8

0 5 10 20 30 40 50 Kilometres
SCALE (at A3) 1:2,500,000
Coordinate System: GCS GDA 1994

PROJECT: 127666004
DATE: 27/09/2012
DRAWN: FA
CHECKED: RS

APPENDIX C2





SWQ HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT

SANTOS

GEOLOGICAL CONTOUR MAP: CADNA OWIE FORMATION


COPYRIGHT

1. Base information copyright MapInfo Australia Pty Ltd
2. ATP/PTL tenure supplied by Santos, August 2011
3. Golder Associates 2012a Cooper Basin UWIR Report



LEGEND

- Geology Data Point
- Town/Locality
- Depth to Cadna Owie (m)
- River/Creek
- Santos Operated Permits




0 5 10 20 30 40 50 Kilometres
SCALE (at A3) 1:2,000,000
Coordinate System: GCS GDA 1994

PROJECT: 127666004
DATE: 27/09/2012
DRAWN: FA
CHECKED: RS

APPENDIX C3





SWQ HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT

SANTOS

GEOLOGICAL CONTOUR MAP: HUTTON SANDSTONE

COPYRIGHT

1. Base information copyright MapInfo Australia Pty Ltd
2. ATP/PL tenure supplied by Santos, August 2011
3. Golder Associates 2012a Cooper Basin UWIR Report



LEGEND

- Geology Data Point
- Town/Locality
- Depth to Hutton Sandstone (m)
- River/Creek
- Santos Operated Permits


Thickness of Hutton Sandstone (m)
High : 241
Low : 2.

0 5 10 20 30 40 50 Kilometres
SCALE (at A3) 1:2,500,000
Coordinate System: GCS GDA 1994

PROJECT: 127666004
DATE: 27/09/2012
DRAWN: FA
CHECKED: RS

APPENDIX C4





SWQ HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT

SANTOS

GEOLOGICAL CONTOUR MAP: POOLOWANNA FORMATION


COPYRIGHT

1. Base information copyright MapInfo Australia Pty Ltd
2. ATP/PL tenure supplied by Santos, August 2011
3. Golder Associates 2012a Cooper Basin UWIR Report



LEGEND

- Geological Data Point
- Town/Locality
- Depth to Poolowanna Formation (m)
- River/Creek
- Santos Operated Permits
- Cooper Basin




0 5 10 20 30 40 50 Kilometres
SCALE (at A3) 1:2,000,000
Coordinate System: GCS GDA 1994

PROJECT: 127666004
DATE: 27/09/2012
DRAWN: FA
CHECKED: RS

APPENDIX C5





SWQ HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT

SANTOS

GEOLOGICAL CONTOUR MAP: TOOLACHEE FORMATION


COPYRIGHT

1. Base information copyright MapInfo Australia Pty Ltd
2. ATP/PL tenure supplied by Santos, August 2011
3. Golder Associates 2012a Cooper Basin UWR Report



LEGEND

- Geology Data Point
- Town/Locality
- Depth to Toolachee Formation (m)
- Highway / Major Road
- River/Creek
- Santos Operated Permits
- Cooper Basin



0 5 10 20 30 40 50 Kilometres

SCALE (at A3) 1:1,500,000

Coordinate System: GCS GDA 1994

PROJECT: 127666004


DATE: 27/09/2012

DRAWN: FA

CHECKED: RS

APPENDIX C6





SWQ HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT

SANTOS

GEOLOGICAL CONTOUR MAP: PATCHAWARRA FORMATION

COPYRIGHT

1. Base information copyright MapInfo Australia Pty Ltd
2. ATP/PL tenure supplied by Santos, August 2011
3. Golder Associates 2012a Cooper Basin UWIR Report



LEGEND

- Geology Data Point
- Town/Locality
- Depth to Patchawarra Formation (m)
- River/Creek
- Santos Operated Permits
- Cooper Basin

Thickness of Patchawarra Formation (m)

