

# 2015

# DISCLOSING THE FACTS:

TRANSPARENCY AND RISK IN HYDRAULIC FRACTURING

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY



A COLLABORATIVE PROJECT OF:



# AUTHORS

Richard Liroff, Investor Environmental Health Network  
Danielle Fugere, As You Sow  
Steven Heim, Boston Common Asset Management, LLC

# COLLABORATING ORGANIZATIONS

**AS YOU SOW** promotes environmental and social corporate responsibility through shareholder advocacy, coalition building, and innovative legal strategies. Its efforts create large-scale systemic change by establishing sustainable and equitable corporate practices.

**BOSTON COMMON ASSET MANAGEMENT, LLC** is a sustainable investment firm dedicated to generating competitive financial returns and meaningful improvements in corporate performance on environmental, social, and governance (ESG) issues. We are long-term investors. We believe that markets typically misvalue the timing and magnitude of risks and opportunities presented by ESG factors. Therefore, our investment strategy is to build and grow diversified portfolios using the high-quality but undervalued sustainable stocks that our integrated investment research identifies. As part of this, we look to add value through targeted company and industry engagement efforts.

**THE INVESTOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH NETWORK (IEHN)** is a collaborative partnership of investment managers and advisors concerned about the impact of corporate practices on environmental health.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report was made possible by the generous support of the (in alphabetical order): Firedoll Foundation, Nathan Cummings Foundation, Park Foundation, The Roddenberry Foundation, Tides Foundation, and the V. Kann Rasmussen Foundation. Additional support was provided by the Arkay Foundation, Arntz Family Foundation, Campbell Foundation, Libra Foundation, and New Belgium Foundation.

This report has benefited from the suggestions of outside reviewers. They include (in alphabetical order by last name with affiliations for identification purposes only): Scott Anderson (Environmental Defense Fund), Jim Bolander (Southwestern Energy), Jonas Kron (Trillium Asset Management), Karina Litwack, Amy Mall (Natural Resources Defense Council), Granville Martin (JPMorgan Chase), Nora Nash (Sisters of St. Francis of Philadelphia), Samantha Rubright (FracTracker Alliance), Nichole Saunders (Environmental Defense Fund), Lucas Schoeppner (Sustainalytics), Ken Scott (Walden Asset Management), Donna Vorhees (Health Effects Institute), Heidi Welsh (Sustainable Investments Institute), and Aaron Ziulkowski (Walden Asset Management). Thanks also to the additional professionals from industry and other sectors who provided reviews. Any errors or omissions are solely the responsibility of the authors.

Special thanks to David Shugar, Yun Liang, Sasan Saadat, Katie Levitt, and Amelia Timbers for their research support.

We would also like to thank Sanford Lewis (IEHN counsel) for legal review, Leah Turino (Boston Common Asset Management) for copy-editing, and Andrew Montes and Kristin Costa for other support.

# DISCLAIMER

*The information in this report has been prepared from sources and data the authors believe to be reliable, but we assume no liability for and make no guarantee as to its adequacy, accuracy, timeliness, or completeness. Boston Common Asset Management, LLC may have invested in and may in the future invest in some of the companies mentioned in this report. The information in this report is not designed to be investment advice regarding any security, company, or industry and should not be relied upon to make investment decisions. We cannot and do not comment on the suitability or profitability of any particular investment. All investments involve risk, including the risk of losing principal. No information herein is intended as an offer or solicitation of an offer to sell or buy, or as a sponsorship of any company, security, or fund. Opinions expressed and facts stated herein are subject to change without notice.*

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

*Disclosing the Facts 2015* is the fourth in a series of investor reports intended to promote improved operating practices among oil and gas companies engaged in horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing. Hydraulic fracturing operations often use toxic chemicals and high volumes of water, release significant levels of greenhouse gases and other pollutants, and have the potential to adversely impact local communities when not properly managed. These issues translate into financial risks to companies and shareholders in the form of fines, regulations, or threats to companies' social license to operate.

Following the maxim of "what gets measured, gets managed", this report encourages oil and gas companies to increase disclosure about their use of current best practices to minimize the environmental risks and community impacts of their "fracking" activities. Disclosure of best management practices and associated key performance indicators is the primary means by which investors gauge how companies are managing the business risks associated with their environmental and community impacts. Disclosure helps both investors and other stakeholders determine whether companies have the systems in place to minimize the community and environmental risks of their operations.

