

## Appendix B

---

### Water Acquisition Tables

---

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

## Appendix B. Water Acquisition Tables

### B.1. Supplemental Tables

**Table B-1. Annual average hydraulic fracturing water use and consumption in 2011 and 2012 compared to total annual water use and consumption in 2010 by state.**

Hydraulic fracturing water use data from the EPA's project database of disclosures to FracFocus 1.0 ([U.S. EPA, 2015c](#)). Annual total water use data from the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Water Census ([Maupin et al., 2014](#)). Estimates of consumptions derived from hydraulic fracturing water use and total water use data. States listed in descending order by the volume of hydraulic fracturing water use.

State	Total annual water use in 2010 (millions of gal) <sup>a,b</sup>	Annual average hydraulic fracturing water use in 2011 and 2012 (millions of gal) <sup>c</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water use compared to total water use (%) <sup>d</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water consumption compared to total water consumption (%) <sup>d,e</sup>
Texas	9,052,000	19,942	0.2	0.7
Pennsylvania	2,967,450	5,105	0.2	1.4
Arkansas	4,124,500	3,676	0.1	0.1
Colorado	4,015,000	3,277	0.1	0.1
Oklahoma	1,157,050	2,949	0.3	0.8
Louisiana	3,117,100	2,462	0.1	0.4
North Dakota	419,750	2,181	0.5	2.9
West Virginia	1,288,450	657	0.1	0.5
Wyoming	1,715,500	538	<0.1	<0.1
New Mexico	1,153,400	371	<0.1	<0.1
Ohio	3,445,600	273	<0.1	0.1
Utah	1,627,900	251	<0.1	<0.1
Montana	2,792,250	155	<0.1	<0.1
Kansas	1,460,000	66	<0.1	<0.1
California	13,870,000	44	<0.1	<0.1
Michigan	3,942,000	28	<0.1	<0.1

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	Total annual water use in 2010 (millions of gal) <sup>a,b</sup>	Annual average hydraulic fracturing water use in 2011 and 2012 (millions of gal) <sup>c</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water use compared to total water use (%) <sup>d</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water consumption compared to total water consumption (%) <sup>d,e</sup>
Mississippi	1,434,450	18	<0.1	<0.1
Alaska <sup>f</sup>	397,850	7	<0.1	<0.1
Virginia	2,792,250	1	<0.1	<0.1
Alabama	3,635,400	1	<0.1	<0.1
TOTAL for all 20 states	64,407,900	42,001	0.1	0.2

<sup>a</sup> Texas, Colorado, Pennsylvania, North Dakota, Oklahoma, and Utah all made some degree of reporting to FracFocus mandatory rather than voluntary during this time period analyzed, January 1, 2011, to February 28, 2013. Three other states started requiring disclosure to either FracFocus or the state (Louisiana, Montana, and Ohio), and five states required or began requiring disclosure to the state (Arkansas, Michigan, New Mexico, West Virginia, and Wyoming). Alabama, Alaska, California, Kansas, Mississippi, and Virginia did not have reporting requirements during the period of time studied ([U.S. EPA, 2015a](#)).

<sup>b</sup> State-level data accessed from the USGS website (<http://water.usgs.gov/watuse/data/2010/>) on January 27, 2015. Total water withdrawals per day (located in downloaded Table 1) were multiplied by 365 days to estimate total water use for the year ([Maupin et al., 2014](#)).

<sup>c</sup> Average of water used for hydraulic fracturing in 2011 and 2012 as reported to FracFocus ([U.S. EPA, 2015c](#)).

<sup>d</sup> Percentages were calculated by averaging annual water use for hydraulic fracturing reported in FracFocus in 2011 and 2012 for a given state ([U.S. EPA, 2015c](#)), and then dividing by 2010 USGS hydraulic fracturing water use ([Maupin et al., 2014](#)) and multiplying by 100. Note that the annual hydraulic fracturing water use reported in FracFocus (the numerator) was not added to the 2010 total USGS water use value in the denominator, and the percentage is simply calculated as by dividing annual hydraulic fracturing use by 2010 total water use or consumption. This was done because of the difference in years between the two datasets, and because the USGS 2010 Census ([Maupin et al., 2014](#)) already included an estimate of hydraulic fracturing water use in its mining category. This approach is also consistent with that of other literature on this topic; see [Nicot and Scanlon \(2012\)](#).

<sup>e</sup> Consumption values were calculated with use-specific consumption rates predominantly from the USGS, including 19.2% for public supply, 19.2% for domestic use, 60.7% for irrigation, 60.7% for livestock, 14.8% for industrial uses, 14.8% for mining ([Solley et al., 1998](#)), and 2.7% for thermoelectric power ([USGS, 2014](#)). We used a rate of 71.6% for aquaculture ([from Verdegem and Bosma, 2009](#)) (evaporation per kg fish + infiltration per kg)/(total water use per kg) \*100. These rates were multiplied by each USGS water use value ([Maupin et al., 2014](#)) to yield a total water consumption estimate. To calculate a consumption amount for hydraulic fracturing, we used a consumption rate of 82.5%. This was calculated by taking the median value for all reported produced water/injected water percentages in Tables 7-1 and 7-2 of this assessment and then subtracting from 100%. If a range of values was given, the midpoint was used. Note that this is likely a low estimate of consumption since much of this return water is not subsequently treated and reused, but rather disposed of in underground injection wells—see Chapter 8.

<sup>f</sup> All reported hydraulic fracturing disclosures for Alaska passed state locational quality assurance methods, but not county methods ([U.S. EPA, 2015c](#)). Thus, only state-level cumulative values were reported here, and no county-level data are provided in subsequent tables.

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

**Table B-2. Annual average hydraulic fracturing water use and consumption in 2011 and 2012 compared to total annual water use and consumption in 2010 by county.**

Counties listed contained wells used for hydraulic fracturing according to the EPA's project database of disclosures to FracFocus 1.0 ([U.S. EPA, 2015c](#)). Annual total water use data from the USGS Water Census ([Maupin et al., 2014](#)). Estimates of consumption derived from hydraulic fracturing water use and total water use data.

State	County	Total annual water use in 2010 (millions of gal) <sup>a</sup>	Annual average hydraulic fracturing water use in 2011 and 2012 (millions of gal) <sup>b</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water use compared to total water use (%) <sup>c</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water consumption compared to total water consumption (%) <sup>c,d</sup>
Alabama	Jefferson	29,685.5	0.6	<0.1	<0.1
	Tuscaloosa	14,319.0	0.5	<0.1	<0.1
Arkansas	Cleburne	9,471.8	740.9	7.8	32.9
	Conway	10,643.4	798.1	7.5	21.2
	Faulkner	3,204.7	284.0	8.9	13.7
	Independence	57,195.5	80.3	0.1	0.3
	Logan	1,525.7	2.4	0.2	0.3
	Sebastian	1,365.1	0.6	<0.1	<0.1
	Van Buren	1,587.8	899.6	56.7	168.8
	White	32,131.0	869.8	2.7	4.7
	Yell	1,507.5	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
California	Colusa	304,782.3	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Glenn	221,420.0	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Kern	788,359.9	41.7	<0.1	<0.1
	Los Angeles	1,118,363.7	0.2	<0.1	<0.1
	Sutter	263,511.8	0.2	<0.1	<0.1
	Ventura	262,610.2	1.8	<0.1	<0.1
Colorado	Adams	84,285.8	3.2	<0.1	<0.1
	Arapahoe	68,255.0	4.0	<0.1	<0.1
	Boulder	84,537.7	4.1	<0.1	<0.1

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Total annual water use in 2010 (millions of gal) <sup>a</sup>	Annual average hydraulic fracturing water use in 2011 and 2012 (millions of gal) <sup>b</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water use compared to total water use (%) <sup>c</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water consumption compared to total water consumption (%) <sup>c,d</sup>
Colorado, cont.	Broomfield	2,336.0	4.5	0.2	0.4
	Delta	131,221.2	0.5	<0.1	<0.1
	Dolores	2,040.4	0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	El Paso	42,380.2	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Elbert	5,040.7	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Fremont	53,366.7	0.6	<0.1	<0.1
	Garfield	95,436.6	1,804.2	1.9	2.7
	Jackson	126,968.9	1.0	<0.1	<0.1
	La Plata	122,873.6	3.5	<0.1	<0.1
	Larimer	150,690.3	5.4	<0.1	<0.1
	Las Animas	26,911.5	7.9	<0.1	<0.1
	Mesa	275,476.5	122.1	<0.1	0.1
	Moffat	62,093.8	14.5	<0.1	<0.1
	Morgan	67,901.0	3.9	<0.1	<0.1
	Phillips	21,509.5	0.2	<0.1	<0.1
	Rio Blanco	97,513.4	147.3	0.2	0.2
	Routt	74,460.0	0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	San Miguel	13,848.1	0.3	<0.1	<0.1
	Weld	168,677.5	1,149.4	0.7	1.0
Yuma	80,595.7	0.4	<0.1	<0.1	
Kansas	Barber	2,164.5	9.9	0.5	0.7
	Clark	1,898.0	0.8	<0.1	0.1
	Comanche	3,011.3	25.6	0.9	1.2
	Finney	102,685.5	2.4	<0.1	<0.1
	Grant	47,128.8	0.2	<0.1	<0.1

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Total annual water use in 2010 (millions of gal) <sup>a</sup>	Annual average hydraulic fracturing water use in 2011 and 2012 (millions of gal) <sup>b</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water use compared to total water use (%) <sup>c</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water consumption compared to total water consumption (%) <sup>c,d</sup>
Kansas, cont.	Gray	69,379.2	3.3	<0.1	<0.1
	Harper	1,357.8	17.3	1.3	2.0
	Haskell	72,496.3	0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Hodgeman	8,460.7	2.7	<0.1	<0.1
	Kearny	64,134.2	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Lane	5,628.3	0.8	<0.1	<0.1
	Meade	55,958.2	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Morton	17,403.2	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Ness	1,478.3	1.6	0.1	0.2
	Seward	57,443.7	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Sheridan	26,393.2	0.7	<0.1	<0.1
	Stanton	41,420.2	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Stevens	72,124.0	0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Sumner	3,442.0	0.2	<0.1	<0.1
Louisiana	Allen	8,942.5	0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Beauregard	10,161.6	2.3	<0.1	0.1
	Bienville	4,810.7	108.9	2.3	10.0
	Bossier	5,599.1	110.1	2.0	4.9
	Caddo	53,644.1	153.6	0.3	1.7
	Calcasieu	81,621.3	0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Caldwell	1,398.0	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Claiborne	952.7	3.8	0.4	1.1
	De Soto	13,373.6	1,085.9	8.1	47.4
	East Feliciana	1,350.5	3.7	0.3	0.7
	Jackson	1,456.4	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Total annual water use in 2010 (millions of gal) <sup>a</sup>	Annual average hydraulic fracturing water use in 2011 and 2012 (millions of gal) <sup>b</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water use compared to total water use (%) <sup>c</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water consumption compared to total water consumption (%) <sup>c,d</sup>
Louisiana, cont.	Lincoln	3,000.3	3.3	0.1	0.3
	Natchitoches	12,530.5	12.7	0.1	0.2
	Rapides	199,976.2	1.7	<0.1	<0.1
	Red River	1,606.0	569.6	35.5	83.2
	Sabine	1,522.1	395.2	26.0	76.6
	Tangipahoa	7,329.2	1.9	<0.1	0.1
	Union	1,481.9	4.9	0.3	1.0
	Webster	2,664.5	1.2	<0.1	0.1
	West Feliciana	15,191.3	2.3	<0.1	0.1
	Winn	846.8	1.1	0.1	0.4
Michigan	Cheboygan	2,777.7	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Gladwin	850.5	1.1	0.1	0.4
	Kalkaska	1,233.7	24.0	1.9	3.7
	Missaukee	1,423.5	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Ogemaw	1,179.0	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Roscommon	1,000.1	2.4	0.2	0.9
Mississippi	Amite	792.1	14.4	1.8	3.8
	Wilkinson	1,270.2	3.2	0.3	0.4
Montana	Daniels	1,408.9	0.6	<0.1	0.1
	Garfield	1,631.6	0.5	<0.1	<0.1
	Glacier	46,760.2	5.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Musselshell	26,827.5	0.4	<0.1	<0.1
	Richland	94,797.8	83.5	0.1	0.1

