

The Secret Sauce: Disclosure and Strategic Interaction in Hydraulic Fracturing

Timothy Fitzgerald¹

Charles F. Mason²

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

1st Paris International Conference: The Economics of Natural Gas 27 June 2017

¹Texas Tech University ²University of Wyoming

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

Results

Technical Change

Combination of technologies has expanded natural gas reserve base: hydraulic fracturing attracts most attention

- both experiential and social learning
- application to heterogeneous geology
- Adoption has two major effects:
 - allowed entry into E&P and servicing \rightarrow competition for market share
 - Public concern about environmental/social/local impacts of development
 - "fracking" has been the lightning rod

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

Hydraulic Fracturing Stylized Facts

- 1. operators contract service companies to perform fracturing
 - extent of operational control?
- 2. frac recipes/formulas vary: companies, time, and space
- perceptions of environmental risk from development/ fracking
 - housing market effects, even if damages not demonstrated
- 4. state-level disclosure requirements for frac ingredients
 - disclosure incomplete allows for confidential "trade secrets"



- 1. identify relationships between firms
 - operators and service companies
 - few firms in our empirical setting \rightarrow opportunity for strategic interaction

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ■ ののの

- 2. use disclosures to identify recipes
 - estimate marginal productivities
 - including fluid chemistry
- 3. assess toxicity of frac ingredients
- 4. assess role of trade secrecy "loophole"
 - parse operator vs. service company
 - pertinent given possible mergers in servicing

Results

This Paper 1000 Words



Cartoon from Columbus Dispatch

< □ > < 同 > < 三 > < 三 > < 三 > < ○ < ○ </p>

Hydraulic Fracturing



- injected fluid largely water, proppant
- lots of attention to small share of chemical additives with more potential environmental/health harm

Sublette County



Source: Pinedale Anticline Project Office, Wyoming BLM

- very rural area with some historic (oil) development
- distant from consumer markets—large basis differentials for gas (Oliver et al. 2014)
- fracking used since 1990s, though technology evolved substantially
- mostly vertical wells in tight sandstone (not horizontal, not shale)
- commuting distance to SW Wyoming oil and gas centers

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

WY regulation (17 Aug, 2010)

- $\,\vartriangleright\,$ components of frac jobs must be reported to Wyo Oil & Gas Commission
- trade secrets exception
- FracFocus reports records for frac jobs in Sublette County, WY
- Combined data: 569 frac jobs (333 records from both sources)
- frac job typically has multiple stages
- three firms conduct fracking operations
 - oil service companies"

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □

FracFocus Injection Data

- detailed, well-specific, injection information
- 13.2 percent proppant
- 86.0 percent water
- provided via FracFocus



Purpose	Number	Percent	Toxic Count	Secret Count
Additives	8	0.0677	3	3
Biocides	9	0.0119	0	4
Breakers	9	0.1718	2	2
Gel	3	0.1479	0	2
Slicks	4	0.0361	0	1
Other	51	0.3644	0	4

Specifying Production Function

Six categories of additives

- Balancing Additives
 - pH control, clay stabilizers, buffers
- Biocides
 - bactericides to prevent naturally-occurring bacteria from multiplying and impeding flow
- Breakers and Crosslinkers
 - create, then destroy cross-linked (rather than linear) gels to increase viscosity and transport more proppant
- Gels & Foamers
 - increase viscosity
- Slicks
 - friction reducers and surfactants
- Unspecified
 - none of the above
- Production data furnished by DrillingInfo

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

Completion Reports

Operators required to report completions to state regulator

• Form 3

Includes similar information to FracFocus – also:

- treated footage
- number of stages of treatment





OSHA Occupational Chemical Database

- match CAS numbers from FracFocus
- information on 751 chemical compounds that pose workplace hazards
- originally compiled with help from EPA
- considered EPA IRIS database

Currently only using match onto list

• may be able to implement relative toxicity measures

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ● ● ● ●

concentrations are relevant

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

Toxicity vs. Secrecy

When firms invoke "trade secret"

do not observe CAS numbers

What dictates choice of secrecy?

• as opposed to revealing highly toxic ingredient...

Which firm (operator or service company) determines what is secret?