This 2015 scorecard benchmarks the public disclosures of 30 companies on 39 key performance indicators. It distinguishes companies disclosing more about practices and impacts from those disclosing less. The scorecard assesses five areas of environmental, social, and governance metrics emphasizing, on a play-by-play basis, quantitative disclosures for: (1) Toxic chemicals; (2) Water and waste management; (3) Air emissions; (4) Community impacts; and (5) Management accountability.<sup>1</sup> It relies solely on publicly available information companies provide on their websites or in corporate financial statements or other reports linked from their websites.

This year, the report card has been compiled amidst a dramatic contraction of well drilling and completion activities and enormous financial write-offs. In this operating environment, companies might be tempted to slow disclosure efforts and perhaps even cut corners on best practices. However, this year's scorecard results show that corporate disclosure efforts have increased among a core group of industry disclosure leaders and even some companies that have been disclosure laggards. Companies continue to pursue operating innovations that not only save money but also yield environmental benefits. These include, for example, substituting pipelines for trucks to move water and waste water, enhancing leak detection and repair efforts, and using less, but safer and more cost-effective chemicals.

Yet, while progress has been made, much more remains to be done. For instance, the industry as a whole must improve its localized disclosures since companies' social license to operate is often determined by local concerns and perceptions of corporate responsiveness. Local impacts can include land and water use, air and water pollution, and nuisances such as noise, light pollution, traffic, and road damage. Progress must also continue on issues such as reducing chemical toxicity, setting goals for reducing methane and other air emissions, and identifying local community concerns and company responses.

## KEY FINDINGS

1. **BHP Billiton stands out as the disclosure leader.** BHP Billiton scored 32 out of a possible 39 points. BHP Billiton's disclosure scores follow a trajectory that investors hope a growing number of companies will emulate. The company ranked near the bottom of the industry in disclosure in the 2013 edition of *Disclosing the Facts*, raced to the top in 2014, and further outdistanced even other improving companies in 2015. Through its score, the company demonstrates that it has been putting systems in place to track data and increase disclosures. Its swift ascent from the bottom of the 2013 scorecard confirms investors' view that at least some of the companies that are disclosure laggards may in fact have good policies, practices, and data systems in place,

---

1. Play-by-play disclosure refers to a company reporting the distinct operational practices and impacts that are occurring at each play in which a company is operating, as distinct from reporting at an aggregate level such as company- or country-wide. 'Play-by-play' is a short-hand way of referring to appropriate localized reporting since impacts and social license controversies are most important at the local level.

but are not revealing them. BHP Billiton's website features a case study of its fracturing operations, written to the *Disclosing the Facts* scorecard outline and addressing investor concerns in a concise, readily accessible manner.

- Hess, Apache, Noble Energy, and CONSOL Energy comprise a core of disclosure leadership companies outpacing the rest of the industry, with Southwestern Energy, Anadarko Petroleum, QEP Resources, and EQT slightly behind.** Hess, Apache, and Noble built on their leadership positions from 2014, disclosing information for about half of the scorecard indicators. CONSOL nearly quadrupled its 2014 score, largely by securing third-party certification for compliance with the best practice standards of the Center for Sustainable Shale Development (CSSD). Many of its standards match scorecard practices. Southwestern Energy, following in BHP Billiton's path, moved from near the bottom of the scorecard to join the leadership group. The company accomplished this leap by incorporating the scorecard in the development of its inaugural corporate sustainability report. By nearly doubling its score in 2015, Anadarko narrowed its gap with the leaders. QEP Resources, like Southwestern Energy, significantly improved its score, moving up from near the bottom of the industry in 2014. EQT's score dropped slightly from 2014 but the company remains ahead of most of the industry.
- Most of the industry—70 percent of the companies assessed—continue to leave investors substantially in the dark about their policies, practices, and impacts, especially on a quantitative play-by-play basis.** These companies disclose from zero to 28% on the scorecard indicators. Some companies that scaled back on reporting, or failed to update their disclosures, lost points. Some companies have good quantitative disclosures for individual shale plays, or informative narrative disclosures across their entire operations, but fail to provide sufficient, quantitative, play-by-play disclosure for each of their major plays. Carrizo Oil & Gas, Continental Resources, and Whiting Petroleum are the lowest scorers, with Carrizo earning zero points.
- Broad policies, not play-by-play quantitative performance metrics, remain the most commonly reported indicators.** The scorecard includes a mix of quantitative indicators and non-quantitative best practice indicators. Since the initial scorecard in 2013, scores have increased by five or more points on about 40% of the original indicators, primarily the non-quantitative ones. The five most widely reported indicators include: substituting pipelines for trucks to transport water for fracturing (23 companies); declaring a practice to use non-potable water instead of fresh water for fracturing whenever feasible (19 companies); avoiding use of diesel fuel in hydraulic fracturing fluids (16 companies); relying on independent third-party databases to screen potential contractors (16 companies); and linking compensation of senior management to health, safety, and environment metrics (15 companies). The three most significant scoring changes on indicators between 2014 and 2015 were for: play-by-play reporting of the types of water sources used for fracturing activities (from 1 to 6 companies); percentages of wastewater reused for fracturing (from 2 to 7); and addressing naturally occurring radioactive materials (NORMs) (from 6 to 12).