745



Low : 7.5

0 5 10 20 30 40 50 Kilometres

SCALE (at A3) 1:1,500,000

Coordinate System: GCS GDA 1994

PROJECT: 127666004

DATE: 27/09/2012

DRAWN: FA

CHECKED: RS


APPENDIX C7





APPENDIX D

Hydrogeological Contour Plans



SWQ HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT

SANTOS

HYDROGEOLOGICAL MAP: TERTIARY FORMATION

COPYRIGHT

1. Base information copyright MapInfo Australia Pty Ltd
2. ATP/PL tenure supplied by Santos, August 2011
3. Groundwater Management Area supplied by the State of Queensland (Department of Natural Resources & Water), 2008
4. Golder Associates 2012a Cooper Basin UWIR Report



LEGEND

- Town/Locality
- Water Level and Electrical Conductivity Data Point
- Water Level Data Point
- Piezometric Isoline (mAHD) 20 m Interval
- Inferred Piezometric Isoline (mAHD) 20 m Interval
- Highway / Major Road
- River/Creek
- Santos Operated Permits
- Groundwater Management Area

Electrical Conductivity ($\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$)

- 0 - 3000
- 3,000 - 4,500
- 4,500 - 6,000
- 6,000 - 7,500
- 7,500 - 9000

0 5 10 20 30 40 50 Kilometres

SCALE (at A3) 1:2,500,000

Coordinate System: GCS GDA 1994

PROJECT: 127666004


DATE: 27/09/2012

DRAWN: FA

CHECKED: RS

APPENDIX D1





SWQ HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT

SANTOS

HYDROGEOLOGICAL MAP: WINTON FORMATION

COPYRIGHT

1. Base information copyright MapInfo Australia Pty Ltd
2. ATP/PL tenure supplied by Santos, August 2011
3. Groundwater Management Area supplied by the State of Queensland (Department of Natural Resources & Water), 2008
4. Golder Associates 2012a Cooper Basin UWIR Report



LEGEND

- Town/Locality
- Water Level and Electrical Conductivity Data Point
- Electrical Conductivity Data Point
- Water Level Data Point
- Inferred Piezometric Isoline (m AHD) 20 m interval
- River/Creek
- Highway / Major Road
- Santos Operated Permits
- Groundwater Management Area

Electrical Conductivity ($\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$)

- 0 - 3,000
- 3,000 - 4,500
- 4,500 - 6,000
- 6,000 - 7,500
- 7,500 - 15,000

0 5 10 20 30 40 50 Kilometres


SCALE (at A3) 1:2,500,000
Coordinate System: GCS GDA 1994

PROJECT: 127666004
DATE: 27/09/2012
DRAWN: FA
CHECKED: RS

APPENDIX D2



North West Mgmt Area 10 of the GABWRP



SWQ HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT

SANTOS

HYDROGEOLOGICAL MAP: HOORAY SANDSTONE

COPYRIGHT

1. Base information copyright MapInfo Australia Pty Ltd
2. ATP/PL tenure supplied by Santos, August 2011
3. Groundwater Management Area supplied by the State of Queensland (Department of Natural Resources & Water), 2008
4. Golder Associates 2012a Cooper Basin UWIR Report



LEGEND

- Town/Locality
- Water Level and Electrical Conductivity Data Point
- Electrical Conductivity Data Point
- Water Level Data Point
- Inferred Piezometric Isoline (metres AHD - Interval 25 metres)
- Highway / Major Road
- Santos Operated Permits
- Groundwater Management Area

- Electrical Conductivity ($\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$)
- 0 - 1,500
 - 1,500 - 3,000
 - 3,000 - 4,500

0 5 10 20 30 40 50 Kilometres
SCALE (at A3) 1:2,500,000
Coordinate System: GCS GDA 1994

PROJECT: 127666004
DATE: 27/09/2012
DRAWN: FA
CHECKED: RS

APPENDIX D3






APPENDIX E

Santos Hydraulic Fracturing - Schematic Well Lease Set up



HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT - HALLIBURTON METHODOLOGY