Summary statistics for frac Jobs

	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
H ₂ O Volume (gal)	1,562,927	1,010,253	364,433	5,614,448
Sand/Water Ratio	0.149	0.070	0.023	0.370
Ingredients (count)	84.6	11.7	28	90
Stages	15.66	4.87	3	27
Treated Interval (ft)	4,381.5	1,475.9	0	6,324
Total Depth (ft)	13,424.4	871.3	10,491	14,914

Notes: Data compiled from FracFocus records and WOGCC completion reports. *N*=333

Number of toxic ingredients reported

	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max		
Additive	1.81	1.03	0	4		
Biocide	0	0	0	0		
Breaker	1.92	1.44	0	7		
Gel	1.20	0.69	0	3		
Proppant	1.96	1.30	1	8		
Slicks	0.29	0.46	0	1		
Unspecified	0.24	0.52	0	3		
Total	7.44	3.26	2	17		
Notes: Estimation sample only, with undisclosed addi-						
tives exclude	d. Data o	compiled fro	m FracF	Focus records, as		

matched to OSHA Occupational Safety Database. N=333.

Number of ingredients withheld as "Trade Secrets"

	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max		
Additive	0.69	1.25	0	4		
Biocide	1.10	1.60	0	4		
Breaker	0.58	0.82	0	3		
Gel	0.38	0.71	0	3		
Slicks	0.58	0.74	0	2		
Unspecified	1.75	2.07	0	6		
Total	5.11	5.71	0	16		
Notes: Estimation sample only. Data compiled from Frac-						
Focus record	s. <i>N</i> =33	3. Total inclu	udes ur	ndisclosed prop-		
pants.						

A (T) vs. C (B) [L: toxics; R: withheld]



A (L) vs. B (R) [T: toxics; B: withheld]



(日)

Differences Across Firms

Table: Trade Secrets and Toxicity, per Well by Service Company and Operator

	Trade Secrets			Toxic Additives				
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Service Company								
A	1.769	1.068	0	8	5.538	2.432	2	15
В	12.920	4.475	0	16	10.483	1.576	7	17
С	2.608	3.266	0	9	6.717	3.200	2	16
Operator								
- L'	2.541	3.202	0	9	6.939	3.198	2	16
11	13.422	3.892	1	16	10.277	1.233	7	13
111	1.762	0.429	1	2	4.619	1.430	2	9
IV	2.500	2.887	0	5	14.750	2.062	13	17
Materia Deterrorite	al fuere Europ	E a surge was a surge		A a la a al A a	00114 0		to Deteler	Total N/ 004

Notes: Data compiled from FracFocus records, as matched to OSHA Occupational Safety Database. Total N=331.

(日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

Production Cross-section

Estimate preliminary models of impact of completion formula on production over different time periods

- productivity of different additives X_i
- impact of secret or toxic ingredients through interaction $lny_j = \beta_0 + \beta_1 WATER_j + \beta_2 SANDRATIO_j + \beta_3 lnFOOTAGE_j + \sum_i \alpha_i lnX_i + \varepsilon_j$

$$lny_{j} = \beta_{0} + \beta_{1} WATER_{j} + \beta_{2} SANDRATIO_{j} + \beta_{3} lnFOOTAGE_{j} + \sum_{i} \alpha_{i} lnX_{i} \times TOXIC_{i} + \varepsilon_{j}$$

$$\textit{Iny}_{j} = \beta_{0} + \beta_{1}\textit{WATER}_{j} + \beta_{2}\textit{SANDRATIO}_{j} + \beta_{3}\textit{InFOOTAGE}_{j} + \sum_{i} \alpha_{i}\textit{InX}_{i} \times \textit{SECRET}_{i} + \varepsilon_{j}$$



Also able to use well-month panel

$$lny_{jt} = \gamma AGE_{jt} + \beta' A_j + \sum_{i} \alpha_i lnX_i + \varepsilon_{jt}$$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● のへぐ



Toxicity is a lightning rod:

• estimate count models: Poisson, negative binomial

$$\sum TOXIC_i = f(A_i, SECRET_i, OPERATOR_i, SERVICE_i, YEAR_i)$$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ = 三 のへで

