

Note to readers with disabilities: *EHP* strives to ensure that all journal content is accessible to all readers. However, some figures and Supplemental Material published in *EHP* articles may not conform to [508 standards](#) due to the complexity of the information being presented. If you need assistance accessing journal content, please contact ehp508@niehs.nih.gov. Our staff will work with you to assess and meet your accessibility needs within 3 working days.

Supplemental Material

Spatial Modeling to Identify Sociodemographic Predictors of Hydraulic Fracturing Wastewater Injection Wells in Ohio Census Block Groups

Genevieve S. Silva, Joshua L. Warren, and Nicole C. Deziel

Table of Contents

Table S1. Odds ratios (posterior means) and 95% credible intervals for the associations between sociodemographic factors and presence of Class II injection wells at the block group level in Ohio (2010-2016), based on Sparse SGLMM ($q = 250$) using three new outcome definitions in addition to our primary definition, “Within Block Group (BG)”.

Table S2. Odds ratios (posterior means) and 95% credible intervals for the associations between sociodemographic factors and presence of Class II injection wells at the block group level in Ohio (2010-2016) based on Sparse SGLMM using three different values of q . (Block groups with CII injection well, $n = 156$; block groups without CII injection well, $n = 9,049$).

Table S1. Odds ratios (posterior means) and 95% credible intervals for the associations between sociodemographic factors and presence of Class II injection wells at the block group level in Ohio (2010-2016), based on Sparse SGLMM ($q = 250$) using three new outcome definitions in addition to our primary definition, “Within Block Group (BG)”.

Characteristic	≤ 5 km BG Centroid	High Volume BG	Within Rural BG	Within BG
N with; without CII injection well in group	N=718; 8,487	N=90; 0	N=152; 3,085	N=156; 9,049
UNG Well (per 1 count)	0.905 (0.856, 0.944)*	0.976 (0.947, 0.996)*	0.967 (0.938, 0.989)*	0.967 (0.939, 0.989)*
Median Age (per 1 year)	0.994 (0.979, 1.01)	1.00 (0.970, 1.04)	0.987 (0.960, 1.02)	0.984 (0.959, 1.01)
% ≥ High School Educated (per 1%)	1.01 (0.995, 1.03)	1.00 (0.972, 1.03)	1.02 (0.988, 1.04)	1.01 (0.988, 1.04)
Median Income (per \$10,000)	0.812 (0.750, 0.885)*	0.934 (0.783, 1.10)	0.793 (0.669, 0.931)*	0.837 (0.719, 0.961)*
% White (per 1%)	1.03 (1.02, 1.03)*	1.02 (0.983, 1.06)	1.01 (0.982, 1.05)	1.02 (0.990, 1.05)
% Voter Turnout (per 1%)	0.974 (0.954, 0.993)*	0.974 (0.934, 1.02)	1.00 (0.966, 1.05)	0.994 (0.959, 1.03)
Population Density (per 1,000 person/mi ²)	0.949 (0.894, 1.01)	0.037 (0.007, 0.096)*	0.011 (0.001, 0.038)*	0.030 (0.008, 0.072)*
Water Area (per 1 km ²)	0.681 (0.535, 0.839)*	0.928 (0.780, 1.01)	0.905 (0.757, 1.00)	0.904 (0.761, 1.00)
Utica Shale (Yes vs. No)	33.7 (18.3, 56.2)*	10.1 (4.25, 20.7)*	6.38 (3.13, 11.7)*	5.06 (2.76, 8.36)*
Marcellus Shale (Yes vs. No)	3.74 (2.21, 5.85)*	1.37 (0.577, 2.78)	2.08 (0.946, 3.96)	2.58 (1.29, 4.45)*

*Indicates statistical significance (95% credible interval does not include 1.0)

All posterior summaries were generated using models that included all of the predictors shown in Table S1.

Sparse SGLMM: sparse version of spatial generalized linear mixed model, q : model complexity, UNG: hydraulically-fractured unconventional natural gas well.

≤ 5 km BG centroid: CII injection well present within a 5-kilometer buffer region from the block group’s centroid, high volume BG: block group with CII injection well(s) receiving a cumulative volume ≥ 141,367 barrels from quarter 3, 2010 to quarter 1, 2016, rural BG: block group with population density < 1,000 person/mile², within BG: the primary model.

Table S2. Odds ratios (posterior means) and 95% credible intervals for the associations between sociodemographic factors and presence of Class II injection wells at the block group level in Ohio (2010-2016) based on Sparse SGLMM using three different values of q . (Block groups with CII injection well, $n = 156$; block groups without CII injection well, $n = 9,049$)

Characteristic	Sparse SGLMM ($q=50$) (DIC: 1085.62, p_D: 19.99)	Sparse SGLMM ($q=150$) (DIC: 1057.85, p_D: 35.12)	Sparse SGLMM ($q=250$) (DIC: 1049.71, p_D: 47.50)
UNG Well (per 1 count)	0.967 (0.940, 0.986)*	0.970 (0.944, 0.990)*	0.967 (0.939, 0.989)*
Median Age (per 1 year)	0.984 (0.961, 1.01)	0.983 (0.958, 1.007)	0.984 (0.959, 1.01)
% \geq High School Educated (per 1%)	1.01 (0.990, 1.04)	1.01 (0.988, 1.03)	1.01 (0.988, 1.04)
Median Income (per \$10,000)	0.839 (0.720, 0.957)*	0.845 (0.727, 0.968)*	0.837 (0.719, 0.961)*
% White (per 1%)	1.01 (0.987, 1.04)	1.02 (0.990, 1.05)	1.02 (0.990, 1.05)
% Voter Turnout (per 1%)	0.995 (0.963, 1.03)	0.996 (0.963, 1.03)	0.994 (0.959, 1.03)
Population Density (per 1,000 person/mi ²)	0.021 (0.005, 0.050)*	0.028 (0.008, 0.067)*	0.030 (0.008, 0.072)*
Water Area (per 1 km ²)	0.919 (0.782, 1.00)	0.912 (0.763, 1.00)	0.904 (0.761, 1.00)
Utica Shale (Yes vs. No)	5.39 (3.19, 8.27)*	4.85 (2.70, 7.92)*	5.06 (2.76, 8.36)*
Marcellus Shale (Yes vs. No)	1.98 (1.18, 3.03)*	2.59 (1.44, 4.47)*	2.58 (1.29, 4.45)*

*Indicates statistical significance (95% credible interval does not include 1.0)

All posterior summaries were generated using models that included all of the predictors shown in Table S2. Estimates with $q = 250$ represent the primary model.

Sparse SGLMM: sparse version of spatial generalized linear mixed model, DIC: deviance information criterion, p_D : effective number of parameters, q : model complexity, UNG: hydraulically-fractured unconventional natural gas well.