Figure E1: Conventional Oil Well Lease Set-up (Batch Mixing)





HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT - HALLIBURTON METHODOLOGY


Figure E2: Conventional Gas Well Lease Set-up





HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT - HALLIBURTON METHODOLOGY

Figure E3: Deep Gas Well Lease Set Up (Coil Tubing Assisted Fracturing)





APPENDIX F

Historical Well Hydraulic Stimulations in SWQ



HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT - HALLIBURTON METHODOLOGY

NAME	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE	DATE
Challum 1	-27.393	141.574	Sep-1987
Brumby 2	-28.381	140.959	Jun-1989
Wilson 4	-27.566	142.426	Jul-1989
Brumby 1	-28.409	140.991	Aug-1991
Epsilon 2	-28.142	141.133	Dec-1991
Epsilon 1	-28.145	141.154	Apr-1992
Thungo 2	-27.735	142.577	Jan-1993
Patroclus 1	-28.111	141.681	Dec-1994
Stokes 1	-28.345	141.029	Mar-1997
Yanda 8	-27.452	141.821	Jun-1997
Challum 3	-27.388	141.537	Oct-1998
Coolah 2	-26.956	141.835	Nov-1998
Challum 13	-27.373	141.571	May-1999
Wolgolla 2	-28.193	141.334	May-2002
Dartmoor 1	-27.687	142.540	Sep-2002
Thungo 7	-27.722	142.582	Sep-2002
Juno 5	-27.697	141.829	Oct-2002
Thungo 7	-27.722	142.582	Oct-2002
Juno 5	-27.697	141.829	Oct-2002
Juno 2	-27.688	141.829	Oct-2002
Juno 5	-27.697	141.829	Oct-2002
Coonaberry 1	-26.851	142.104	Oct-2002
Ramses 1	-26.764	142.102	Nov-2002
Moon 1	-28.227	141.042	Nov-2002
Ipundu North 2	-26.911	143.307	Jan-2004
Talgeberry 2	-26.948	143.430	Jan-2004
Talgeberry 8	-26.952	143.432	Jan-2004
Challum 24	-27.381	141.598	Jan-2004
Challum 22	-27.408	141.650	Jan-2004
Karmona 3	-27.304	141.883	Jan-2004
Ipundu North 11	-26.917	143.310	Jan-2004
Ipundu North 11	-26.917	143.310	Jan-2004
Thungo 8	-27.719	142.585	Jan-2004
Ipundu North 2	-26.911	143.307	Feb-2004
Mulberry 1	-26.892	143.402	Feb-2004
Roti West 1	-27.367	142.143	Mar-2004
Gimboola West 1	-26.872	143.403	Oct-2004
Winninia 1	-27.856	141.836	Nov-2004
Winninia North 2	-27.828	141.894	Nov-2004
Baryulah 6	-27.753	141.869	Dec-2004
Baryulah 6	-27.753	141.869	Dec-2004
Baryulah 6	-27.753	141.869	Dec-2004
Baryulah 6	-27.753	141.869	Dec-2004
Baryulah 6	-27.753	141.869	Dec-2004
Baryulah 6	-27.753	141.869	Dec-2004
Winninia North 3	-27.826	141.879	Jan-2005
Winninia North 3	-27.826	141.879	Jan-2005
Winninia North 3	-27.826	141.879	Jan-2005
Winninia North 3	-27.826	141.879	Jan-2005
Winninia North 3	-27.826	141.879	Jan-2005
Endeavour 1	-26.789	143.382	Feb-2005
Endeavour 2	-26.796	143.379	Feb-2005
Talgeberry 7	-26.944	143.430	Feb-2005
Talgeberry 7	-26.944	143.430	Feb-2005
Cranstoun 1	-26.814	143.387	Apr-2005
Takyah 1	-27.010	143.301	Apr-2005
Takyah 1	-27.010	143.301	Apr-2005
Mulberry 2	-26.891	143.397	May-2005
Mulberry 3	-26.895	143.409	May-2005
Ipundu North 9	-26.918	143.305	May-2005
Ipundu North 4	-26.914	143.306	May-2005
Mulberry 4	-26.890	143.405	Jun-2005
Ipundu North 9	-26.918	143.305	Jun-2005
Ipundu North 4	-26.914	143.306	Jul-2005
Ipundu North 4	-26.914	143.306	Jul-2005
Iliad 1	-28.294	141.366	Aug-2005
Iliad 2	-28.294	141.355	Aug-2005
Jackson 45	-27.578	142.414	Aug-2005
Ipundu 12	-26.936	143.332	Aug-2005