## CONCLUSIONS

The rising scores of leadership companies, a trend that began with the second edition of *Disclosing the Facts* in 2014, show that, at least for a segment of the oil and gas industry, the scorecard is having its desired effect of triggering a "race to the top" in improved disclosure.

As the scoring leader, BHP Billiton has demonstrated that companies can tell their story concisely and in a fashion readily accessible to investors and other stakeholders. Such information is critical to investors who seek clear data on which to base investment decisions, especially in an industry that is facing tremendous challenges, including the most basic challenge of retaining a social license to operate. Through this scorecard, investors seek to encourage the entire industry to implement current best management practices, to report on those practices, and to provide quantitative indicators of success in reducing impacts.

While significant improvement in reporting has been seen in a handful of companies, 70 percent of the companies assessed still score below 28 percent on scorecard indicators. Companies continue to miss opportunities to address issues of public concern that feature prominently in media reports and activist advocacy critical of the industry. These issues include, for example, use of diesel fuel in fracturing fluids, radioactive waste, and induced seismicity (earthquakes). Diesel fuel does not appear to be widely used in fracturing fluids, yet many companies are silent on whether they have a policy to avoid it. Naturally occurring radioactive material waste has surfaced as an issue, especially in Pennsylvania and North Dakota, but few companies discuss straightforward procedures for reducing radioactivity risks. Additionally, while companies increasingly acknowledge induced seismicity as a risk, they often fail to discuss the specific steps they are taking to manage the hazard.

The failure of the majority of the largest oil and gas companies to either adopt current best management practices or to report on their adoption is a continuing challenge requiring ongoing engagement by investors.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Companies should report data associated with their operational impacts using quantitative metrics, on a play-by-play basis, in order for investors to be able to rigorously assess company practices. In particular:

1. Companies should disclose their leak detection and repair programs for methane emissions, providing information on program scope (percentage of facilities/assets covered), technologies deployed, frequency of inspection, and results.
2. Companies should develop systems to track community concerns and corporate responses and provide such information to senior management, corporate boards of directors, investors, and other stakeholders.
3. Companies not using diesel or BTEX chemicals in their fracturing fluids should disclose this, and companies not relying on their own toxicity scoring systems should draw on those of their principal chemical suppliers to report progress in reducing toxicity of fracturing fluids.

## SCORECARD

(Out Of 39 Possible Points\*)