Table: Various Fixed Effect Results, First Six Months' Gas

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Log H ₂ O Volume	0.12	0.12	0.20*	0.40***	0.43***	0.46***
	(0.093)	(0.096)	(0.10)	(0.15)	(0.16)	(0.16)
Sand/Water Ratio	-1.52*	-1.44	-0.26	-0.29	0.053	0.048
	(0.90)	(0.87)	(1.04)	(1.01)	(1.13)	(1.05)
Log Treated Interval	0.66***	0.58***	0.54***	0.021	0.0055	0.27
	(0.088)	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.19)	(0.21)	(0.21)
Stages		0.014	0.0086	0.0038	0.0045	0.0056
		(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.014)
Operator II				0.73***		
				(0.23)		
Service Company B					0.95***	
					(0.30)	
Service Company C					0.22	
					(0.17)	
Ν	204	204	204	204	183	204
R^2	0.21	0.22	0.25	0.30	0.31	0.36
Notes: Constant inclu	uded. Rob	ust standa	rd errors i	n parenthe	ses. Oper	ator I is the
excluded group: operators III and IV are dropped from the trimmed sample. Column						

3 included year fixed effects, which were not significant. Column 6 has spatial fixed effects, which are jointly significant.

Table: Panel Results, Log Monthly Gas Production

	log Gas	log Gas	log Gas	log Gas
Well Age	-0.075**	-0.076**	-0.076**	-0.076**
	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)
Log Water Volume (gal)	0.27***	0.50***	0.33***	0.28***
Cand/Mater Datia	(0.0083)	(0.011)	(0.020)	(0.021)
Sand/Water Ratio	0.44	0.52	-0.24	(0.30
Log Treated Interval	-0.055**	-0.020	-0.083	-0.0094
Log frouted interval	(0.0099)	(0.022)	(0.032)	(0.0069)
Stages	0.038***	0.027***	0.046***	0.040***
	(0.00084)	(0.0024)	(0.0014)	(0.0012)
Additive		0.12**		
		(0.017)		
Breaker		0.11**		
l la ca calla d		(0.017)		
Unspecified		0.052		
Additive × Toxicity		(0.0025)	0.0046	
Additive × Toxicity			(0.0040)	
Breaker × Toxicity			-0.0076	
,			(0.0035)	
Unspecified \times Toxicity			-0.036	
			(0.017)	
Breaker × Secret				-0.0049*
				(0.0015)
Unspecified × Secret				-0.0020
Constant	6 07***	E 60***	6 94***	(0.0016)
Constant	(0.18)	(0.14)	(0.34)	(0.39)
Observations	1868	1664	1664	1664
D ²	0.25	0.27	0.25	0.25
11	0.55	0.37	0.55	0.55

Notes: Operator clustered standard errors in parentheses. <lu>

Table: Count Model Results (294 Obsns)

	Poisson	Negative Binomial	OĹS
Log Water Volume (gal)	-0.39***	-0.39***	-2.42***
,	(0.061)	(0.061)	(0.54)
Sand/Water Ratio	0.82*	0.82*	8.37
	(0.49)	(0.49)	(5.80)
Stages	0.011*	0.011*	0.094**
	(0.0058)	(0.0058)	(0.045)
Secret Gel Count	0.13***	0.13***	0.50*
	(0.044)	(0.044)	(0.30)
Secret Slicks Count	0.15**	0.15**	1.02**
	(0.066)	(0.066)	(0.45)
Secret Unspecified Count	-0.044**	-0.044**	-0.32**
	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.14)
Operator I	0.94***	0.94***	6.53***
	(0.12)	(0.12)	(1.04)
Operator II	-0.65***	-0.65***	-4.42***
	(0.17)	(0.17)	(1.53)
Service Company A	-1.36***	-1.36***	-10.2***
	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.98)
Service Company C	-1.51***	-1.51***	-10.8***
	(0.18)	(0.18)	(1.68)
2011	-0.12	-0.12	-0.64
	(0.085)	(0.085)	(0.68)
2012	0.34***	0.34***	1.92***
	(0.096)	(0.096)	(0.73)
2013	0.42***	0.42***	2.37***
	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.84)
Individual		-17.1***	
Heterogeneity		(0.14)	
Pseudo-R ² [R ²]	0.18	0.17	[0.64]
Notes: Dependent variable	is count of a	Il injected additives tha	t appear on