NAME	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE	DATE
Ipundu 12	-26.936	143.332	Aug-2005
Tartulla 6	-27.207	142.139	Oct-2005
Psyche 4	-27.929	141.810	Oct-2005
Baryulah 8	-27.738	141.834	Nov-2005
Baryulah 8	-27.738	141.834	Nov-2005
Baryulah 8	-27.738	141.834	Nov-2005
Baryulah 8	-27.738	141.834	Nov-2005
Baryulah 7	-27.750	141.857	Nov-2005
Baryulah 7	-27.750	141.857	Nov-2005
Baryulah 7	-27.750	141.857	Nov-2005
Baryulah 7	-27.750	141.857	Nov-2005
Talgeberry 6	-26.945	143.420	Nov-2005
Ipundu 4A	-26.936	143.333	Nov-2005
Ipundu 4A	-26.936	143.333	Nov-2005
Wellington 5	-27.739	141.865	Nov-2005
Thoar 3	-28.025	141.775	Nov-2005
Baryulah 9	-27.759	141.847	Dec-2005
Baryulah 9	-27.759	141.847	Dec-2005
Baryulah 9	-27.759	141.847	Dec-2005
Baryulah 9	-27.759	141.847	Dec-2005
Wellington 5	-27.739	141.865	Dec-2005
Juno 4	-27.687	141.837	Dec-2005
Juno 4	-27.687	141.837	Dec-2005
Juno 4	-27.687	141.837	Dec-2005
Juno 4	-27.687	141.837	Dec-2005
Juno 4	-27.687	141.837	Dec-2005
Psyche 3	-27.942	141.824	Dec-2005
Durham Downs North 2	-27.054	141.821	Jan-2006
Baryulah 10	-27.756	141.878	Jan-2006
Baryulah 10	-27.756	141.878	Jan-2006
Baryulah 10	-27.756	141.878	Jan-2006
Baryulah 10	-27.756	141.878	Jan-2006
Winna 4	-27.725	142.540	Jan-2006
Talgeberry 4	-26.945	143.435	Jan-2006
Talgeberry 4	-26.945	143.435	Jan-2006
Tickalara 10	-28.344	141.378	Feb-2006
Iliad 3	-28.293	141.364	Feb-2006
Tickalara 3	-28.341	141.384	Mar-2006
Sigma 1	-28.335	141.340	Mar-2006
Sigma 2	-28.340	141.341	Mar-2006
Mulberry 6	-26.894	143.399	Mar-2006
Dululu 1	-28.326	141.440	Mar-2006
Yanda 16	-27.449	141.826	Apr-2006
Tickalara 3	-28.341	141.384	Apr-2006
Mulberry 8	-26.899	143.399	Apr-2006
Yanda 16	-27.449	141.826	Apr-2006
Mulberry 9	-26.899	143.406	May-2006
Mulberry 10A	-26.902	143.414	May-2006
Chancett 1	-26.856	143.406	May-2006
Mulberry 14	-26.899	143.411	May-2006
Mulberry 16	-26.888	143.399	May-2006
Gimboola 3	-26.880	143.412	May-2006
Epsilon 3	-28.161	141.137	Jun-2006
Toby 1	-26.685	142.368	Jun-2006
Mulberry 15	-26.888	143.393	Jun-2006
Kercummurra 1	-27.108	142.433	Jul-2006
Endeavour 8	-26.800	143.377	Jul-2006
Mulberry 17	-26.899	143.388	Jul-2006
Gimboola 2	-26.880	143.418	Jul-2006
Mulberry 12	-26.884	143.392	Jul-2006
Gimboola 4a	-26.875	143.412	Aug-2006
Endeavour 9	-26.781	143.391	Aug-2006
Endeavour 7	-26.795	143.382	Aug-2006
Talgeberry 12	-26.941	143.433	Aug-2006
Talgeberry 13	-26.940	143.427	Aug-2006
Minni Ritchi 1	-26.825	143.375	Aug-2006
Cranstoun 3	-26.817	143.390	Sep-2006
Talgeberry 9	-26.948	143.424	Sep-2006



HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RISK ASSESSMENT - HALLIBURTON METHODOLOGY

NAME	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE	DATE
Talgeberry 11	-26.948	143.436	Sep-2006
Patroclus 1	-28.111	141.681	Sep-2006
Patroclus 1	-28.111	141.681	Sep-2006
Orientos 2	-28.048	141.428	Oct-2006
Talgeberry 14	-26.946	143.441	Oct-2006
Endeavour 18	-26.800	143.370	Oct-2006
Kooyong 1	-26.809	143.355	Oct-2006
Endeavour 19	-26.806	143.370	Oct-2006
Mulberry 19	-26.899	143.393	Oct-2006
Mulberry 22	-26.904	143.405	Oct-2006
Mulberry 21	-26.904	143.400	Oct-2006
Mulberry 23	-26.910	143.399	Oct-2006
Endeavour 5	-26.789	143.377	Oct-2006
Mulberry 5	-26.894	143.405	Oct-2006
Endeavour 16	-26.795	143.370	Nov-2006
Endeavour 13	-26.789	143.370	Nov-2006
Barrolka 9	-26.862	141.758	Nov-2006
Barrolka 9	-26.862	141.758	Nov-2006
Yanda 19	-27.459	141.793	Nov-2006
Durham Downs 4	-27.077	141.786	Nov-2006
Winninia North 1	-27.814	141.888	Nov-2006
Yanda 20	-27.453	141.796	Nov-2006
Yanda 19	-27.459	141.793	Nov-2006
Baryulah 12	-27.740	141.847	Nov-2006
Endeavour 15	-26.795	143.376	Nov-2006
Baryulah 12	-27.740	141.847	Dec-2006
Baryulah 12	-27.740	141.847	Dec-2006
Baryulah 12	-27.740	141.847	Dec-2006
Baryulah 12	-27.740	141.847	Dec-2006
Baryulah 12	-27.740	141.847	Dec-2006
Baryulah 11	-27.753	141.843	Dec-2006
Yanda 20	-27.453	141.796	Dec-2006
Baryulah 11	-27.753	141.843	Dec-2006
Baryulah 11	-27.753	141.843	Dec-2006
Baryulah 11	-27.753	141.843	Dec-2006
Yanda 24	-27.458	141.808	Dec-2006
Baryulah 11	-27.753	141.843	Dec-2006
Yanda 21	-27.449	141.804	Dec-2006
Baryulah 11	-27.753	141.843	Dec-2006
Theta 1	-27.979	141.745	Jan-2007
Yanda 22	-27.446	141.814	Jan-2007
Theta 1	-27.979	141.745	Jan-2007
Kooroopa North 1	-27.001	143.230	Feb-2007
Kooroopa North 2	-26.996	143.218	Feb-2007
Jackson 28	-27.583	142.413	Feb-2007
Endeavour 34	-26.803	143.373	Mar-2007
Endeavour 33	-26.803	143.367	Mar-2007
Endeavour 26	-26.783	143.388	Mar-2007
Mulberry 11	-26.894	143.393	Mar-2007
Thungo 9	-27.725	142.583	May-2007
Thungo 13	-27.734	142.581	May-2007
Dilkera North 1	-27.739	142.641	May-2007
Thungo 10	-27.728	142.583	May-2007
Thungo 11	-27.729	142.573	May-2007
Endeavour 28	-26.789	143.388	May-2007
Mulberry 29	-26.893	143.388	May-2007
Mulberry 42	-26.888	143.381	May-2007
Mulberry 44	-26.899	143.382	May-2007
Mulberry 26	-26.886	143.389	May-2007
Endeavour 39	-26.806	143.364	May-2007
Endeavour 25	-26.783	143.381	May-2007
Endeavour 35	-26.787	143.373	May-2007
Talgeberry 5	-26.936	143.435	May-2007
Mulberry 27	-26.888	143.387	May-2007
Currambar 1	-27.753	142.666	Jun-2007
Muthero 6	-27.712	142.615	Jun-2007
Muthero 7	-27.712	142.612	Jun-2007
Endeavour 29	-26.793	143.367	Jun-2007
Mulberry 35	-26.913	143.403	Jun-2007

