



Farmington Community Working Group Summary Notes

Date: Nov. 13, 2018

In Attendance: Director Len Hiebert Area D, Peace River Regional District
James O'Hanley, Vice President, Applications, BC Oil and Gas Commission
Dean Zimmer, Executive Director, Permit Adjudication, 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
Barry Critcher, Community Member
Pat and Jim Strasky, Community Member
Kim and Rod Strasky, Community Member

Summary of Discussion:

Maria Reschke opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and introducing Dean Zimmer, Executive Director, Permit Adjudication and James O'Hanley, Vice President, Applications to the Farmington Community Working Group (FCWG).

Maria provided a brief overview of the Noise Order and noted the noise controls for operations in the Farmington area became effective today. Community members asked why the Order was restricted to the Farmington area and it was explained the BC Oil and Gas Commission (Commission) recognized the more immediate need in the Farmington area. The Order also provides the opportunity to test out the noise requirements within a specific area.

When asked if active operations must comply with the Order it was confirmed, as per Section B of the Order, active operations are required to develop a Noise Mitigation Plan. James O'Hanley explained how the Commission arrived at the 800 meter distance and stated as of today three applications had been submitted to the Commission using the new Noise Mitigation Plan. Director Hiebert commented on conversations he is having with industry about how they are working to find creative solutions and rethinking how they set up their sites to reduce noise impacts.

Since discussions on Consultation and Notification were not finalized at the last meeting, Maria asked the FCWG if we could revisit what was documented to make sure what we had captured was correct. The FCWG agreed the list was mostly complete but we could strengthen the language regarding interactions the Commission has with land

owners when they relay concerns on a proposed site and how this should be part of the Commission's application determinations.

Other recommendations put forward:

- Make the Written Submission forms easier for the land owner to find and make it clear where the Submission is going.
- Land owners should get to see a summary of their concerns before they are being sent to the company/Commission as their conversations are usually just with a land agent.
- The Commission should be having contact with the land owner before a permit is issued.

James O'Hanley gave a description of the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) Delegation Agreement and how determinations are made. He explained as listed in appendix 1 of the Agreement what applications the BC Oil and Gas Commission makes decisions on, which decisions are made by the ALC and what activities are exempt from required non-farm use approval. This conversation initiated multiple concerns regarding Schedules A and B and what the requirements are from industry and the Commission. The FCWG stated they are not getting copies of Schedules A and B and if done they are not done properly.

Concerns and

Recommendations: The FCWG began discussing the ALC Agreement and worked on the following concerns and recommendations:

Concerns	Recommendations
• Land is not being reclaimed in Schedule B	
• Concerned with the level of schedule B being done	• Commission to reconsider standards for Schedule B
• Schedule B not being done in a timely manner as stated in the Oil and Gas Activity Operations Manual	• Schedule B needs to be done by a specialist and with the time frame as stated in the Oil and Gas Activity Operations Manual
• Schedule B not being done properly, and no one comes out to review	• Follow up on qualifications of agrologists, etc.
• Poor location, inconvenience to landowner	• Lease in the best location as per the agreement
• Schedules A and B not being shared with the landowners	• Copies of Schedules A & B need to be sent to the land owners
	• Put responsibility on the company to prove quality of their work (ie crop loss)
	• Soil handling in delegation agreement update

Next Steps:

Before the meeting closed we were able to discuss future meetings and when it would be appropriate to have industry join us. Not all community members feel they are ready to meet with industry and would rather work through a few more topics and experience

some tangible results on the land before sitting down with them. It was agreed we would meet again in early December to finish up some topic discussions and decide what to present to industry. The tentative plan is to invite industry in for the January meeting.

Next Meeting: Dec. 11, 2018