

## Letter to the Editor

1 In the current controversy over the potential exploitation of unconventional (shale)  
2 gas resources in England based on hydraulic fracturing ('fracking'), the arguments of  
3 those opposed to its use have been focussed on three main areas of concern: (i) local  
4 groundwater pollution, (ii) disturbances to local communities by increased lorry traffic  
5 in the vicinity of drilling sites, and (iii) the further exploitation of new sources of  
6 fossil fuels which is contrary to long-term government targets to reduce greenhouse gas  
7 emissions. (The current UK government target is a 80% reduction by 2050 from the  
8 1990 baseline). The UK Prime Minister recently expressed his support for fracking in  
9 an article in the *Daily Telegraph* : 'We cannot afford to miss out on shale gas' (11<sup>th</sup>  
10 August, 2013).

11 One feature of the fracking debate which has received no serious attention is the  
12 deleterious effects of sealing soil surfaces by establishing numerous drilling pads, and the  
13 associated loss of a range of soil functions (food and fibre production, carbon storage,  
14 flood protection), which is one consequence of shale gas exploitation. By contrast to the  
15 USA where shale gas is currently subject to significant exploitation, the total land area  
16 of England (130 000 km<sup>2</sup>) is small. Where multiple horizontal wells are drilled from  
17 a single well pad (the drilling technology likely to be deployed in England), the area  
18 of sealed ground is estimated to be around 1.4 hectares during operations, and around  
19 0.61 hectares after partial reclamation (New York State Department of Environmental  
20 Conservation, 2011).

21 It has been estimated that the Bowland shale, which underlies a substantial  
22 proportion of central and northern England, may contain 1329 tcf (trillion cubic feet)  
23 of gas (a total gas-in-place estimate; Andrews, 2013). There is currently insufficient  
24 information to estimate how much of this could be recovered, or the associated density  
25 of drilling pads required to extract it. During shale gas exploitation in the USA, the

26 density of drill pads is typically around 1 per 1.5 km<sup>2</sup> (New York State Department of  
27 Environmental Conservation, 2011). Drill pads at this density in England would lead  
28 to sealing of a substantial area of soil; this does not appear to have been considered to  
29 date. This is a substantial loss of productive soil resource at a time when global food  
30 security is also a serious and growing concern (Blum & Nortcliff, 2013).

31 The Defra Soil Strategy for England (2009) pre-dates the recent interest in on-  
32 shore shale gas exploration and it does not consider its implications for soil sealing. It  
33 refers to soil sealing in urban areas as an ‘unavoidable consequence of development’ and  
34 cites targets for the increased use of brownfield land for further development. The ma-  
35 jority of drill pads are likely to be established on greenfield sites and so will contribute  
36 to land take. Although Defra have established a code of practice for the sustainable  
37 use of soils during construction, there may also be novel engineering approaches that  
38 can help to minimise soil sealing during shale gas exploitation, and to maximise the  
39 area of restored land after site closure. This is a challenge that should be addressed by  
40 engineers and soil scientists if the shale gas industry develops in the UK. The issue of  
41 soil sealing should have greater prominence in the current debate over potential shale  
42 gas exploitation and needs to be considered along with the other potential benefits and  
43 drawbacks.

44 B. G. RAWLINS

45 British Geological Survey

46 Keyworth

47 Nottingham

48 NG12 5GG

49 UK

50

51 **References**

52 Andrews, I.J. 2013. *The Carboniferous Bowland Shale gas study: geology and resource*  
53 *estimation*. British Geological Survey for Department of Energy and Climate  
54 Change, London, UK.

55 Blum, W. E.H. and Nortcliff, S. (2013) *Soils and food security*. In: Brevick, E. C.  
56 and Burgess, L. C. (eds.) *Soils and human health*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, pp.  
57 299-321.

58 Defra, 2009. *Safeguarding our Soils A Strategy for England*. Defra, London.  
59 [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/69261/pb13297-soil-strategy-090910.pdf)  
60 [/data/file/69261/pb13297-soil-strategy-090910.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/69261/pb13297-soil-strategy-090910.pdf). Accessed 23/08/2013.

61 New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, 2011. *Supplemental*  
62 *Generic Environmental Impact Statement On The Oil, Gas and Solution Mining*  
63 *Regulatory Program*. New York State Department of Environmental Conserva-  
64 tion. <http://www.dec.ny.gov/data/dmn/rdsgeisfull0911.pdf>. Accessed 23/08/2013.