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Total annual water use in 2010 (millions of gal) <sup>a</sup>	Annual average hydraulic fracturing water use in 2011 and 2012 (millions of gal) <sup>b</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water use compared to total water use (%) <sup>c</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water consumption compared to total water consumption (%) <sup>c,d</sup>
Montana, cont.	Roosevelt	31,539.7	52.1	0.2	0.2
	Rosebud	71,412.3	3.5	<0.1	<0.1
	Sheridan	7,354.8	9.7	0.1	0.2
New Mexico	Chaves	88,078.2	2.8	<0.1	<0.1
	Colfax	17,450.7	0.7	<0.1	<0.1
	Eddy	70,612.9	225.6	0.3	0.5
	Harding	1,168.0	0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Lea	64,057.5	113.7	0.2	0.3
	Rio Arriba	39,080.6	16.5	<0.1	0.1
	Roosevelt	63,367.7	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	San Juan	125,432.3	11.6	<0.1	<0.1
	Sandoval	23,922.1	0.4	<0.1	<0.1
North Dakota	Billings	762.9	44.4	5.8	16.2
	Bottineau	1,164.4	0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Burke	394.2	63.6	16.1	40.8
	Divide	806.7	102.2	12.7	18.6
	Dunn	1,076.8	309.5	28.7	43.1
	Golden Valley	208.1	4.6	2.2	3.8
	Mckenzie	13,753.2	588.4	4.3	6.2
	Mclean	7,873.1	12.2	0.2	0.4
	Mountrail	1,248.3	449.4	36.0	98.3
	Stark	1,168.0	48.0	4.1	8.5
	Williams	7,705.2	558.5	7.2	11.3

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Total annual water use in 2010 (millions of gal) <sup>a</sup>	Annual average hydraulic fracturing water use in 2011 and 2012 (millions of gal) <sup>b</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water use compared to total water use (%) <sup>c</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water consumption compared to total water consumption (%) <sup>c,d</sup>
Ohio	Ashland	2,033.1	1.5	0.1	0.2
	Belmont	65,528.5	1.9	<0.1	0.1
	Carroll	1,127.9	152.7	13.5	37.3
	Columbiana	3,763.2	30.7	0.8	2.2
	Coshocton	53,775.5	5.4	<0.1	0.1
	Guernsey	2,379.8	8.4	0.4	0.7
	Harrison	481.8	16.5	3.4	7.3
	Jefferson	632,917.3	26.2	<0.1	0.1
	Knox	3,270.4	1.1	<0.1	0.1
	Medina	3,540.5	1.3	<0.1	0.1
	Muskingum	6,018.9	5.1	0.1	0.3
	Noble	478.2	8.3	1.7	3.4
	Portage	18,414.3	3.2	<0.1	0.1
	Stark	16,479.8	2.4	<0.1	<0.1
	Tuscarawas	14,165.7	6.7	<0.1	0.2
Wayne	6,051.7	1.7	<0.1	0.1	
Oklahoma	Alfalfa	2,996.7	182.7	6.1	12.0
	Beaver	15,341.0	23.1	0.2	0.3
	Beckham	4,099.0	108.0	2.6	4.7
	Blaine	3,763.2	203.3	5.4	9.3
	Bryan	5,062.6	10.3	0.2	0.4
	Caddo	24,064.5	25.4	0.1	0.3
	Canadian	5,584.5	441.9	7.9	15.6
	Carter	159,906.5	161.9	0.1	0.5
	Coal	1,193.6	85.9	7.2	21.5

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Total annual water use in 2010 (millions of gal) <sup>a</sup>	Annual average hydraulic fracturing water use in 2011 and 2012 (millions of gal) <sup>b</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water use compared to total water use (%) <sup>c</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water consumption compared to total water consumption (%) <sup>c,d</sup>
Oklahoma, cont.	Custer	3,281.4	19.0	0.6	1.2
	Dewey	10,953.7	162.6	1.5	6.2
	Ellis	8,486.3	184.3	2.2	3.2
	Garvin	16,279.0	15.0	0.1	0.4
	Grady	13,537.9	111.5	0.8	2.3
	Grant	5,569.9	77.8	1.4	5.2
	Harper	3,266.8	8.8	0.3	0.4
	Hughes	3,394.5	30.5	0.9	2.2
	Jefferson	4,496.8	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Johnston	1,671.7	32.9	2.0	4.7
	Kay	16,957.9	17.3	0.1	0.4
	Kingfisher	3,744.9	10.2	0.3	0.5
	Kiowa	5,022.4	0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Latimer	1,062.2	0.6	0.1	0.1
	Le Flore	8,635.9	0.3	<0.1	<0.1
	Logan	4,077.1	4.2	0.1	0.3
	Love	2,011.2	4.4	0.2	0.5
	Major	6,321.8	1.2	<0.1	<0.1
	Marshall	2,613.4	98.4	3.8	7.2
	McClain	2,952.9	2.1	0.1	0.2
Noble	12,990.4	25.3	0.2	1.8	
Oklahoma	47,836.9	1.2	<0.1	<0.1	
Osage	6,971.5	3.8	0.1	0.2	
Pawnee	4,839.9	15.7	0.3	1.4	
Payne	4,332.6	9.9	0.2	0.6	

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Total annual water use in 2010 (millions of gal) <sup>a</sup>	Annual average hydraulic fracturing water use in 2011 and 2012 (millions of gal) <sup>b</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water use compared to total water use (%) <sup>c</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water consumption compared to total water consumption (%) <sup>c,d</sup>
Oklahoma, cont.	Pittsburg	6,314.5	349.0	5.5	16.0
	Roger Mills	2,847.0	235.5	8.3	12.6
	Seminole	124,837.3	0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Stephens	49,990.4	27.7	0.1	0.3
	Texas	110,208.1	0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Washita	3,310.6	102.1	3.1	5.4
	Woods	4,139.1	155.1	3.7	10.9
Pennsylvania	Allegheny	234,140.2	13.6	<0.1	<0.1
	Armstrong	65,853.3	55.7	0.1	1.8
	Beaver	157,793.2	30.5	<0.1	0.2
	Blair	8,303.8	5.9	0.1	0.2
	Bradford	4,354.5	1,059.4	24.3	78.2
	Butler	5,730.5	121.8	2.1	6.0
	Cameron	292.0	6.6	2.3	4.1
	Centre	16,560.1	38.5	0.2	0.5
	Clarion	1,843.3	8.1	0.4	1.4
	Clearfield	111,051.3	111.5	0.1	2.3
	Clinton	6,161.2	94.4	1.5	3.0
	Columbia	3,810.6	5.6	0.1	0.4
	Crawford	5,091.8	2.4	<0.1	0.1
	Elk	7,876.7	37.5	0.5	1.9
	Fayette	16,465.2	120.2	0.7	2.7
	Forest	744.6	7.7	1.0	1.6
	Greene	13,023.2	359.0	2.8	24.7
Huntingdon	5,121.0	2.7	0.1	0.2	

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Total annual water use in 2010 (millions of gal) <sup>a</sup>	Annual average hydraulic fracturing water use in 2011 and 2012 (millions of gal) <sup>b</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water use compared to total water use (%) <sup>c</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water consumption compared to total water consumption (%) <sup>c,d</sup>
Pennsylvania, cont.	Indiana	21,819.7	16.2	0.1	0.7
	Jefferson	1,730.1	13.8	0.8	1.7
	Lawrence	36,598.6	27.0	0.1	1.0
	Lycoming	5,854.6	704.6	12.0	33.8
	McKean	4,723.1	60.5	1.3	4.9
	Potter	2,281.3	16.5	0.7	1.0
	Somerset	10,833.2	5.8	0.1	0.2
	Sullivan	222.7	66.5	29.9	79.8
	Susquehanna	1,617.0	751.3	46.5	123.4
	Tioga	2,909.1	566.3	19.5	47.3
	Venango	2,989.4	2.4	0.1	0.3
	Warren	5,099.1	2.3	<0.1	0.2
	Washington	130,535.0	433.7	0.3	4.6
	Westmoreland	14,607.3	207.0	1.4	3.8
Wyoming	4,788.8	150.0	3.1	15.2	
Texas	Andrews	23,363.7	236.2	1.0	2.7
	Angelina	5,540.7	0.8	<0.1	<0.1
	Archer	2,536.8	0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Atascosa	15,038.0	327.3	2.2	4.0
	Austin	2,555.0	2.1	0.1	0.1
	Bee	3,087.9	20.0	0.6	1.1
	Borden	2,427.3	8.0	0.3	1.0
	Bosque	3,544.2	0.7	<0.1	<0.1
	Brazos	24,790.8	7.7	<0.1	0.1
	Brooks	1,204.5	1.5	0.1	0.3

