27.07.2018

gLAWcal #295 Comment #295

THREE OUTCOMES FOR REGUALT-ING FRACKING FLUID

Based on

Paolo Davide Farah and Riccardo Tremolada" A Comparison between Shale Gas in China and Unconventional Fuel Development in the United States" Brooklyn Journal of International Law, Vol. 41, No. 2, 2016.



A gLAWcal comment on Paolo Davide Farah and Riccardo Tremolada" A Comparison between Shale Gas in China and Unconventional Fuel Development in the United States: Water, Environmental Protection, and Sustainable Development" Brooklyn Journal of International Law, Vol. 41, No. 2, 2016.

While not a unique scenario, concern for the environment during resource extraction is heightened during shale gas extraction. This may be for a greater modern societal emphasis that requires considering and balancing both the environment and the effort required to obtain the resource. Hydraulic fracturing requires a large amount of freshwater be used with additives to be effective in resource extraction. As the author notes, there are three outcomes for this fracking fluid: (1) it can be extracted, recycled, and used again; (2) it can be left inside of the shale deposit; or (3) it can be extracted and stored on or off site or treated for other uses. These three potential outcomes present three very different regulatory burdens for those overseeing the fracking industry. While the first outcome is the ideal one, especially in areas in which freshwater resources are scarce, there are still burdens on regulation of the recycling and treatment practices. The chapter suggests that mine drainage from coal extraction could replace the freshwater requirements for fluid. However, it is to be used with caution as the acceptability of mine drainage may be increased if it has a specific use in another resource extraction industry. It could certainly be effective in the short-term, reducing the mine drainage that ends up in other water sources. But again, it is important to note that it would often be better for regulatory bodies to not give preference to methods of resource extraction that has a measurably negative impact on the environment.



Cite as: gLAWcal Comment #295 "Three outcomes for regualting fracking fluid" (2018) based on Paolo Davide Farah and Riccardo Tremolada" A Comparison between Shale Gas in China and Unconventional Fuel Development in the United States: Water, Environmental Protection, and Sustainable Development" Brooklyn Journal of International Law, Vol. 41, No. 2, 2016. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=2802157

The gLAWcal comments are insight and short analytical pieces written by the gLAWcal team. The gLAWcal comments are based on, and inspired by, the books and chapters published within one of the gLAWcal book series published by Routledge Publishing (New York/London) or by other gLAWcal publications.

gLAWcal is an independent non-profit research organization (think tank) that aims at providing a new focus on issues related to economic law, globalization and development, namely the relationship between international economy and trade, with special attention to a number of non-trade-related values and concerns. Through research and policy analysis, gLAWcal sheds a new light on issues such as good governance, human rights, right to water, rights to food, social, economic and cultural rights, labour rights, access to knowledge, public health, social welfare, consumer interests and animal welfare, climate change, energy, environmental protection and sustainable development, product safety, food safety and security.

OUR MISSION

To collaborate with Government, Civil society and business community to balance the excess of globalization with Non Trade Concerns.



To influence policymakers, to raise awareness over Non Trade Concerns, to encourage stakeholder participation, and to disseminate gLAWcal's publication results.



Email: research@glawcal.org.uk

Website: glawcal.org.uk

Facebook: gLAWcal - Global Law Initiatives for

Sustainable Development

Twitter: @gLAWcal LinkedIn: gLAWcal