



Farmington Community Working Group Summary Notes

Date: Oct. 16, 2018

In Attendance: Director Len Hiebert Area D, Peace River Regional District
Crystal Brown, Electoral Area Manager, Peace River Regional District
Sara Dickinson, Executive Director, Permit Adjudication, BC Oil and Gas Commission
Corey Jonsson, Director, Stakeholder Relations, BC Oil and Gas Commission
Maria Reschke, Manager, Stakeholder Relations, Public Working Groups, BCOGC
Laura-Lea Gibson, Community Relations Assistant, Public Working Groups, BCOGC
Hugh Craig, Community Member
Toby Handfield, Community Member
Corey Quinton, Community Member
Pat Strasky, Community Member
Kim Strasky, Community Member

Summary of Discussion:

Peace River Regional District (PRRD) Director Hiebert opened the meeting, and welcomed everyone. Director Hiebert started the meeting talking about the draft noise order and the new noise guidelines to be completed in the future. He has had conversations with Encana regarding changes to the guidelines and what measures they are taking to eliminate noise levels. Director Hiebert reported back on the presentation he made at the Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission conference in Coeur d'Alene, Idaho. He learnt other jurisdictions are experiencing similar difficulties with noise, with no resolution yet found to address it.

Maria Reschke also gave an update on when the noise guidelines are to be out and a few examples of what we can expect to see in the guidelines. Maria also noted the new seismic station on Kim and Rod Strasky's land and the erosion issue currently being investigated by Ken McLean also on the Strasky's land. The BC Oil and Gas Commission (Commission) will be making a donation to the Farmington Community Hall for allowing the working group to use the hall for its meetings.

Sara Dickinson gave an outline of the review process undertaken prior to decisions being made on applications submitted to the Commission. The outline touched briefly on considerations, beginning with the initial Consultation and Notification

process and engagement with First Nations. She provided an overview of the documentation companies are required to upload into the Application Management System along with a brief description of various points throughout the review process and how these impact the final decisions made on applications. Included were considerations involved in the land and habitat review, such as wildlife, old growth areas and wetlands adjacent to rivers and streams. Sara also touched on the review completed when an activity takes place within the Agricultural Land Reserve.

The community members were interested to know what happens when a company and the Commission are not in agreement on an application. Sara clarified the Commission's role is not to be in agreement with the company but to make a decision based on the information provided in the application. The company may choose to withdraw the application if it's clear that it will not be approved as submitted. Sara provided further explanation on what decisions may look like: 1) the company may be asked to revise the application for further consideration; 2) a permit may be issued with or without conditions; 3) the application may be refused and no permit issued.

From their experience with providing written submissions, community members have the sense that all permits are approved regardless of the questions and requests they include in their written submissions. Sara explained all submissions are taken into consideration when a decision is being made on an application, however; landowners may not always be directly informed of how their input has affected the final decision.

Corey Jonsson clarified the Commission does provide decision rationales when requested and asked for further input from the community members on how they would prefer this information be shared with them in the future. This led to further discussion on the role of Land Owner Liaisons who are available to meet with land owners to answer questions and provide information before, during and after a decision.

Community members asked how long a pipeline permit is valid if it has not been constructed and if an amendment to that permit means time would be reset. Commission staff recorded the question and provided the following response to the community group by email:

- A pipeline permit is valid for two years from time of issue. If construction has not begun within that time, the permit holder may apply to the Commission for an extension of up to an additional year.
- An extension can only be granted once. An amendment to a pipeline permit does not extend the expiry date – it is counted from the original permitted date.

Some discussion took place regarding the difference between permitting activity on Crown land and on private land. Community members noted while care is being

taken to protect wild animals on Crown land, domestic animals are not being given the same consideration.

Community members are concerned when a line list is submitted with an application, the Commission may not know that all concerns are accurately recorded on the line list. Sara outlined parts of the review process that include a cross-check to be sure land owner information is correct. This led to further discussion regarding the Consultation and Notification process and recommendations to alleviate this concern, including a requirement for land owners to sign off on receipt of notification.

Corey explained that land owners were consulted during the development of the Consultation and Notification Regulation. In their feedback they noted concern that signing a document could be misconstrued as acceptance of a proposal. Based on current feedback, the Commission recognizes it is time to renew the dialogue on these processes and consider changes that will work for everyone.

Concerns and

Recommendations: The community working group was able to complete most of the discussion regarding Consultation and Notification, with a few points left undiscussed. The group agreed to finalize the recommendations by email. Additional suggestions brought forward by email have been incorporated into the chart below.

CONCERNS	RECOMMENDATIONS
Information provided during C&N: • Same letter for one well is used for 14 wells. This is not an accurate reflection of a larger well pad. • Land owners receive a standard form letter with general information. • Many land owners do not know their options or what to do with the C&N letters they receive.	• Include more accurate and relevant detail in C&N letter on proposed project and require company to breakdown the work into phases with a description of the impacts of each phase, for example: ○ During this phase of the work (usually 2 - 3 weeks in length) you will see traffic increase by (number) of trucks per day. ○ Noise will increase by (decibels). ○ You will smell diesel smoke at times during the day. ○ The flare may go off at any time and be on for extended periods and the lights on the pad will be on 24/7 for the life of the wellsite. • Remove the word “temporary” and provide real time frames. • Have an updated FAQ on Commission website with information and guidance for land owners regarding what the landowners need to know and what questions to ask companies during the C&N process.

	Require C&N letters to outline resources available to land owners including Land Owner Liaison contact information and Farmer's Advocate Office.
Timeframe: 21 days is not enough time.	21 or 30 days (may need further discussion) to start after landowners have signed for C&N.
Land owner written concerns: - No value in Written Submissions. Concerns sent in by land owners are not being addressed. The Commission acknowledges the submission has been received but nothing further happens. - Company's response is as per regulations therefore Commission considers concerns to have been met. - The Commission is not hearing/recognizing submissions/all concerns from land owners.	- Have a signoff process to confirm land owners have received notification. - All concerns should go directly to the Commission and copied to company; one avenue for concerns to be documented as opposed to both written response to the company and/or written submission to the Commission. - Clarification for the Commission and land owners on responses provided by the company: When a land owner has provided a written submission, Commission reps contact land owner to review responses received from the company. This will ensure the Commission is aware of standard information used by companies to meet C&N requirements and reveal when standard answers do not alleviate the land owner's concerns. - Publish all comments received from landowners. - The Commission provide opportunity for land owners to meet and discuss how concerns raised during C&N were considered in a decision regarding activity on their land.
C&N Radius: - Impacted Landowners outside the C&N Radius are not considered. - Current radius not sufficient.	- Industry to assess sites from perspective of all land owners – consideration should be given to those within line of sight and noise impact. - Increase expansion of the radius.
Project info from company: - Land owners are not able to speak directly to the company; discussions and negotiations are with lands person. - The lands person does not always relay full or accurate information back to the company on issues raised by land owners, or the land owner's concerns may be misinterpreted. This often results in blaming the middleman for miscommunication with no resolution of the land owner's concerns.	- There should be no third party discussions regarding projects. - Land owners should be able to deal directly with the company.

Next Steps: For the next meeting, the working group agreed to discuss any final items regarding Consultation and Notification, then begin to discuss the Agriculture Land Commission Delegation Agreement.

Next Meeting: Nov. 13, 2018