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Total annual water use in 2010 (millions of gal) <sup>a</sup>	Annual average hydraulic fracturing water use in 2011 and 2012 (millions of gal) <sup>b</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water use compared to total water use (%) <sup>c</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water consumption compared to total water consumption (%) <sup>c,d</sup>
Texas, cont.	Burleson	10,694.5	3.0	<0.1	<0.1
	Cherokee	24,845.6	0.5	<0.1	<0.1
	Clay	1,963.7	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Cochran	24,035.3	3.0	<0.1	<0.1
	Coke	12,713.0	0.3	<0.1	<0.1
	Colorado	52,465.1	0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Concho	2,832.4	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Cooke	4,533.3	454.3	10.0	29.9
	Cottle	733.7	0.3	<0.1	0.1
	Crane	8,566.6	92.3	1.1	5.7
	Crockett	4,281.5	279.0	6.5	29.5
	Crosby	27,261.9	1.3	<0.1	<0.1
	Culberson	14,311.7	37.7	0.3	0.4
	Dallas	112,204.7	5.6	<0.1	<0.1
	Dawson	28,842.3	17.5	0.1	0.1
	DeWitt	2,394.4	546.6	22.8	48.6
	Denton	60,684.9	455.0	0.7	2.3
	Dimmit	4,073.4	1,794.2	44.0	81.3
	Ector	21,958.4	226.5	1.0	4.6
	Edwards	332.2	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Ellis	8,530.1	4.2	<0.1	0.1
	Erath	5,876.5	0.8	<0.1	<0.1
	Fayette	9,008.2	13.7	0.2	1.2
Fisher	2,854.3	1.8	0.1	0.1	
Franklin	1,956.4	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Total annual water use in 2010 (millions of gal) <sup>a</sup>	Annual average hydraulic fracturing water use in 2011 and 2012 (millions of gal) <sup>b</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water use compared to total water use (%) <sup>c</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water consumption compared to total water consumption (%) <sup>c,d</sup>
Texas, cont.	Freestone	297,861.9	53.9	<0.1	0.5
	Frio	20,589.7	127.5	0.6	0.9
	Gaines	121,778.6	21.6	<0.1	<0.1
	Garza	5,234.1	0.6	<0.1	<0.1
	Glasscock	20,680.9	598.1	2.9	4.2
	Goliad	142,963.2	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Gonzales	7,121.2	577.9	8.1	17.6
	Grayson	8,143.2	9.3	0.1	0.3
	Gregg	33,010.6	9.4	<0.1	0.2
	Grimes	112,500.3	15.5	<0.1	0.3
	Hansford	43,643.1	2.9	<0.1	<0.1
	Hardeman	2,230.2	0.4	<0.1	<0.1
	Hardin	2,376.2	0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Harrison	11,869.8	141.6	1.2	6.0
	Hartley	113,555.2	1.9	<0.1	<0.1
	Haskell	12,143.6	0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Hemphill	3,150.0	263.9	8.4	16.3
	Hidalgo	171,630.3	8.0	<0.1	<0.1
	Hockley	46,314.9	3.0	<0.1	<0.1
	Hood	9,351.3	76.0	0.8	2.2
	Houston	3,686.5	8.6	0.2	0.6
	Howard	10,811.3	97.6	0.9	2.7
	Hutchinson	34,437.8	0.3	<0.1	<0.1
Irion	1,335.9	411.4	30.8	74.5	
Jack	2,241.1	14.0	0.6	2.2	

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Total annual water use in 2010 (millions of gal) <sup>a</sup>	Annual average hydraulic fracturing water use in 2011 and 2012 (millions of gal) <sup>b</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water use compared to total water use (%) <sup>c</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water consumption compared to total water consumption (%) <sup>c,d</sup>
Texas, cont.	Jefferson	88,585.5	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Jim Hogg	306.6	0.1	<0.1	0.1
	Johnson	9,241.8	582.0	6.3	18.5
	Jones	5,679.4	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Karnes	1,861.5	1,055.2	56.7	120.1
	Kenedy	456.3	0.2	0.1	0.1
	Kent	6,132.0	0.4	<0.1	<0.1
	King	1,485.6	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Kleberg	1,171.7	3.4	0.3	0.5
	Knox	9,800.3	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	La Salle	2,474.7	1,288.7	52.1	93.7
	Lavaca	3,763.2	45.0	1.2	2.0
	Lee	3,120.8	1.2	<0.1	0.1
	Leon	2,171.8	56.2	2.6	6.6
	Liberty	20,662.7	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Limestone	11,158.1	10.7	0.1	0.9
	Lipscomb	11,015.7	89.0	0.8	1.1
	Live Oak	1,916.3	294.0	15.3	40.1
	Loving	781.1	138.4	17.7	94.1
	Lynn	19,892.5	1.1	<0.1	<0.1
Madison	1,554.9	45.3	2.9	8.2	
Marion	3,606.2	5.9	0.2	0.9	
Martin	14,063.5	432.0	3.1	4.7	
Maverick	20,498.4	52.4	0.3	0.4	
McMullen	657.0	745.9	113.5	350.4	

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Total annual water use in 2010 (millions of gal) <sup>a</sup>	Annual average hydraulic fracturing water use in 2011 and 2012 (millions of gal) <sup>b</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water use compared to total water use (%) <sup>c</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water consumption compared to total water consumption (%) <sup>c,d</sup>
Texas, cont.	Medina	19,228.2	0.2	<0.1	<0.1
	Menard	1,014.7	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Midland	12,891.8	307.4	2.4	3.7
	Milam	16,665.9	4.9	<0.1	0.1
	Mitchell	6,559.1	11.0	0.2	0.3
	Montague	3,989.5	925.3	23.2	77.8
	Montgomery	32,565.3	0.2	<0.1	<0.1
	Moore	57,075.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Nacogdoches	5,891.1	271.7	4.6	12.5
	Navarro	18,699.0	4.8	<0.1	0.1
	Newton	2,263.0	0.2	<0.1	<0.1
	Nolan	4,124.5	4.5	0.1	0.2
	Nueces	85,767.7	1.0	<0.1	<0.1
	Ochiltree	21,348.9	33.3	0.2	0.2
	Oldham	2,124.3	1.3	0.1	0.1
	Orange	150,128.2	0.3	<0.1	<0.1
	Palo Pinto	18,403.3	9.6	0.1	0.3
	Panola	6,365.6	346.5	5.4	20.7
	Parker	8,241.7	261.7	3.2	9.8
	Pecos	52,954.2	8.2	<0.1	<0.1
Polk	204,009.5	0.2	<0.1	<0.1	
Potter	2,029.4	0.4	<0.1	<0.1	
Reagan	9,333.1	410.5	4.4	7.8	
Reeves	20,772.2	164.2	0.8	1.1	
Roberts	7,690.6	38.2	0.5	1.2	

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Total annual water use in 2010 (millions of gal) <sup>a</sup>	Annual average hydraulic fracturing water use in 2011 and 2012 (millions of gal) <sup>b</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water use compared to total water use (%) <sup>c</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water consumption compared to total water consumption (%) <sup>c,d</sup>
Texas, cont.	Robertson	158,344.3	45.4	<0.1	0.2
	Runnels	2,847.0	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Rusk	582,134.9	65.8	<0.1	0.3
	Sabine	799.4	31.1	3.9	13.9
	San Augustine	1,131.5	182.1	16.1	50.8
	San Patricio	4,172.0	1.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Schleicher	967.3	27.0	2.8	5.0
	Scurry	14,187.6	1.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Shelby	4,920.2	133.6	2.7	8.2
	Sherman	78,073.5	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Smith	11,231.1	0.2	<0.1	<0.1
	Somervell	746,005.3	4.8	<0.1	<0.1
	Starr	9,552.1	5.0	0.1	0.1
	Stephens	13,446.6	2.6	<0.1	0.1
	Sterling	719.1	36.6	5.1	11.9
	Stonewall	923.5	0.9	0.1	0.3
	Sutton	1,153.4	1.6	0.1	0.3
	Tarrant	104,430.2	1,443.0	1.4	3.9
	Terrell	543.9	0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Terry	48,362.5	7.5	<0.1	<0.1
Tyler	1,872.5	0.1	<0.1	<0.1	
Upshur	8,610.4	0.2	<0.1	<0.1	
Upton	7,975.3	462.6	5.8	14.2	
Van Zandt	4,139.1	0.1	<0.1	<0.1	
Walker	4,478.6	3.4	0.1	0.2	

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Total annual water use in 2010 (millions of gal) <sup>a</sup>	Annual average hydraulic fracturing water use in 2011 and 2012 (millions of gal) <sup>b</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water use compared to total water use (%) <sup>c</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water consumption compared to total water consumption (%) <sup>c,d</sup>
Texas, cont.	Waller	9,829.5	0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Ward	6,909.5	107.3	1.6	4.6
	Washington	2,430.9	2.2	0.1	0.2
	Webb	15,862.9	1,117.8	7.0	18.2
	Wharton	81,606.7	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Wheeler	6,522.6	858.0	13.2	21.5
	Wichita	25,936.9	0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Wilbarger	12,683.8	0.2	<0.1	<0.1
	Willacy	15,209.6	0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Wilson	7,843.9	84.5	1.1	1.7
	Winkler	5,274.3	7.7	0.1	0.5
	Wise	24,966.0	529.7	2.1	8.9
	Wood	19,334.1	0.2	<0.1	<0.1
	Yoakum	77,325.3	7.5	<0.1	<0.1
	Young	21,162.7	0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Zapata	2,697.4	1.1	<0.1	0.1	
Zavala	14,410.2	130.0	0.9	1.3	
Utah	Carbon	15,067.2	7.3	<0.1	0.1
	Duchesne	119,811.3	85.5	0.1	0.1
	San Juan	10,632.5	0.3	<0.1	<0.1
	Sevier	52,512.6	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Uintah	100,229.0	157.5	0.2	0.2
Virginia	Buchanan	313.9	0.6	0.2	0.3
	Dickenson	1,741.1	0.8	<0.1	0.2
	Wise	1,927.2	0.1	<0.1	<0.1

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Total annual water use in 2010 (millions of gal) <sup>a</sup>	Annual average hydraulic fracturing water use in 2011 and 2012 (millions of gal) <sup>b</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water use compared to total water use (%) <sup>c</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water consumption compared to total water consumption (%) <sup>c,d</sup>
West Virginia	Barbour	773.8	19.9	2.6	6.9
	Brooke	4,551.6	54.8	1.2	5.1
	Doddridge	405.2	78.5	19.4	69.4
	Hancock	28,718.2	1.2	<0.1	<0.1
	Harrison	20,232.0	40.2	0.2	1.9
	Lewis	901.6	2.4	0.3	0.8
	Marion	5,982.4	70.1	1.2	4.9
	Marshall	158,358.9	84.5	0.1	0.7
	Monongalia	42,102.8	6.8	<0.1	0.1
	Ohio	3,825.2	116.5	3.0	10.4
	Pleasants	24,703.2	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Preston	2,890.8	8.4	0.3	1.4
	Ritchie	587.7	2.8	0.5	1.7
	Taylor	824.9	52.9	6.4	17.6
	Tyler	4,934.8	2.1	<0.1	0.2
	Upshur	1,814.1	34.9	1.9	6.8
Webster	1,292.1	2.3	0.2	0.3	
Wetzel	1,467.3	78.2	5.3	11.9	
Wyoming	Big Horn	143,368.4	2.9	<0.1	<0.1
	Campbell	44,318.3	11.7	<0.1	0.1
	Carbon	137,130.5	4.5	<0.1	<0.1
	Converse	56,972.9	106.8	0.2	0.3
	Fremont	186,150.0	28.2	<0.1	<0.1
	Goshen	144,248.0	5.8	<0.1	<0.1
	Hot Springs	28,572.2	0.3	<0.1	<0.1

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Total annual water use in 2010 (millions of gal) <sup>a</sup>	Annual average hydraulic fracturing water use in 2011 and 2012 (millions of gal) <sup>b</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water use compared to total water use (%) <sup>c</sup>	Hydraulic fracturing water consumption compared to total water consumption (%) <sup>c,d</sup>
Wyoming, cont.	Johnson	43,205.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Laramie	86,297.0	18.3	<0.1	<0.1
	Lincoln	74,562.2	0.8	<0.1	<0.1
	Natrona	62,885.9	1.8	<0.1	<0.1
	Niobrara	25,148.5	0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Park	111,317.7	0.9	<0.1	<0.1
	Sublette	61,006.1	314.8	0.5	0.7
	Sweetwater	61,699.6	39.4	0.1	0.1
	Uinta	79,518.9	0.6	<0.1	<0.1
	Washakie	60,400.2	1.1	<0.1	<0.1

<sup>a</sup> County-level data accessed from the USGS website (<http://water.usgs.gov/watuse/data/2010/>) on November 11, 2014. Total daily water withdrawals were multiplied by 365 days to estimate total water use for the year ([Maupin et al., 2014](#)).

