

## **Headline Notes of the Joint Meeting of the Springs Road and Tinker Lane CLG's held on 11<sup>th</sup> February 2016**

Tony Roberts, acting as Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Representatives from the Environment Agency and the Health and Safety Executive were present to talk about their work.

Andy Barker and Greg Broughton from the Environment Agency showed a short film and followed this up with a presentation.

Tony Almond and Trevor Sexty from the Health and Safety Executive then gave a presentation on their role.

They mentioned that there was to be an event held in the Misson Village Hall the following day (Friday 12<sup>th</sup> February) at which other regulators, including the Oil and Gas Authority, Notts County Council planners and Public Health England would be present to answer questions. They urged members of the CLG to attend this event.

They then took questions from the group.

Wil asked how often companies reported to the regulators? It was explained that during production there would not be an expectation to report regularly, but if anything different was being done then, yes, there would be an expectation that companies would report regularly to the regulators.

It was further explained that during exploration drilling companies must report to the HSE weekly. Any unplanned activity or event must be reported to the HSE also.

Richard asked how independent are the Independent Well Examiners? The response was that although they are paid by the operator, they must be separate. They cannot be involved in the design, construction or operation of the well and in regard to onshore drilling, they cannot be part of the same company.

Pete Marsden asked where all the HSE and EA files were stored – where is all that information held at the end of the life of the well? In the case of the Environment Agency the files are held within the EA offices. The HSE files are kept by the operators but are audited.

Kevin asked how long they are kept after abandonment? They are kept by the HSE for 6 years and by the EA for 7 years (after being held by the Independent Well Examiner for 6 months.) Any data on breaches will also be kept for 7 years.

Tony Roberts asked if this documentation is in the public domain? Tony Almond replied that if it relates to a notice of improvement or stoppage then yes, it is public.

The regulators were asked whether they rely on data sent, or whether visits are also made? They replied that visits are generally held jointly and not unannounced. However the EA will carry out unannounced visits as well. On being asked how often they would visit they replied that it would depend on the risk at the time – if the risk was low (ie during production) visits would reflect this.

Richard asked if the regulators could give any examples of any action taken which would boost the confidence of the group? Andrew spoke about a case in recent months where Severn Trent were fined £3 million for permit breaches. He explained that environmental crime attracts huge sanctions and can lead to custodial sentences.

Jayne asked how many breaches there had been in the industry. As the industry is new there have been no breaches, but in the conventional onshore industry very few as the risk is low.

The regulators went on to explain that they are happy with the processes and regulations which are in existence during the exploration phase of shale drilling. Jayne suggested that the regulators are transposing old regulations from offshore to onshore and being reactive rather than proactive. The regulators pointed out that they do not have regulatory powers offshore, but they are using well tested, onshore regulations. They feel that they do not need new regulations.

Tony then stated that he felt that the concerns within the CLG are that the regulations are fit for purpose and how they as a group can monitor that the regulators are doing their job. He mentioned Daneshill as an example of where regulation didn't work and stated that he is not convinced by what he is hearing presently. He then asked how the regulators enforce when data requested is not forthcoming?

Rob Boeuf asked whether the regulators took any action at Preese Hall following the seismic event. The regulators explained that this was an issue of seismicity, which is dealt with by The Oil and Gas Authority (formerly DECC.) They pointed out that the EA and HSE regulations were met at that site.

Julie Barlow of IGas stated that the EA and industry have recently consulted on a new document for technical expertise which includes shale specifically. This is aimed at industry.

Andrew of the EA pointed out that they are currently carrying out a re-permitting exercise for all current sites, even though they feel they are all low risk.

Tony of the HSE pointed out that all of their activity is aimed at stopping operators working in an unsafe environment – it is not about booking them when wrongdoing, more about ensuring things are done properly in the first place.

Tony Roberts asked whether the regulators could let Rhonda know that data requested on the IGas sites had been submitted and is acceptable? That would give the community comfort that IGas were adhering to the rules. Bob suggested that this information could be made available on the website?

Whilst the HSE said that this was outside their gift but would ask, the EA stated that they could keep the CLG updated regularly as to IGas's compliance and then CLG members can upload to their various websites. This was agreed.

Bev asked how the agencies were going to cope with the increase in workload following the 14<sup>th</sup> round awards? Did they have enough staff?

Andrew stated that the EA will not expand its numbers. Tony from the HSE stated that they are looking to recruit and add to the team, there are already 10 well specialists with a further 5 in training (which takes 3 years.)

Bev then asked who would be responsible for monitoring decommissioned wells – say 60 years down the line. Tony answered that the regulators would make sure the well was plugged and abandoned properly.

It was pointed out that if the industry does take off then the income from permits will increase, allowing further recruitment. However, Andrew explained that the EA already has 50 people working on onshore oil and gas and 30 of these have been moved to work on shale.

Peter Edwards then spoke about the Prof Smythe report, stating that he had heard 2 polarised views about geology and was left not knowing who to believe. IGas have 3d data and Prof Smythe has historical 2d data. He wants assurances that the concerns are taken into account.