NAME	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE	DATE
Yanda 25	-27.460	141.799	Jun-2007
Takyah 2	-27.011	143.282	Jul-2007
Kooroopa 3	-27.024	143.236	Jul-2007
Coonaberry 2	-26.842	142.109	Aug-2007
Coonaberry 2	-26.842	142.109	Aug-2007
Challum West 1	-27.358	141.503	Aug-2007
Lepard 1	-27.827	141.732	Aug-2007
Lepard 1	-27.827	141.732	Aug-2007
Lepard 1	-27.827	141.732	Aug-2007
Lepard 1	-27.827	141.732	Aug-2007
Patroclus 4	-28.116	141.689	Sep-2007
Ipundu 2	-26.926	143.321	Sep-2007
Ipundu 14	-26.937	143.337	Sep-2007
Mulberry 33	-26.896	143.402	Oct-2007
Mulberry 34	-26.896	143.402	Oct-2007
Mulberry 31	-26.896	143.402	Oct-2007
Mulberry 32	-26.896	143.402	Oct-2007
Talgeberry 18	-26.945	143.427	Oct-2007
Talgeberry 22	-26.940	143.438	Oct-2007
Dilkera 2	-27.744	142.629	Jan-2008
Jackson 17	-27.598	142.419	Mar-2008
Mama 1	0.000	0.000	Aug-2008
Yanda 15	-27.452	141.807	Sep-2008
Durham Downs North 1	-27.054	141.810	Oct-2008
Tartulla 8	-27.195	142.151	Oct-2008
Ramses 2	-26.755	142.106	Nov-2008
Iliad 4	-28.294	141.370	Nov-2008
Iliad 6	-28.297	141.365	Nov-2008
Galex 2	-27.453	141.852	Nov-2008
Yawa 2	-27.376	141.929	Nov-2008
Vega 3	-27.719	141.864	Dec-2008
Vega 3	-27.719	141.864	Dec-2008
Vega 3	-27.719	141.864	Dec-2008
Vega 3	-27.719	141.864	Dec-2008
Vega 3	-27.719	141.864	Dec-2008
Vega 3	-27.719	141.864	Dec-2008
Vega 3	-27.719	141.864	Dec-2008
Iliad 5	-28.296	141.353	Sep-2009
Baryulah 4	-27.752	141.873	Sep-2009
Baryulah 4	-27.752	141.873	Sep-2009
Baryulah 4	-27.752	141.873	Sep-2009
Baryulah 4	-27.752	141.873	Oct-2009
Baryulah 4	-27.752	141.873	Oct-2009
Baryulah 5	-27.755	141.865	Oct-2009
Baryulah 5	-27.755	141.865	Oct-2009
Baryulah 5	-27.755	141.865	Oct-2009
Baryulah 5	-27.755	141.865	Oct-2009
Theta 2	-27.960	141.726	Oct-2009
Psyche 6	-27.903	141.818	Oct-2009
Okotoko West 2	-27.351	141.956	Oct-2009
Baryulah 5	-27.755	141.865	Nov-2009
Ipundu 16	-26.928	143.320	Jun-2010
Ipundu North 13	-26.916	143.302	Jun-2010
Patroclus 3	-28.114	141.687	Jun-2010
Moon 1	-28.227	141.042	Jul-2010
Moon 1	-28.227	141.042	Jul-2010
Moon 1	-28.227	141.042	Jul-2010
Moon 1	-28.227	141.042	Jul-2010
Challum 5	-27.416	141.657	- ⁽¹⁾
Dingera 2	-27.957	141.901	- ⁽¹⁾
Dilkera 3	-27.742	142.634	- ⁽¹⁾
Psyche 2	-27.916	141.836	- ⁽¹⁾
Mulberry 24	-26.910	143.417	- ⁽¹⁾
Psyche 2	-27.916	141.836	- ⁽¹⁾
Endeavour 11	-26.791	143.385	- ⁽¹⁾
Ramses 2	-26.755	142.106	- ⁽¹⁾
Genoa 2	-28.141	141.853	- ⁽¹⁾