<sup>b</sup> Average of water used for hydraulic fracturing in 2011 and 2012, as reported to FracFocus ([U.S. EPA, 2015c](#)).

<sup>c</sup> Percentages were calculated by averaging annual water use for hydraulic fracturing reported in FracFocus in 2011 and 2012 for a given county ([U.S. EPA, 2015c](#)), and then dividing by 2010 USGS total water use for that county ([Maupin et al., 2014](#)) and multiplying by 100.

<sup>d</sup> Consumption values were calculated with use-specific consumption rates predominantly from the USGS, including 19.2% for public supply, 19.2% for domestic use, 60.7% for irrigation, 60.7% for livestock, 14.8% for industrial uses, 14.8% for mining ([Solley et al., 1998](#)), and 2.7% for thermoelectric power ([USGS, 2014](#)). We used a rate of 71.6% for aquaculture ([from Verdegem and Bosma, 2009](#)) (evaporation per kg fish + infiltration per kg)/(total water use per kg)\*100. These rates were multiplied by each USGS water use value ([Maupin et al., 2014](#)) to yield a total water consumption estimate. To calculate a consumption amount for hydraulic fracturing, we used a consumption rate of 82.5%. This was calculated by taking the median value for all reported produced water/injected water percentages in Tables 7-1 and 7-2 of this assessment and then subtracting from 100%. If a range of values was given, the midpoint was used. Note that this is likely a low estimate of consumption since much of this return water is not subsequently treated and reused, but rather disposed of in underground injection wells—see Chapter 8.

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

**Table B-3. Comparison of water use per well estimates from the EPA’s project database of disclosures to FracFocus 1.0 (U.S. EPA, 2015c) and literature sources.**Source: ([U.S. EPA, 2015c](#))

State	Basin <sup>a</sup>	Water use per well (gal) - FracFocus estimate <sup>b</sup>	Water use per well (gal) - Literature estimate <sup>b,c</sup>	FracFocus estimate as a percentage of literature estimate (%)
Colorado	Denver	403,686	2,900,000	14
North Dakota		2,140,842	2,200,000	97
Oklahoma		2,591,778	3,000,000	86
Pennsylvania <sup>d</sup>		4,301,701	4,450,000	97
Texas	Fort Worth	3,881,220	4,500,000	86
Texas	Salt	3,139,980	4,000,000	78
Texas	Western Gulf	3,777,648	4,600,000	82
Average <sup>e</sup>				77
Median <sup>e</sup>				86

<sup>a</sup> In cases where a basin is not specified, estimates were for the entire state and not specific to a particular basin. Basin boundaries for the FracFocus estimates were determined from data from the U.S. EIA ([see U.S. EPA, 2015b](#)).

<sup>b</sup> The type of literature estimate determined the specific comparison with FracFocus. If averages were given in the literature (as for North Dakota and Pennsylvania), those values were compared with FracFocus averages; where medians were given in the literature (as for Colorado, Oklahoma, and Texas), they were compared with FracFocus medians.

<sup>c</sup> Literature estimates were from the following sources: Colorado ([Goodwin et al., 2014](#)), North Dakota ([North Dakota State Water Commission, 2014](#)), Pennsylvania ([Mitchell et al., 2013](#)), and Texas ([Nicot et al., 2012](#))—see far right-column and footnotes in Table B-5 for details on literature estimates. Where the literature provided a range, the mid-point was used. Only literature estimates that were not directly derived from FracFocus were included.

<sup>d</sup> The results from [Mitchell et al. \(2013\)](#) were used for Pennsylvania since they were derived from Pennsylvania Department of Environment Protection records. Estimates from [Hansen et al. \(2013\)](#) were not included here because they were based on FracFocus.

<sup>e</sup> Average and median percentage calculations were not weighted by the number of wells for a given estimate.

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

**Table B-4. Comparison of well counts from the EPA’s project database of disclosures to FracFocus 1.0 (U.S. EPA, 2015c) and state databases for North Dakota, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia.**

State	FracFocus well counts <sup>a</sup>			State database well counts			FracFocus counts as a percentage of state database counts		
	2011	2012	Total	2011	2012	Total	2011	2012	Total
North Dakota <sup>b</sup>	613	1,458	2,071	1,225	1,740	2,965	50%	84%	70%
Pennsylvania <sup>c</sup>	1,137	1,257	2,394	1,963	1,347	3,310	58%	93%	72%
West Virginia <sup>d</sup>	93	176	269	214	251	465	43%	70%	58%
Average							50%	82%	67%

<sup>a</sup> FracFocus disclosures from [U.S. EPA \(2015c\)](#).

<sup>b</sup> For North Dakota state well counts, we used a North Dakota Department of Mineral Resources online database containing a list of horizontal wells completed in the Bakken Formation. Data for North Dakota were accessed on July 9, 2014 at <https://www.dmr.nd.gov/oilgas/bakkenwells.asp>.

<sup>c</sup> For Pennsylvania state well counts, we used completed horizontal wells as a proxy for hydraulically fractured wells in the state. The Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection has online databases of permitted and spudded wells, which differentiate between conventional and unconventional wells and can generate summary statistics at both the county and state scale. The number of spudded wells (i.e., wells drilled) provided a better comparison with the number of hydraulically fractured wells in FracFocus than that of permitted wells. The number of permitted wells was nearly double that of spudded in 2011 and 2012, indicating that almost half of the wells permitted were not drilled in that same year. Therefore, we used spudded wells here. Data for Pennsylvania were accessed on February 11, 2014 from [http://www.depreportingservices.state.pa.us/ReportServer/Pages/ReportViewer.aspx?/Oil\\_Gas/Spud\\_External\\_Data](http://www.depreportingservices.state.pa.us/ReportServer/Pages/ReportViewer.aspx?/Oil_Gas/Spud_External_Data).

<sup>d</sup> For West Virginia state well counts, data on the number of hydraulically fractured wells per year were received from the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection on February 25, 2014.

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

**Table B-5. Water use per hydraulically fractured well as reported in the EPA’s project database of disclosures to FracFocus 1.0 (U.S. EPA, 2015c) by state and basin.**

Source: ([U.S. EPA, 2015c](#))

Other literature estimates are also included where available. NA indicates other literature estimates were not available. All FracFocus estimates were limited to disclosures with valid state, county, and volume information. States listed in order addressed in Chapter 4.

State	Basin/total <sup>a</sup>	Number of disclosures	Mean (gal)	Median (gal)	10 <sup>th</sup> percentile (gal)	90 <sup>th</sup> percentile (gal)	Literature estimates
Texas	Permian	8,419	1,068,511	841,134	40,090	1,814,633	Many formations reported <sup>b</sup>
	Western Gulf	4,549	3,915,540	3,777,648	173,832	6,786,052	4.5–4.7 million gal (median, Eagle Ford play) <sup>b</sup>
	Fort Worth	2,564	3,880,724	3,881,220	923,381	6,649,406	4.5 million gal (median, Barnett play) <sup>b</sup>
	TX-LA-MS Salt	626	4,261,363	3,139,980	193,768	10,010,707	6–7.5 million gal (median, Texas-Haynesville play) and 0.5-1 million gallons (median, Cotton Valley play) <sup>b</sup>
	Anadarko	604	4,128,702	3,341,310	492,421	8,292,996	Many formations reported <sup>b</sup>
	Other	120	1,601,897	184,239	21,470	5,678,588	NA
	Total	16,882	2,494,452	1,420,613	58,709	6,115,195	Not reported by state <sup>b</sup>
Colorado	Denver	3,166	753,887	403,686	143,715	2,588,946	2.9 million gal (median, Wattenberg field of Niobrara play) <sup>c</sup>
	Uinta-Piceance	1,520	2,739,523	1,798,414	840,778	5,066,380	NA
	Raton	146	108,003	95,974	24,917	211,526	NA
	Other	66	605,740	183,408	34,412	601,816	NA
	Total	4,898	1,348,842	463,462	147,353	3,092,024	NA

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	Basin/total <sup>a</sup>	Number of disclosures	Mean (gal)	Median (gal)	10 <sup>th</sup> percentile (gal)	90 <sup>th</sup> percentile (gal)	Literature estimates
Wyoming	Greater Green River	861	841,702	752,979	147,020	1,493,266	NA
	Powder River	351	739,129	5,927	5,353	2,863,182	NA
	Other	193	613,618	41,664	22,105	1,818,606	NA
	Total	1,405	784,746	322,793	5,727	1,837,602	NA
Pennsylvania	Appalachian	2,445	4,301,701	4,184,936	2,313,649	6,615,981	4.2-4.6 million gal (average, Marcellus play, Susquehanna River Basin) <sup>d</sup>
	Total	2,445	4,301,701	4,184,936	2,313,649	6,615,981	4.1-4.5 <sup>d</sup> and 4.3-4.6 <sup>e</sup> million gal (average)
West Virginia	Appalachian	273	5,034,217	5,012,238	3,170,210	7,297,080	NA
	Total	273	5,034,217	5,012,238	3,170,210	7,297,080	4.7-6 million gal (average) <sup>d</sup>
Ohio	Appalachian	146	4,206,955	3,887,499	2,885,568	5,571,027	NA
	Total	146	4,206,955	3,887,499	2,885,568	5,571,027	NA
North Dakota	Williston	2,109	2,140,842	2,022,380	969,380	3,313,482	NA
	Total	2,109	2,140,842	2,022,380	969,380	3,313,482	2.2 million gal (average) <sup>f</sup>
Montana	Williston	187	1,640,085	1,552,596	375,864	3,037,398	NA
	Other	20	945,541	1,017,701	157,639	1,575,197	NA
	Total	207	1,572,979	1,455,757	367,326	2,997,552	NA
Oklahoma	Anadarko	935	3,742,703	3,259,774	1,211,700	6,972,652	Many formations reported <sup>g</sup>
	Arkoma	158	6,323,750	6,655,929	172,375	9,589,554	Many formations reported <sup>g</sup>
	Ardmore	98	6,637,332	8,021,559	81,894	8,835,842	Many formations reported <sup>g</sup>
	Other	592	1,963,480	1,866,144	1,319,247	2,785,352	NA
	Total	1,783	3,539,775	2,591,778	1,260,906	7,402,230	3 million gal (median) <sup>g</sup>