### COMPANY

2015 SCORE 2014 SCORE

COMPANY	2015 SCORE	2014 SCORE
<b>BHP Billiton, Ltd. (BHP)</b>	<b>32</b>	18
<b>Hess Corp. (HES)</b>	<b>21</b>	17
<b>Apache Corp. (APA)</b>	<b>20</b>	13
<b>CONSOL Energy, Inc. (CNX)</b>	<b>19</b>	5
<b>Noble Energy, Inc. (NBL)</b>	<b>19</b>	13
<b>Southwestern Energy Co. (SWN)</b>	<b>16</b>	2
<b>Anadarko Petroleum Corp. (APC)</b>	<b>15</b>	8
<b>QEP Resources, Inc. (QEP)</b>	<b>15</b>	1
<b>EQT Corp. (EQT)</b>	<b>14</b>	16
<b>ConocoPhillips Corp. (COP)</b>	<b>11</b>	5
<b>Range Resources Corp. (RRC)</b>	<b>11</b>	9
<b>Royal Dutch Shell plc (RDS)</b>	<b>11</b>	9
<b>Occidental Petroleum Corp. (OXY)</b>	<b>10</b>	7
<b>Penn Virginia Corp. (PVA)</b>	<b>10</b>	9
<b>BP plc (BP)</b>	<b>8</b>	6
<b>Cabot Oil &amp; Gas Corp. (COG)</b>	<b>8</b>	8
<b>Encana Corp. (ECA)</b>	<b>8</b>	15
<b>EOG Resources, Inc. (EOG)</b>	<b>8</b>	9
<b>Devon Energy Corp. (DVN)</b>	<b>7</b>	5
<b>Exco Resources, Inc. (XCO)</b>	<b>7</b>	7
<b>Newfield Exploration Co. (NFX)</b>	<b>6</b>	4
<b>Chesapeake Energy Corp. (CHK)</b>	<b>4</b>	7
<b>Chevron Corp. (CVX)</b>	<b>4</b>	6
<b>Exxon Mobil Corp. (XOM)</b>	<b>4</b>	5
<b>Pioneer Natural Resources** (PXD)</b>	<b>3</b>	–
<b>Ultra Petroleum Corp. (UPL)</b>	<b>3</b>	9
<b>WPX Energy, Inc. (WPX)</b>	<b>3</b>	3
<b>Continental Resources, Inc. (CLR)</b>	<b>2</b>	0
<b>Whiting Petroleum Corp. (WLL)</b>	<b>2</b>	3
<b>Carrizo Oil &amp; Gas, Inc. (CRZO)</b>	<b>0</b>	0

\* 2014 had a total of 35 possible points.

\*\* For the 2015 scorecard, Pioneer Natural Resources was substituted for Talisman Energy, Inc., which was acquired by Repsol, S.A.

4. Naturally occurring radioactive material waste has been a high-profile issue, especially in Pennsylvania and North Dakota. Companies operating in those states in particular should disclose what steps, if any, they take to measure, track, and assure appropriate disposal of contaminated materials.
5. Seismicity has been a high-profile issue in Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, and Ohio. Companies operating in those states in particular should disclose what steps they take, consistent with and beyond applicable state regulations, to reduce the risk of inducing seismic events, including implementing precautionary practices for their own drilling, completion, and disposal operations and assuring sound practices by their waste disposal contractors.
6. Companies should employ a wide range of tools for avoiding groundwater contamination, including assessing and monitoring adjacent wells, identifying existing faults and fractures, and testing ground water before and after drilling to further reduce the potential for contamination and to detect and remedy any contamination that does occur.

In addition to enhancing their reporting,

7. Companies should link executive compensation to corporate performance on health, safety, and environmental indicators, and should incorporate metrics beyond the injury and spill data which are most commonly relied on in such linked compensation systems. Additional metrics might include, for example, measures to reduce companies' environmental impact, such as implementation of leak detection and repair programs and progress towards greenhouse gas reduction goals.
8. Government agencies and the oil and gas industry should work together to develop more systematic research and data on the human health effects (including worker health) of hydraulic fracturing operations. This might follow the model of the U.S. government and the automobile industry agreeing on creation of the Health Effects Institute to produce credible, broadly accepted research on the health effects of air pollution.




IMAGE: U.S. Energy Information Administration

Source: U.S. Energy Information Administration based on data from various published studies.  
 Updated: April 13, 2015

**A COLLABORATIVE PROJECT OF:**



1611 Telegraph Ave., Ste. 1450 · Oakland, CA 94612 · 510.735.8158

[www.asyousow.org](http://www.asyousow.org)



84 State St., Ste. 940 · Boston, MA 02109 · 617.720.5557

[www.bostoncommonasset.com](http://www.bostoncommonasset.com)



201 Park Washington Court · Falls Church, VA 22046 · 703.532.2929

[www.iehn.org](http://www.iehn.org)