(1) No record



APPENDIX G

Potential Hydraulic Fracture Locations

Table G1: Summary of Scheduled Hydraulic Fracturing Locations

NAME	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE	DATE
<i>Oil Wells</i>			
IPUNDU NORTH OIL APP A	-26.908	143.303	2013
IPUNDU NORTH OIL APP B	-26.917	143.315	2013
KOOROOPA NORTH OIL APP A	-26.994	143.208	2013
KOOROOPA OIL APP A	-27.019	143.240	2013
MULBERRY OIL APP C	-26.904	143.384	2012
MULBERRY OIL APP E	-26.903	143.394	2012
MULBERRY WF EXPANSION - P1 ⁽¹⁾	-26.891	143.394	2013
MULBERRY WF EXPANSION - P2 ⁽¹⁾	-26.894	143.396	2013
MULBERRY WF EXPANSION - P3 ⁽¹⁾	-26.893	143.389	2013
MULBERRY WF EXPANSION - P4 ⁽¹⁾	-26.896	143.394	2013
OLIVE OYL OIL NFE	-27.015	143.197	2012
TOOBUNYAH OIL APP A	-26.951	143.099	2012
TOOBUNYAH OIL APP B	-26.944	143.102	2012
TOOBUNYAH OIL DEV A	-26.948	143.104	2012
<i>Gas Wells</i>			
BARROLKA GAS DEV L DCXF	-26.848	141.774	2013
BARROLKA GAS DEV M DCXF	-26.884	141.761	2013
BARROLKA GAS DEV N DCXF	-26.868	141.745	2013
BARROLKA NE-1 GAS DEV RDCXF	-26.814	141.758	2013
BARYULAH GAS DEV H DPPXCF	-27.762	141.835	2015
BARYULAH GAS DEV I DPPXCF	-27.760	141.867	2015
BARYULAH GAS DEV J DPPXCF	-27.756	141.873	2013
BARYULAH GAS DEV K DPPXCF	-27.750	141.879	2013
BARYULAH GAS DEV L DPPXCF	-27.751	141.863	2015
BARYULAH GAS DEV M DPPXCF	-27.747	141.838	2013
BARYULAH GAS DEV N DPPXCF	-27.753	141.835	2015
BARYULAH GAS DEV O DPPXCF	-27.763	141.844	2015
BARYULAH GAS DEV P DPPXCF	-27.755	141.883	2015