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	Basin/total <sup>a</sup>	Number of disclosures	Mean (gal)	Median (gal)	10 <sup>th</sup> percentile (gal)	90 <sup>th</sup> percentile (gal)	Literature estimates
Kansas	Total	121	1,135,973	1,453,788	10,836	2,227,926	NA
Arkansas	Arkoma	1,423	5,190,254	5,259,965	3,234,963	7,121,249	NA
	Total	1,423	5,190,254	5,259,965	3,234,963	7,121,249	NA
Louisiana	TX-LA-MS Salt	939	5,289,100	5,116,650	2,851,654	7,984,838	NA
	Other	27	896,899	232,464	87,003	3,562,400	NA
	Total	966	5,166,337	5,077,863	1,812,099	7,945,630	NA
Utah	Uinta-Piceance	1,396	375,852	304,105	77,166	770,699	NA
	Other	10	58,874	56,245	28,745	97,871	NA
	Total	1,406	373,597	302,075	76,286	769,360	NA
New Mexico	Permian	732	991,369	426,258	89,895	2,502,923	NA
	San Juan	363	159,680	97,734	27,217	313,919	NA
	Other	50	33,787	8,358	1,100	98,841	NA
	Total	1,145	685,882	175,241	35,638	1,871,666	NA

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	Basin/total <sup>a</sup>	Number of disclosures	Mean (gal)	Median (gal)	10 <sup>th</sup> percentile (gal)	90 <sup>th</sup> percentile (gal)	Literature estimates
California	San Joaquin	677	131,653	77,238	22,100	285,029	NA
	Other	34	132,391	36,099	13,768	361,192	NA
	Total	711	131,689	76,818	21,462	285,306	130,000 gallon (average) <sup>h</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Basin boundaries for the FracFocus estimates were determined from data from the U.S. EIA ([see U.S. EPA, 2015b](#)).

<sup>b</sup> Literature estimates for Texas were from [Nicot et al. \(2012\)](#), using proprietary data from IHS. In most cases, Nicot et al. reported at the play scale or smaller, rather than the EIA basin scale used for FracFocus. We reference 2011 and 2012 (partial year) for Nicot et al. where possible to overlap with the period of study for FracFocus, though more years were available for most formations. A range is reported for some medians because median water use was different for the two years. There were five formations reported for the Permian Basin (Wolfberry, Wolfcamp, Canyon, Clearfork, and San Andres-Greyburg). The most active area in the Permian Basin in 2011–2012 was the Wolfberry, which reported a median of 1 to 1.1 million gallons per well—these were mostly vertical wells. For the TX-LA-MS Salt Basin, Nicot et al. reported two formations (TX-Haynesville and Cotton Valley), with similar levels of activity in 2011-2012. Wells in TX-Haynesville were predominantly horizontal, while those in Cotton Valley were predominantly vertical (though horizontal wells in Cotton Valley were also reported). There were three fields reported in the Anadarko Basin (Granite Wash, Cleveland, and Marmaton). The most active area in the Anadarko Basin in 2011-2012 was the Granite Wash, which reported a median of 3.3 to 5.2 million gallons per well and where wells were mostly horizontal.

<sup>c</sup> Literature estimates for the Denver Basin were from [Goodwin et al. \(2014\)](#). Goodwin et al. assessed 200 randomly sampled wells in the Wattenberg Field of the Denver Basin (Niobrara Play), using industry data for wells operated by Noble Energy, drilled between January 1, 2010, and July 1, 2013. Water consumption is reported rather than water use, but Goodwin et al. assume, based on Noble Energy practices, that water use and water consumption were identical because none of the flowback or produced water is reused for hydraulic fracturing. Goodwin et al. reported drilling water consumed, hydraulic fracturing water consumed, and total water consumed. We present hydraulic fracturing water consumption here (hydraulic fracturing water consumption was approximately 95% of the total).

<sup>d</sup> [Hansen et al. \(2013\)](#), using data from FracFocus via Skytruth. For the Susquehanna River Basin portion of the Marcellus play, and for Pennsylvania as a whole, the range of annual averages is reported for 2011 and 2012. Similarly, for West Virginia, the range of annual averages is reported for 2011 and 2012 (partial year).

<sup>e</sup> [Mitchell et al. \(2013\)](#), using data reported to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection. Mitchell et al. reported water use in the Ohio River Basin for 2011 and 2012 (partial year) for horizontal and vertical wells. Here we report results for horizontal wells, which made up the majority of wells over the two-year period (i.e., 93%, 1,191 horizontal wells versus 96 vertical wells). A range is reported as before because the average water use differed between the two years.

<sup>f</sup> Literature estimates for North Dakota were from an informational bulletin from the [North Dakota State Water Commission \(2014\)](#). No further information was available.

<sup>g</sup> [Murray \(2013\)](#), who assessed water use for oil and gas operations from 2000–2010 for eight formations in Oklahoma using data from the Oklahoma Corporation Commission. It is not possible to extract an estimate corresponding to 2011–2012 from Murray without the raw data, because medians were presented for the 10-year period rather than separated by year.

<sup>h</sup> Literature estimates for California were from a California Council on Science and Technology report using data from FracFocus ([CCST, 2014](#)).

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

**Table B-6. Estimated percent domestic use water from ground water and self-supplied by county.**

Counties listed contained hydraulically fractured wells with valid state, county, and volume information (U.S. EPA, 2015c).

Data estimated from the USGS Water Census (Maupin et al., 2014).

State	County	Percent domestic use water from ground water <sup>a,b</sup>	Percent domestic use water self supplied <sup>a,c</sup>
Alabama	Jefferson	11.9	0.8
	Tuscaloosa	10.7	6.1
Arkansas	Cleburne	0.0	0.0
	Conway	8.6	8.6
	Faulkner	48.0	3.5
	Independence	20.5	9.4
	Logan	0.0	0.0
	Sebastian	0.0	0.0
	Van Buren	6.4	6.4
	White	0.4	0.0
	Yell	1.8	1.8
California	Colusa	97.9	10.3
	Glenn	96.5	21.6
	Kern	74.5	1.7
	Los Angeles	45.0	4.2
	Sutter	19.4	4.6
	Ventura	30.9	3.9
Colorado	Adams	18.1	2.8
	Arapahoe	19.3	1.3
	Boulder	1.7	1.5
	Broomfield	0.0	0.0
	Delta	59.6	28.4
	Dolores	55.2	51.4
	El Paso	19.6	5.1
	Elbert	100.0	75.2
	Fremont	15.6	15.6

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Percent domestic use water from ground water <sup>a,b</sup>	Percent domestic use water self supplied <sup>a,c</sup>
Colorado, cont.	Garfield	36.7	28.5
	Jackson	84.4	40.7
	La Plata	24.4	11.3
	Larimer	2.3	0.8
	Las Animas	26.3	16.0
	Mesa	7.3	6.2
	Moffat	36.4	25.8
	Morgan	57.9	4.9
	Phillips	100.0	25.3
	Rio Blanco	60.2	32.5
	Routt	22.6	5.9
	San Miguel	71.4	32.5
	Weld	4.7	0.7
	Yuma	100.0	38.1
Kansas	Barber	100.0	19.0
	Clark	100.0	24.2
	Comanche	100.0	19.2
	Finney	100.0	2.1
	Grant	100.0	23.8
	Gray	100.0	36.4
	Harper	100.0	10.3
	Haskell	100.0	35.2
	Hodgeman	100.0	42.3
	Kearny	100.0	14.6
	Lane	100.0	24.1
	Meade	100.0	25.4
	Morton	100.0	21.7
	Ness	100.0	24.2
Seward	100.0	15.7	

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Percent domestic use water from ground water <sup>a,b</sup>	Percent domestic use water self supplied <sup>a,c</sup>
Kansas, cont.	Sheridan	100.0	44.9
	Stanton	100.0	29.8
	Stevens	100.0	25.9
	Sumner	51.3	0.0
Louisiana	Allen	100.0	7.5
	Beauregard	100.0	20.6
	Bienville	100.0	16.8
	Bossier	29.4	14.6
	Caddo	12.2	8.8
	Calcasieu	98.3	12.7
	Caldwell	100.0	6.5
	Claiborne	100.0	10.4
	De Soto	55.8	21.8
	East Feliciana	100.0	11.8
	Jackson	100.0	13.8
	Lincoln	100.0	4.2
	Natchitoches	23.2	11.4
	Rapides	100.0	3.3
	Red River	83.2	27.6
	Sabine	67.5	36.2
	Tangipahoa	100.0	26.9
	Union	100.0	11.2
	Webster	100.0	11.3
	West Feliciana	100.0	2.4
Winn	100.0	16.4	
Michigan	Cheboygan	100.0	76.4
	Gladwin	100.0	84.5
	Kalkaska	100.0	89.0
	Missaukee	100.0	90.6
	Ogemaw	100.0	90.8
	Roscommon	100.0	91.9

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Percent domestic use water from ground water <sup>a,b</sup>	Percent domestic use water self supplied <sup>a,c</sup>
Mississippi	Amite	100.0	26.0
	Wilkinson	100.0	11.1
Montana	Daniels	100.0	29.4
	Garfield	100.0	70.0
	Glacier	62.1	17.7
	Musselshell	89.9	54.5
	Richland	100.0	30.8
	Roosevelt	84.2	20.9
	Rosebud	51.3	10.3
	Sheridan	100.0	31.0
New Mexico	Chaves	100.0	11.8
	Colfax	30.7	2.6
	Eddy	100.0	2.2
	Harding	100.0	25.0
	Lea	100.0	17.4
	Rio Arriba	84.0	42.3
	Roosevelt	100.0	8.9
	San Juan	14.6	12.9
	Sandoval	98.9	23.2
North Dakota	Billings	NA	33.3
	Bottineau	100.0	13.7
	Burke	100.0	12.5
	Divide	100.0	12.5
	Dunn	100.0	21.4
	Golden Valley	100.0	7.7
	Mckenzie	75.8	15.7
	Mclean	12.5	9.9
	Mountrail	65.7	11.5
	Stark	NA	5.7
	Williams	27.4	7.3