Tony from the HSE said that the OGA (Oil and Gas Authority) would not approve plans if the geology was not appropriate. Both the HSE and OGA are provided with schematics of the well and geological information, including 3d data and have an input.

At this point Andrew urged people to come to the event in Misson the following day, as representatives from the OGA would be there to answer questions on seismicity. He also went on to explain the traffic light system which is in place to make sure there are no problems with seismicity.

Christie explained that Torworth lies within a mile of Tinker Lane. They have a known fault in this area and Ranskill has had a sinkhole. Residents are concerned that IGas have not carried out 3d seismic.

This application is for a vertical well only at this stage and Julie explained that if IGas wanted to frack then they would carry out 3d seismic studies. She also pointed out that there is a lot of 2d seismic and some historical 3d data for the area.

Jayne asked why so much emphasis is put on 3d seismic data at Springs Road? Julie explained that this is necessary to look for faults and to assess the geology of the area. Tony from the HSE stated that 3d data also helps to identify pockets of gas, not just for faults.

Julie asked to point out at this stage that the slide showing the permits was a catch all to show how heavily regulated the industry is. We will not require all of these permits all of the time.

Peter Thompson asked who decides what is an acceptable standard – it seems like they are decided by the industry or are reactive?

After clarifying that Peter was referring to methane leakage, the HSE stated that any methane release is reportable by law, even using equipment to prevent a leak is reportable. There is no allowance for fugitive emissions – the level is zero.

Peter then pointed out that at Daneshill (which was an old munitions site) the well was drilled and then abandoned – why? Julie stated that it was an exploration well, drilled purely to obtain geological cores and then it was plugged and abandoned as planned. Asked why a company would do that she explained that this is normal practice to gather data.

Rob pointed out that regulations are agreed with IGas, but then contractors are employed to carry out the work. How can people be sure that what has been agreed is put into practice?

Tony said that the HSE speak to both IGas and Contractors. There must be a clear hierarchy – someone will be responsible for anyone on the site to make sure they are competent and carry out their roles appropriately.

Tony Roberts said that any business would make sure things are done properly, that is only good business practice.

The HSE would check competencies and ensure that a company representative is on site 24 hrs a day. This is always the case.

Peter Edwards pointed out that Misson Springs was a bombing site and so there will be munitions. A conversation then took place around this but it was pointed out that the Regulation 22 letter asks for further information about this topic so it will be addressed further.

Christie expressed surprise that the planning application does not ask for land use history. Andrew replied that it is in the planning regulations and the EA would consider former land use.

Tony thanked the representatives for attending and expressed hope that the CLG will be kept informed of events in the future.

3 Minute of last meeting – Springs Road was accepted

4 Minute of last meeting – Tinker Lane was accepted

5 Matters arising  
**Springs Road**

Rhonda reported that IGas had looked into the issue of the fatality on the Springs Road level crossing being omitted from the transport assessment. The statistic had not been present in the Department for Transport records, although it was recorded by Network Rail.

Rhonda reported that the Regulations 22 letter had now been received and would be uploaded to the Springs Road website soon. Effectively the clock stops now until IGas can provide the necessary information.

With regard to the Misterton 1 well abandonment, discussions are ongoing with the landowner regarding access to carry out this works. A meeting is scheduled.

**Tinker Lane**

Rhonda reported that the response to the scoping report had been received and the planning application and EIA was being prepared by IGas.

In response to Cllr Yates question regarding the groundwater monitoring boreholes data, Rhonda reported that once a baseline had been established, the data would be made public.

Rhonda explained that there was a meeting scheduled the following day to agree potential dates for the drop in sessions and would report back following this.

Christie asked about dates for the Doe Green visit – Rhonda to follow up on this.

6 Any Other Business

Jayne Watson reported that the results of a recent survey in Misson Parish showed that 87% of the population were against, 4% for and 9% undecided. A petition containing 363 signatures has been given to Cllr Yates and will be given to the County Council on the 25<sup>th</sup> Feb.

7 Dates of next meetings

Tinker Lane will meet at 7pm on the 25<sup>th</sup> February, with Jayne Watson as guest speaker.

A further Tinker Lane CLG will be held on Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> March at Lound Village Hall with representatives from Nottinghamshire County Council planners in attendance

Springs Road will meet on Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> March to discuss the Regulation 22 response. They will meet in the Bawtry New Hall at 7.15 pm (venue to be confirmed.)

In attendance	
Christie Willis	Torworth
Rob Boeuf	Sutton
Sandra Crawford	Austerfield
Alexander Young	Bawtry
Kevin Senior	Beckingham
Will Bedford	Finningley
Richard Johnson	Finningley and Blaxton
George Fiddler	Haxey
Bob Kendall	Mattersey
Tony Roberts	Mattersey
Bev Fullwood	Mattersey
Peter Edwards	Misson
Jayne Watson	Misson
Peter Marsden	Misterton
Andy Howard	Babworth
Peter Thompson	Blyth
Carole Thompson	Blyth
Sharon Dyson	Sutton
James Helliwell	Torworth