Summary of Results

- substantial differences across firms (operators and service companies) in usage of
 - trade secrecy provisions
 - toxic additives
- little evidence that these have large productive impacts
- toxicity concentrated amongst proppants, crosslinkers/breakers, chemical balancer s
- harder to pin down usage of trade secrets, but biocides are important
- firms may be able to react to regulation by substituting fluid chemistry, but gross benefits are not delineated

Motivation						
	- N					
				~		

Table: Toxicity Results (204 obsns)

	Log 6 Month Gas	Log 6 Month Gas	Log 12 Month Gas	Log 12 Month Gas
Log Water Volume (gal)	0.41*	0.51**	0.49**	0.64**
·	(0.21)	(0.25)	(0.22)	(0.25)
Sand/Water Ratio	-0.027	-1.50	0.57	-0.97
	(0.94)	(1.00)	(0.95)	(0.98)
Log Treated Interval	0.29*	0.19	0.21	0.094
	(0.17)	(0.19)	(0.16)	(0.15)
Additive	0.0045		0.0094	
	(0.049)		(0.048)	
Biocide	0.047		-0.064	
	(0.17)		(0.15)	
Breaker	0.12		0.12	
	(0.076)		(0.076)	
Gel	0.0058		0.045	
	(0.12)		(0.12)	
Slicks	-0.024		-0.015	
	(0.087)		(0.080)	
Unspecified	0.19		0.20	
	(0.12)		(0.12)	
Additive \times Toxicity		-0.029**		-0.030**
		(0.013)		(0.013)
Breaker \times Toxicity		0.010		0.0067
		(0.0070)		(0.0069)
Gel \times Toxicity		-0.0089		-0.0039
		(0.017)		(0.016)
Slicks \times Toxicity		0.12**		0.13**
		(0.052)		(0.052)
Unspecified \times Toxicity		-0.073		-0.089
		(0.055)		(0.055)
Constant	6.79***	4.00	6.22**	3.36
	(2.59)	(3.16)	(2.46)	(3.11)
R ²	0.30	0.33	0.26	0.32

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. Biocide is excluded due to collinearity.

lotivatio	n	Background	Data	Empirics	R	esults
		Table: Trade Se	cret Results ((204 Obsns)		
		Log 6 Month Gas	Log 6 Month Gas	Log 12 Month Gas	Log 12 Month Gas	
=	Log Water Volume (ga	l) 0.41*	0.36***	0.49**	0.42***	=
	Sand/Water Ratio	(0.21) -0.027 (0.04)	(0.12) -0.86 (1.02)	(0.22) 0.57	(0.13) -0.043 (1.07)	
	Log Treated Interval	(0.34) 0.29* (0.17)	0.13	0.93) 0.21 (0.16)	0.026	
	Additive	0.0045	()	0.0094 (0.048)	(0.00)	
	Biocide	0.047 (0.17)		-0.064 (0.15)		
	Breaker	0.12		0.12		
	Gel	(0.076) 0.0058 (0.12)		(0.076) 0.045 (0.12)		
	Slicks	-0.024		-0.015		
	Unspecified	0.19 (0.12)		0.20 (0.12)		
	$\text{Additive} \times \text{Secret}$	X- /	0.00024 (0.014)	(-)	0.0034 (0.011)	
	$\text{Biocide} \times \text{Secret}$		-0.011 (0.012)		-0.0048 (0.0092)	
	$Breaker \times Secret$		0.0029 (0.012)		-0.0093 (0.0079)	
	$\text{Gel} \times \text{Secret}$		0.013		0.0082	
	$Slicks\timesSecret$		-0.036		-0.059*	
	$\text{Unspecified} \times \text{Secret}$		-0.0054		-0.0047	
	Constant	6.79*** (2.59)	6.34*** (1.58)	6.22** (2.46) < 🗇 🕨	(0.0088) 6.76*** ∢ ≧ ▶ ⁴(1.54) ≡	୬୯୯