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Percent domestic use water from ground water <sup>a,b</sup>	Percent domestic use water self supplied <sup>a,c</sup>
Ohio	Ashland	98.8	57.4
	Belmont	76.4	8.9
	Carroll	96.4	76.4
	Columbiana	63.2	43.2
	Coshocton	99.3	34.9
	Guernsey	37.6	9.5
	Harrison	65.6	45.9
	Jefferson	33.1	10.2
	Knox	99.2	41.1
	Medina	98.4	83.1
	Muskingum	93.4	17.0
	Noble	8.0	8.0
	Portage	32.6	18.3
	Stark	91.2	30.9
	Tuscarawas	94.0	23.5
Wayne	99.1	49.0	
Oklahoma	Alfalfa	100.0	14.6
	Beaver	100.0	47.9
	Beckham	100.0	10.6
	Blaine	100.0	8.8
	Bryan	26.0	7.8
	Caddo	45.4	35.1
	Canadian	100.0	0.0
	Carter	17.5	0.5
	Coal	31.5	27.5
	Custer	70.8	13.2
	Dewey	100.0	22.5
	Ellis	100.0	31.4
	Garvin	41.3	15.8
	Grady	100.0	34.2
	Grant	100.0	13.2
Harper	100.0	22.6	

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Percent domestic use water from ground water <sup>a,b</sup>	Percent domestic use water self supplied <sup>a,c</sup>
Oklahoma, cont.	Hughes	23.6	6.7
	Jefferson	13.5	1.8
	Johnston	53.4	1.1
	Kay	39.2	4.6
	Kingfisher	100.0	28.3
	Kiowa	10.3	0.0
	Latimer	12.6	12.6
	Le Flore	14.3	13.1
	Logan	61.1	34.6
	Love	100.0	3.8
	Major	100.0	28.1
	Marshall	20.1	4.4
	McClain	95.9	23.9
	Noble	23.3	14.3
	Oklahoma	22.0	2.5
	Osage	18.0	14.9
	Pawnee	38.2	27.7
	Payne	47.9	12.6
	Pittsburg	0.6	0.0
	Roger Mills	80.1	19.4
Seminole	78.8	16.1	
Stephens	99.2	14.9	
Texas	100.0	10.9	
Washita	53.9	18.2	
Woods	100.0	14.7	
Pennsylvania	Allegheny	15.7	15.3
	Armstrong	45.3	36.8
	Beaver	54.7	26.8
	Blair	34.9	24.0
	Bradford	100.0	65.2
	Butler	51.8	42.8
	Cameron	29.0	29.0

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Percent domestic use water from ground water <sup>a,b</sup>	Percent domestic use water self supplied <sup>a,c</sup>
Pennsylvania, cont.	Centre	93.1	21.3
	Clarion	61.5	55.8
	Clearfield	38.4	22.7
	Clinton	48.4	38.1
	Columbia	77.5	56.7
	Crawford	97.7	66.0
	Elk	25.3	15.6
	Fayette	19.2	16.1
	Forest	100.0	78.3
	Greene	31.9	31.9
	Huntingdon	73.2	57.8
	Indiana	52.2	49.1
	Jefferson	60.7	46.1
	Lawrence	40.5	38.8
	Lycoming	60.0	29.3
	McKean	56.6	33.3
	Potter	93.7	58.1
	Somerset	42.6	33.5
	Sullivan	100.0	76.9
	Susquehanna	79.9	74.7
	Tioga	81.3	58.3
Venango	95.9	32.7	
Warren	96.9	49.4	
Washington	21.6	21.5	
Westmoreland	21.3	19.8	
Wyoming	100.0	70.6	
Texas	Andrews	100.0	23.4
	Angelina	100.0	9.8
	Archer	16.9	16.9
	Atascosa	100.0	16.3
	Austin	100.0	55.6
	Bee	100.0	52.5

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Percent domestic use water from ground water <sup>a,b</sup>	Percent domestic use water self supplied <sup>a,c</sup>
Texas, cont.	Borden	100.0	71.4
	Bosque	88.7	30.3
	Brazos	100.0	2.1
	Brooks	100.0	35.3
	Burleson	100.0	42.9
	Cherokee	87.5	26.1
	Clay	44.6	36.7
	Cochran	100.0	23.3
	Coke	29.0	28.9
	Colorado	100.0	45.4
	Concho	96.8	5.0
	Cooke	75.5	8.9
	Cottle	100.0	21.4
	Crane	100.0	14.3
	Crockett	100.0	42.5
	Crosby	35.6	19.0
	Culberson	100.0	13.8
	Dallas	1.0	0.7
	Dawson	100.0	33.8
	DeWitt	100.0	42.3
	Denton	9.0	3.6
	Dimmit	100.0	30.5
	Ector	100.0	28.3
	Edwards	100.0	42.1
	Ellis	32.2	7.9
	Erath	100.0	43.3
	Fayette	100.0	27.6
	Fisher	NA	36.8
	Franklin	0.9	0.0
	Freestone	100.0	31.2
Frio	100.0	20.4	
Gaines	100.0	45.5	

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Percent domestic use water from ground water <sup>a,b</sup>	Percent domestic use water self supplied <sup>a,c</sup>
Texas, cont.	Garza	20.1	17.2
	Glasscock	NA	100.0
	Goliad	NA	66.7
	Gonzales	96.8	15.9
	Grayson	56.0	4.2
	Gregg	20.8	14.1
	Grimes	100.0	26.0
	Hansford	100.0	16.4
	Hardeman	87.6	13.3
	Hardin	100.0	29.5
	Harrison	43.8	24.8
	Hartley	100.0	39.7
	Haskell	100.0	15.7
	Hemphill	100.0	27.5
	Hidalgo	9.2	1.6
	Hockley	100.0	27.4
	Hood	70.8	39.8
	Houston	79.7	36.6
	Howard	100.0	19.8
	Hutchinson	27.3	14.9
	Irion	100.0	50.0
	Jack	46.7	43.8
	Jefferson	25.0	5.8
	Jim Hogg	NA	25.0
	Johnson	34.9	6.8
	Jones	60.5	60.5
	Karnes	100.0	17.6
	Kenedy	100.0	25.0
	Kent	100.0	37.5
	King	100.0	33.3
Kleberg	100.0	1.9	
Knox	86.2	24.2	

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Percent domestic use water from ground water <sup>a,b</sup>	Percent domestic use water self supplied <sup>a,c</sup>
Texas, cont.	La Salle	100.0	43.3
	Lavaca	100.0	56.0
	Lee	100.0	15.9
	Leon	100.0	41.4
	Liberty	98.5	42.5
	Limestone	46.5	32.5
	Lipscomb	100.0	23.5
	Live Oak	32.8	32.1
	Loving	NA	0.0
	Lynn	64.1	32.2
	Madison	100.0	66.9
	Marion	13.7	8.4
	Martin	100.0	48.9
	Maverick	27.6	27.6
	McMullen	100.0	40.0
	Medina	98.0	23.6
	Menard	36.4	36.4
	Midland	100.0	22.1
	Milam	82.5	41.1
	Mitchell	100.0	14.7
	Montague	57.1	49.7
	Montgomery	100.0	26.6
	Moore	100.0	8.1
	Nacogdoches	55.6	21.6
	Navarro	22.0	22.0
	Newton	100.0	63.7
	Nolan	100.0	17.6
	Nueces	5.6	5.6
	Ochiltree	100.0	16.8
	Oldham	100.0	58.8
Orange	99.1	41.2	
Palo Pinto	11.7	11.7	

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Percent domestic use water from ground water <sup>a,b</sup>	Percent domestic use water self supplied <sup>a,c</sup>
Texas, cont.	Panola	96.6	58.7
	Parker	63.5	41.1
	Pecos	100.0	31.3
	Polk	41.9	41.7
	Potter	100.0	12.6
	Reagan	100.0	16.2
	Reeves	100.0	31.1
	Roberts	100.0	33.3
	Robertson	97.1	22.5
	Runnels	13.5	13.5
	Rusk	90.7	41.8
	Sabine	76.2	69.0
	San Augustine	78.0	74.4
	San Patricio	88.8	21.8
	Schleicher	100.0	40.0
	Scurry	32.5	27.7
	Shelby	66.2	58.2
	Sherman	100.0	33.3
	Smith	48.0	13.7
	Somervell	87.7	69.3
	Starr	23.2	23.2
	Stephens	13.5	13.5
	Sterling	NA	18.8
	Stonewall	NA	40.0
	Sutton	100.0	26.7
	Tarrant	3.7	1.3
	Terrell	100.0	25.0
	Terry	100.0	16.7
	Tyler	100.0	73.6
	Upshur	54.1	23.2
Upton	100.0	15.2	
Van Zandt	65.7	39.0	

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Percent domestic use water from ground water <sup>a,b</sup>	Percent domestic use water self supplied <sup>a,c</sup>
Texas, cont.	Walker	57.7	30.6
	Waller	100.0	37.2
	Ward	100.0	4.5
	Washington	48.2	36.0
	Webb	99.4	0.5
	Wharton	100.0	45.9
	Wheeler	100.0	31.3
	Wichita	8.8	2.9
	Wilbarger	100.0	11.5
	Willacy	28.4	28.4
	Wilson	100.0	6.9
	Winkler	100.0	3.8
	Wise	51.3	50.4
	Wood	21.3	12.9
	Yoakum	100.0	36.0
	Young	19.3	18.9
Zapata	13.9	13.9	
Zavala	100.0	15.2	
Utah	Carbon	50.0	1.2
	Duchesne	57.1	10.4
	San Juan	68.3	47.5
	Sevier	100.0	10.0
	Uintah	87.7	3.1
Virginia	Buchanan	NA	27.6
	Dickenson	2.5	2.5
	Wise	5.9	2.3
West Virginia	Barbour	24.1	24.8
	Brooke	33.4	6.8
	Doddridge	60.6	62.1
	Hancock	67.7	6.9
	Harrison	8.8	8.9
	Lewis	29.5	30.3

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Percent domestic use water from ground water <sup>a,b</sup>	Percent domestic use water self supplied <sup>a,c</sup>
West Virginia, cont.	Marion	5.8	4.9
	Marshall	96.5	12.0
	Monongalia	5.3	5.5
	Ohio	5.4	3.4
	Pleasants	100.0	27.9
	Preston	66.1	41.0
	Ritchie	45.2	46.4
	Taylor	14.9	14.9
	Tyler	44.4	39.2
	Upshur	27.3	27.8
	Webster	41.9	43.2
	Wetzel	96.3	28.6
Wyoming	Big Horn	79.4	11.3
	Campbell	100.0	0.6
	Carbon	63.8	6.7
	Converse	96.5	17.0
	Fremont	49.3	23.7
	Goshen	100.0	21.1
	Hot Springs	31.9	8.2
	Johnson	40.8	35.4
	Laramie	38.1	13.0
	Lincoln	82.4	9.0
	Natrona	69.0	6.6
	Niobrara	100.0	16.3
	Park	18.9	13.7

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

State	County	Percent domestic use water from ground water <sup>a,b</sup>	Percent domestic use water self supplied <sup>a,c</sup>
Wyoming, cont.	Sublette	54.6	22.1
	Sweetwater	3.5	0.4
	Uinta	19.5	11.5
	Washakie	100.0	16.0

<sup>a</sup> Data accessed from the USGS website (<http://water.usgs.gov/watuse/data/2010/>) on November 11, 2014. Domestic water use is water used for indoor household purposes such as drinking, food preparation, bathing, washing clothes and dishes, flushing toilets, and outdoor purposes such as watering lawns and gardens (Maupin et al., 2014).

