

Agricultural Reuse of Treated Produced Water




Katie Lewis and Jaroy Moore
Texas A&M AgriLife Research – Lubbock

Bill Weathersby
Energy Water Solutions


Purpose of Project

Use locally produced oilfield-generated produced water for agricultural beneficial reuse purposes.



Objectives

- 1. Evaluate cotton growth and yield response to irrigating with treated produced water blended with groundwater (1:4 ratio).**
- 2. Determine the effect of treated produced water on soil chemical properties by measuring soil elemental concentrations and pH and electrical conductivity (EC) at varying soil depths.**




Why Cotton?

- Non-food crop
- Texas' most valuable crop

2014 Yield

- U.S.: 15.8 million bales
- Texas: 6.2 million bales
 - 86% of Texas cotton produced in West Texas



Cotton Production

- **Cotton is considered a drought and salt tolerant crop**
 - Requires 510 – 610 mm water (20” – 24”) for maximum yield
 - ~50% of cotton in Texas High Plains is irrigated
- **Threat to maintaining production**

WATER QUANTITY and QUALITY

Project Details

- **Location**

- Texas A&M AgriLife Research Station, Pecos, TX
- 12.1" average rainfall (1981-2010)


Permian Basin Oil Production

2008

710,480 barrels/day

2015

1,339,412 barrels/day



Project Details

- **Produced water**
 - Anadarko provided locally produced oilfield-generated produced water
 - Transported the water to the test site for treatment and land-application
- **Treatment of produced water**
 - Energy Water Solutions (the Woodlands, TX)
 - Developed a process train for the treatment of produced water from both oil and gas production fields

Public Policy Initiatives

Improved Legislation & Permitting

💧 Wellington Water Works

- 💧 Colorado Water Court Approval 2007



💧 HB and Senate Bill in Colorado enabling ground discharge

- 💧 Over 7.5 M Barrels of recycled water released in aquifer

💧 United States Patents for design and processes

- **6,348,154**– Methods to remove heavy metals from water
- **8,097,163**– Purification of oil field water for beneficial use
- **12/421,462**– Beneficial use of produced water (pending)




💧 Texas Railroad Commission mobile permit

- 💧 Five additional bills proposed in Texas in 2013 Session
 - 💧 SWD tariff, recycling mandate, discharge of fresh..



Mobilizing Recycling

planning *for lowered costs*



Consistent water quality via plant control systems

- Movable in field
- Central field depot
- Optimum placement
- Close to wells
- Limit trucking
- Lower risk & opex

Modular units scale:
1,250 to over 50,000 BPD



EWS Optimized Process

Patented Technology


Modular On Site Energy Water Solution

Fresh Water
and Products

US Patent Protection

8,097,163 - Purification of
oilfield Water for beneficial use (1-5)


6,348,154 - Methods to remove heavy
metals from water - rare earth minerals
harvesting (4)



energywater
SOLUTIONS


Confidential

Project Details



Irrigation Treatments (3 reps)

1. 100% groundwater (GW)
2. Blended water (4:1 ratio, GW:treated produced)



Irrigation volumes (June 6th to September 4th)

Groundwater: 13.9 acre-inches

Blended water: 10.7 acre-inches

Project Details

- **Cotton variety: DP 1359**
 - Planted on 2 June 2015
 - Harvested on 24 November 2015
 - Lint yield
 - Fiber quality
- **Soil and Water Monitoring:**
 - Soil samples collected at depth prior to initiating research and after the final irrigation event
 - 0-15 cm, 15-30 cm, and 30-60 cm
 - Water samples (groundwater, treated produced, and blended) were collected every four weeks

RESULTS



Water samples collected on 6 June 2015

Parameters	Units	Water Source		
		Groundwater	Treated Produced	Blended
Sodium (Na)	ppm	999	42	766
Calcium (Ca)	ppm	167	4	127
Magnesium (Mg)	ppm	50	1	40
Carbonate (CO ₃)	ppm	< 1	< 1	< 1
Bicarbonate (HCO ₃)	ppm	122	37	122
Chloride (Cl)	ppm	1900	20	1450
Conductivity	μS/cm	4950	150	3800
pH		7.6	7.8	7.4
Phosphorus (P)	ppm	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01
Potassium (K)	ppm	18	5	14
Nitrate (NO ₃)	ppm	5	6	4
Sulfate (SO ₄)	ppm	1204	31	1362
Boron (B)	ppm	0.5	4.1	0.8
TDS	ppm	3218	98	2470
SAR		17.4	4.9	15.2

Soil Characteristics

Hoban silty clay loam




pH	Conductivity	NO ₃ -N	P	K	Ca	Mg	S	Na	SAR*
--	mmhos/cm				ppm				--
8.7	1.8	22.1	30	450	17634	516	482	1373	16.7

17% CaCO₃ and 31% gypsum (NRCS)


Soil Characteristics (post harvest)

Irrigation Source	Sample Depth	pH	Conductivity mmhos/cm	NO ₃ -N	P	K	Ca	Mg ppm	S	Na	B	Cl	SAR*
Blended	0-6"	9.0	1.5	9	35	531	14915	575	654	1230	1.6	1018	13.8
	6-12"	9.1	1.2	12	26	474	16896	513	476	1347	1.2	896	17.6
	12-24"	8.8	1.7	19	19	425	24243	485	528	1349	1.2	1256	15.3
Groundwater	0-6"	8.9	2.2	36	35	528	15054	596	835	1751	1.6	1637	17.5
	6-12"	9.0	2.1	18	26	471	16352	514	503	1496	1.1	979	17.3
	12-24"	8.8	1.8	26	16	409	25706	485	504	1487	1.2	1609	16.9



Cotton Yield

Irrigation Source	Lint Yield (lb/acre)
Groundwater	587
Blended	568
<i>P-value</i>	0.834



Summary



Irrigating with treated
produced water blended
with groundwater

- Did not reduce cotton
yield or lint quality
- Reduced soil salinity
parameters


Future Research

- Identify and quantify boron in treated water
 - Fate in soil?
 - Plant uptake?
- Blending greater volumes of desalinated produced water with less well water may:
 - Improve soil chemical and physical properties
 - As result of decreasing salt load
 - Conserve fresh water sources
 - Enhance the longevity of agricultural production
- However, other ratios of blended water (and possibly other crops) must be examined...

Future Research

Treatments

1. Groundwater (100%)
2. Blend 1 (1:1 GW:TPW)
3. Blend 2 (2:1 GW:TPW)
4. Blend 3 (3:1 GW:TPW)
5. TPW (100%)



Katie L. Lewis, Ph.D.
Texas A&M AgriLife Research – Lubbock
katie.lewis@ag.tamu.edu
361-815-3836