NAME	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE	DATE
BARYULAH GAS DEV Q DPPXCF	-27.734	141.848	2015
BARYULAH GAS DEV R DPPXCF	-27.743	141.848	2015
BARYULAH GAS DEV S DPPXCF	-27.736	141.826	2015
CHALLUM WEST 1 GAS DEV RX	-27.358	141.503	2015
COONABERRY 3 ⁽²⁾	-26.853	142.119	2012
DINGERA 2 GAS DEV CXF ⁽²⁾	-27.957	141.901	2014
DURHAM DOWNS 5 ⁽²⁾	-27.130	141.789	2015
DURHAM DOWNS NORTH 3 ⁽²⁾	-27.041	141.827	2012
HERA GAS DEV C DPPXCF	-27.688	141.854	2016
HERA GAS DEV D DPPXCF	-27.684	141.865	2016
KANOOK 1 GAS DEV CXF ⁽²⁾	-27.106	141.915	2014
KARMONA 5 GAS DEV X ⁽²⁾	-27.311	141.890	2013
KARMONA EAST GAS DEV B DCXF	-27.291	141.906	2015
KARMONA EAST GAS DEV C DCXF	-27.299	141.903	2015
KARMONA GAS DEV C DCXF	-27.303	141.898	2014
KARMONA GAS DEV D DCXF	-27.298	141.886	2014
KARRI 1 RX ⁽²⁾	-27.531	142.175	2013
LEPARD GAS DEV A DPPXCF	-27.839	141.732	2014
MT HOWITT GAS DEV A DCXF	-26.619	142.496	2015
MT HOWITT GAS DEV B DCXF	-26.599	142.493	2015
OKOTOKO WEST GAS DEV A DCXF	-27.355	141.962	2015
PSYCHE 2 GAS DEV RX ⁽²⁾	-27.916	141.836	2013
PSYCHE GAS DEV E DCXF	-27.921	141.814	2015
ROTI GAS DEV A DCXF	-27.376	142.174	2012
VEGA GAS DEV B DPPXCF	-27.726	141.880	2015
VEGA GAS DEV C DPPXCF	-27.714	141.884	2015
VEGA NORTH 1 RECOMPLETION (RX) ⁽²⁾	-27.726	141.880	2013
BOLAH GAS NFE	-26.969	141.641	2014
CLINTON 1 CXF ⁽²⁾	-26.291	142.079	2012 / 2013

NAME	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE	DATE
FLAME GAS NFE	-26.336	142.052	2016
GALEX GAS DEV A DCXF ⁽²⁾	-27.456	141.847	2012
JUNO (6) GAS DEV B DPPXCF	-27.701	141.823	2014
MARAL GAS NFE	-26.412	142.104	2016
MARAMA WEST GAS NFE	-26.056	142.099	2016
MARENGO 1 CXF ⁽²⁾	-26.339	141.826	2012 / 2013
MUNKAH EAST GAS DEV A DCXF ⁽¹⁾	-27.432	141.941	- ⁽³⁾
WINDIGO GAS DEV A DCXF	-27.393	142.107	2015

Notes:

(1) Coordinates are approximate only

(2) Existing wells

(3) No data

At Golder Associates we strive to be the most respected global company providing consulting, design, and construction services in earth, environment, and related areas of energy. Employee owned since our formation in 1960, our focus, unique culture and operating environment offer opportunities and the freedom to excel, which attracts the leading specialists in our fields. Golder professionals take the time to build an understanding of client needs and of the specific environments in which they operate. We continue to expand our technical capabilities and have experienced steady growth with employees who operate from offices located throughout Africa, Asia, Australasia, Europe, North America, and South America.

Africa	+ 27 11 254 4800
Asia	+ 86 21 6258 5522
Australasia	+ 61 3 8862 3500
Europe	+ 356 21 42 30 20
North America	+ 1 800 275 3281
South America	+ 55 21 3095 9500

solutions@golder.com
www.golder.com

Golder Associates Pty Ltd
124 Pacific Highway
St. Leonards New South Wales 2065
Australia
T: +61 2 9478 3900