<sup>b</sup> Percent domestic water use from ground water estimated with the following equation: (Domestic public supply volume from ground water + Domestic self-supplied volume from ground water) / Domestic total water use volume \* 100. Domestic public supply volume from ground water was estimated by multiplying the volume of domestic water from public supply by the ratio of public supply volume from ground water to total public supply volume.

<sup>c</sup> Percent domestic water use self-supplied estimated by dividing the volume of domestic water self-supplied by total domestic water use volume.

**Table B-7. Projected hydraulic fracturing water use by Texas counties between 2015 and 2060, expressed as a percentage of 2010 total county water use.**

Hydraulic fracturing water use data from [Nicot et al. \(2012\)](#). Total water use data from 2010 from the USGS Water Census ([Maupin et al., 2014](#)). All 254 Texas counties are listed by descending order of percentages in 2030.

Texas county	Projected hydraulic fracturing water use as a percentage of 2010 total water use <sup>a,b</sup>									
	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050	2055	2060
McMullen	126.2	137.0	152.1	165.1	176.7	164.0	145.3	126.6	108.0	89.3
Irion	36.1	59.2	70.5	63.7	53.4	43.1	32.8	22.4	12.1	5.4
La Salle	58.4	58.3	59.7	60.8	61.9	54.6	45.3	36.0	26.7	17.4
San Augustine	60.2	56.2	52.2	48.2	44.2	40.2	36.2	32.1	28.1	24.1
Sterling	12.0	32.0	39.9	40.5	41.0	34.7	28.3	21.9	15.6	10.7
Dimmit	38.2	38.1	38.9	39.0	38.7	33.9	27.9	22.0	16.0	10.1
Sabine	9.6	19.2	28.7	38.3	35.1	31.9	28.7	25.6	22.3	19.2
Leon	9.9	19.3	27.0	34.6	32.9	29.0	25.1	21.2	17.3	13.5
Karnes	48.1	43.0	37.9	32.6	27.2	21.8	16.4	11.0	5.6	0.2
Loving	13.1	17.4	23.4	29.4	28.8	26.2	23.6	20.9	18.3	15.7
Shackelford	0.0	7.9	15.7	23.6	21.2	18.9	16.5	14.1	11.8	9.4
Madison	5.5	11.8	15.7	19.7	17.4	15.2	13.0	10.9	8.7	6.5
Schleicher	10.5	15.8	19.1	19.7	17.1	14.5	11.9	9.3	6.7	4.7
Sutton	0.0	11.0	15.1	19.1	23.2	20.6	18.1	15.5	12.9	10.3
Shelby	11.0	20.4	19.4	18.4	17.4	15.7	14.1	12.5	10.9	9.3
DeWitt	26.9	24.1	21.4	18.4	15.4	12.3	9.3	6.3	3.2	0.2
Hemphill	25.7	23.1	20.5	17.8	15.2	12.6	10.0	7.3	4.7	2.1

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

Texas county	Projected hydraulic fracturing water use as a percentage of 2010 total water use <sup>a,b</sup>									
	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050	2055	2060
Terrell	0.0	9.7	13.2	16.8	20.4	18.2	15.9	13.6	11.3	9.0
Coryell	7.0	24.4	22.8	16.5	10.1	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Montague	28.6	24.5	20.4	16.3	12.2	8.2	4.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Crockett	7.6	12.5	14.8	13.4	11.2	9.1	6.9	4.7	2.5	1.1
Upton	12.1	15.2	14.1	12.9	11.7	9.8	7.9	5.9	4.0	2.7
Borden	3.1	8.6	12.0	12.1	12.2	10.3	8.4	6.4	4.5	3.1
Live Oak	13.3	12.4	11.5	11.8	12.2	12.7	13.2	11.7	9.8	7.8
Reagan	11.2	14.0	12.7	11.3	9.9	8.1	6.4	4.6	2.8	1.6
Clay	3.2	5.9	8.6	11.3	10.3	9.4	8.4	7.5	6.6	5.6
Wheeler	17.6	15.3	13.1	10.8	8.6	6.3	4.1	1.8	0.0	0.0
Lavaca	7.9	13.2	12.0	10.7	9.4	8.1	6.7	5.4	4.0	2.7
Washington	0.0	6.7	11.8	10.7	9.6	8.6	7.5	6.4	5.3	4.3
Nacogdoches	7.9	11.4	10.7	10.0	9.2	8.3	7.5	6.6	5.7	4.9
Hill	17.1	14.7	12.2	9.8	7.3	4.9	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Jack	3.5	5.3	7.1	8.8	7.9	7.1	6.2	5.3	4.4	3.5
Panola	7.2	10.2	9.2	8.5	7.7	7.0	6.3	5.5	4.8	4.0
Jim Hogg	4.8	6.4	8.0	8.0	6.9	6.0	4.9	3.9	2.9	1.8
Howard	4.4	7.1	8.5	8.0	6.8	5.6	4.4	3.2	2.1	1.3
Parker	3.7	5.0	6.3	7.6	6.8	6.1	5.3	4.5	3.8	3.0
Hamilton	8.8	10.7	8.9	7.1	5.3	3.5	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Johnson	14.2	11.9	9.5	7.1	4.7	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Midland	6.7	8.3	7.7	7.1	6.2	5.2	4.1	3.0	2.0	1.2

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

Texas county	Projected hydraulic fracturing water use as a percentage of 2010 total water use <sup>a,b</sup>									
	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050	2055	2060
Kenedy	4.1	5.4	6.8	6.8	5.9	5.1	4.1	3.3	2.4	1.6
Fayette	3.9	8.4	7.6	6.6	5.5	4.4	3.4	2.3	1.2	0.2
Lee	2.1	4.1	5.3	6.5	5.8	5.1	4.3	3.6	2.9	2.1
Winkler	2.9	3.8	5.1	6.3	6.0	5.4	4.7	4.1	3.4	2.8
Wilson	6.7	7.7	7.0	6.2	5.4	4.6	3.9	3.1	2.3	1.5
Martin	5.7	7.1	6.5	6.0	5.3	4.4	3.5	2.6	1.8	1.2
Burleson	1.0	2.9	4.3	5.7	5.1	4.5	3.9	3.3	2.6	2.0
Atascosa	6.3	5.7	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.0	4.2	3.4	2.7
Bosque	1.8	3.0	4.3	5.5	5.1	4.6	4.2	3.7	3.2	2.8
Webb	7.5	7.1	6.3	5.4	4.6	3.8	3.1	2.3	1.4	0.5
Gonzales	8.0	7.1	6.2	5.3	4.4	3.6	2.7	1.8	0.9	0.0
Marion	1.1	2.4	3.8	5.1	5.2	4.7	4.2	3.7	3.2	2.7
Harrison	4.3	6.1	5.5	5.1	4.6	4.2	3.7	3.3	2.9	2.4
Eastland	0.0	3.9	5.9	5.0	4.2	3.3	2.5	1.7	0.8	0.0
Archer	1.0	2.4	3.6	4.9	4.5	4.1	3.7	3.3	2.9	2.5
Zavala	4.7	5.5	5.2	4.9	4.6	4.3	4.0	3.4	2.7	2.0
Roberts	6.9	6.0	5.1	4.2	3.4	2.5	1.6	0.7	0.0	0.0
Maverick	2.5	3.0	3.6	4.2	4.8	4.5	4.0	3.6	3.1	2.6
Cooke	11.9	9.3	6.7	4.1	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ward	2.7	3.2	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.6	3.2	2.7	2.3	1.9
Austin	0.0	1.2	2.5	3.7	3.4	3.0	2.6	2.2	1.9	1.5
Reeves	1.4	1.8	2.7	3.7	3.9	3.6	3.3	3.0	2.6	2.3

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

Texas county	Projected hydraulic fracturing water use as a percentage of 2010 total water use <sup>a,b</sup>									
	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050	2055	2060
Glasscock	3.1	4.1	3.9	3.6	3.1	2.6	2.1	1.5	1.0	0.7
Tyler	1.9	2.6	3.2	3.2	2.8	2.4	2.0	1.6	1.1	0.7
Hood	1.4	2.0	2.6	3.2	2.9	2.6	2.2	1.9	1.6	1.3
Garza	1.5	2.0	2.5	2.9	2.7	2.4	2.1	1.8	1.5	1.2
Andrews	2.3	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.6	2.3	2.0	1.7	1.4	1.1
Crane	1.3	1.7	2.1	2.6	3.1	2.8	2.5	2.2	1.9	1.7
Erath	0.9	1.4	1.9	2.4	2.2	2.0	1.8	1.6	1.4	1.2
Wise	3.6	3.2	2.8	2.4	2.0	1.6	1.2	0.8	0.4	0.0
Upshur	0.2	0.9	1.7	2.4	2.9	2.6	2.3	2.1	1.8	1.5
Mitchell	1.2	1.6	2.0	2.4	2.1	1.9	1.7	1.4	1.2	0.9
Ector	1.5	2.0	2.1	2.3	2.2	1.9	1.7	1.4	1.2	1.0
Culberson	0.3	0.4	1.3	2.2	2.9	2.6	2.4	2.1	1.9	1.6
Lipscomb	1.7	3.0	2.6	2.1	1.7	1.3	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.0
Angelina	0.4	0.9	1.5	2.1	2.2	2.0	1.8	1.6	1.4	1.2
Houston	2.1	2.7	2.4	2.1	1.8	1.5	1.2	0.9	0.6	0.3
Frio	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.7	1.5	1.2	0.9
Newton	1.8	2.3	2.1	1.8	1.6	1.3	1.0	0.8	0.5	0.3
Kleberg	1.0	1.4	1.7	1.7	1.5	1.3	1.1	0.8	0.6	0.4
Brooks	1.0	1.3	1.7	1.7	1.5	1.2	1.0	0.8	0.6	0.4
Brazos	0.4	0.9	1.2	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.0	0.8	0.7	0.5
Comanche	0.4	0.7	1.0	1.4	1.2	1.1	1.0	0.8	0.7	0.5
Ochiltree	0.6	1.1	1.5	1.2	1.0	0.7	0.5	0.2	0.0	0.0

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

Texas county	Projected hydraulic fracturing water use as a percentage of 2010 total water use <sup>a,b</sup>									
	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050	2055	2060
Palo Pinto	0.3	0.6	0.9	1.2	1.1	1.0	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.5
Limestone	0.9	1.0	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.0	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.4
Duval	0.7	0.9	1.1	1.1	1.0	0.8	0.7	0.5	0.4	0.3
Stephens	0.1	0.4	0.8	1.1	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.6	0.5	0.4
Dawson	0.5	0.8	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.0	0.8	0.6	0.5	0.3
Scurry	0.0	0.6	0.8	1.0	1.2	1.1	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.5
Bee	0.8	1.1	1.1	1.0	0.9	0.7	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.1
Val Verde	0.0	0.5	0.8	0.9	1.1	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.6	0.5
Colorado	<0.1	0.3	0.6	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.4
Tarrant	2.1	1.7	1.3	0.9	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Zapata	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.2
Ellis	0.3	0.5	0.6	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.3
Jim Wells	0.4	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.2
Lynn	0.0	0.4	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.4
Henderson	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.4
Hansford	0.0	0.4	0.8	0.7	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.1	0
Gaines	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.2
Gregg	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.2
Refugio	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1
Caldwell	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1
Pecos	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.2
Anderson	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.2

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

Texas county	Projected hydraulic fracturing water use as a percentage of 2010 total water use <sup>a,b</sup>									
	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050	2055	2060
Young	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1
San Patricio	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1
Smith	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2
Cherokee	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2
McLennan	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1
Terry	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2
Starr	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
Cochran	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1
Jasper	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	<0.1
Dallas	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	<0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Robertson	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Grimes	<0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Yoakum	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Freestone	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Cass	<0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Hutchinson	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	<0.1	<0.1	0.0
Rusk	<0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	<0.1
Willacy	<0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Victoria	<0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Sherman	0.0	0.0	<0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Calhoun	<0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Lubbock	0.0	0.0	<0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

Texas county	Projected hydraulic fracturing water use as a percentage of 2010 total water use <sup>a,b</sup>									
	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050	2055	2060
Jackson	<0.1	<0.1	0.1	0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Matagorda	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Polk	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Wharton	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Nueces	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Hidalgo	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Cameron	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Somervell	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Goliad	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Brazoria	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Fort Bend	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Aransas	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Armstrong	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bailey	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bandera	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bastrop	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Baylor	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bell	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bexar	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Blanco	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bowie	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Brewster	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

Texas county	Projected hydraulic fracturing water use as a percentage of 2010 total water use <sup>a,b</sup>									
	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050	2055	2060
Briscoe	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Brown	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Burnet	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Callahan	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Camp	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Carson	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Castro	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Chambers	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Childress	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Coke	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Coleman	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Collin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Collingsworth	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Comal	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Concho	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cottle	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Crosby	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dallam	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Deaf Smith	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Delta	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Denton	1.7	1.1	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dickens	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

Texas county	Projected hydraulic fracturing water use as a percentage of 2010 total water use <sup>a,b</sup>									
	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050	2055	2060
Donley	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Edwards	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
El Paso	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Falls	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Fannin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Fisher	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Floyd	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Foard	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Franklin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Galveston	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gillespie	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gray	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Grayson	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Guadalupe	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hall	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hardeman	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hardin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Harris	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hartley	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Haskell	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hays	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

Texas county	Projected hydraulic fracturing water use as a percentage of 2010 total water use <sup>a,b</sup>									
	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050	2055	2060
Hockley	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hopkins	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hudspeth	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hunt	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Jeff Davis	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Jefferson	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Jones	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kaufman	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kendall	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kent	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kerr	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kimble	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
King	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kinney	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Knox	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lamar	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lamb	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lampasas	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Liberty	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Llano	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
McCulloch	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mason	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

Texas county	Projected hydraulic fracturing water use as a percentage of 2010 total water use <sup>a,b</sup>									
	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050	2055	2060
Medina	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Menard	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Milam	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mills	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Montgomery	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Moore	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Morris	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Motley	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Navarro	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Nolan	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Oldham	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Orange	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Parmer	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Potter	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Presidio	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rains	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Randall	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Real	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Red River	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rockwall	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Runnels	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
San Jacinto	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

Texas county	Projected hydraulic fracturing water use as a percentage of 2010 total water use <sup>a,b</sup>									
	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050	2055	2060
San Saba	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Stonewall	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Swisher	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Taylor	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Throckmorton	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Titus	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tom Green	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Travis	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Trinity	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Uvalde	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Van Zandt	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Walker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Waller	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Wichita	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Wilbarger	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Williamson	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Wood	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

<sup>a</sup> Total water use data accessed from the USGS website (<http://water.usgs.gov/watuse/data/2010/>) on April 21, 2015. Data from [Nicot et al. \(2012\)](#) transcribed.

<sup>b</sup> Percentages calculated by dividing projected hydraulic fracturing water use volumes from [Nicot et al. \(2012\)](#) by 2010 total water use from the USGS and multiplying by 100. Percentages less than 0.1 were not rounded and simply noted as “<0.1”, but where the percentage was actually zero because there was no projected hydraulic fracturing water use we noted that as “0.0”.

## B.2. References for Appendix B

- [CCST](http://ccst.us/publications/2014/2014wst.pdf) (California Council on Science and Technology). (2014). Advanced well stimulation technologies in California: An independent review of scientific and technical information. Sacramento, CA. <http://ccst.us/publications/2014/2014wst.pdf>
- [Goodwin, S; Carlson, K; Knox, K; Douglas, C; Rein, L.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/es404675h) (2014). Water intensity assessment of shale gas resources in the Wattenberg field in northeastern Colorado. *Environ Sci Technol* 48: 5991-5995. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/es404675h>
- [Hansen, E; Mulvaney, D; Betcher, M.](http://www.downstreamstrategies.com/documents/reports_publication/marcellus_wv_pa.pdf) (2013). Water resource reporting and water footprint from Marcellus Shale development in West Virginia and Pennsylvania. Durango, CO: Earthworks Oil & Gas Accountability Project. [http://www.downstreamstrategies.com/documents/reports\\_publication/marcellus\\_wv\\_pa.pdf](http://www.downstreamstrategies.com/documents/reports_publication/marcellus_wv_pa.pdf)
- [Maupin, MA; Kenny, JF; Hutson, SS; Lovelace, JK; Barber, NL; Linsey, KS.](http://dx.doi.org/10.3133/cir1405) (2014). Estimated use of water in the United States in 2010. (USGS Circular 1405). Reston, VA: U.S. Geological Survey. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3133/cir1405>
- [Mitchell, AL; Small, M; Casman, EA.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/es403537z) (2013). Surface water withdrawals for Marcellus Shale gas development: performance of alternative regulatory approaches in the Upper Ohio River Basin. *Environ Sci Technol* 47: 12669-12678. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/es403537z>
- [Murray, KE.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/es4000593) (2013). State-scale perspective on water use and production associated with oil and gas operations, Oklahoma, U.S. *Environ Sci Technol* 47: 4918-4925. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/es4000593>
- [Nicot, JP; Reedy, RC; Costley, RA; Huang, Y.](http://www.twdb.state.tx.us/publications/reports/contracted_reports/doc/0904830939_2012Update_MiningWaterUse.pdf) (2012). Oil & gas water use in Texas: Update to the 2011 mining water use report. Nicot, JP; Reedy, RC; Costley, RA; Huang, Y. [http://www.twdb.state.tx.us/publications/reports/contracted\\_reports/doc/0904830939\\_2012Update\\_MiningWaterUse.pdf](http://www.twdb.state.tx.us/publications/reports/contracted_reports/doc/0904830939_2012Update_MiningWaterUse.pdf)
- [Nicot, JP; Scanlon, BR.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/es204602t) (2012). Water use for shale-gas production in Texas, U.S. *Environ Sci Technol* 46: 3580-3586. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/es204602t>
- [North Dakota State Water Commission.](http://www.swc.nd.gov/4dlink9/4dcgi/GetContentPDF/PB-2419/Fact%20Sheet.pdf) (2014). Facts about North Dakota fracking and water use. Bismarck, ND. <http://www.swc.nd.gov/4dlink9/4dcgi/GetContentPDF/PB-2419/Fact%20Sheet.pdf>
- [Solley, WB; Pierce, RR; Perlman, HA.](http://pubs.er.usgs.gov/publication/cir1200) (1998). Estimated use of water in the United States in 1995. (USGS Circular: 1200). U.S. Geological Survey. <http://pubs.er.usgs.gov/publication/cir1200>
- [U.S. EPA](http://www2.epa.gov/hfstudy/analysis-hydraulic-fracturing-fluid-data-fracfocus-chemical-disclosure-registry-1-pdf) (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency). (2015a). Analysis of hydraulic fracturing fluid data from the FracFocus chemical disclosure registry 1.0 [EPA Report]. (EPA/601/R-14/003). Washington, D.C.: Office of Research and Development, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. <http://www2.epa.gov/hfstudy/analysis-hydraulic-fracturing-fluid-data-fracfocus-chemical-disclosure-registry-1-pdf>
- [U.S. EPA](http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-03/documents/fracfocus_data_management_report_final_032015_508.pdf) (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency). (2015b). Analysis of hydraulic fracturing fluid data from the FracFocus chemical disclosure registry 1.0: Data management and quality assessment report [EPA Report]. (EPA/601/R-14/006). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development. [http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-03/documents/fracfocus\\_data\\_management\\_report\\_final\\_032015\\_508.pdf](http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-03/documents/fracfocus_data_management_report_final_032015_508.pdf)
- [U.S. EPA](http://www2.epa.gov/hfstudy/epa-project-database-developed-fracfocus-1-disclosures) (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency). (2015c). Analysis of hydraulic fracturing fluid data from the FracFocus chemical disclosure registry 1.0: Project database [EPA Report]. (EPA/601/R-14/003). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development. <http://www2.epa.gov/hfstudy/epa-project-database-developed-fracfocus-1-disclosures>
- [USGS](http://dx.doi.org/10.3133/sir20145184) (U.S. Geological Survey). (2014). Withdrawal and consumption of water by thermoelectric power plants in the United States, 2010. (Scientific Investigations Report 20145184). Reston, VA. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3133/sir20145184>

---

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*

[Verdegem, MCI; Bosma, RH.](#) (2009). Water withdrawal for brackish and inland aquaculture, and options to produce more fish in ponds with present water use. *Water Policy* 11: 52-68.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2166/wp.2009.003>

---

*This document is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy.*