



Farmington Community Working Group Summary Notes

Date: Dec. 11, 2018

In Attendance: Director Len Hiebert Area D, Peace River Regional District
Dean Zimmer, Executive Director, Permit Adjudication, BC Oil and Gas Commission
Patrick Smook, Director, Compliance & Enforcement, 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
Barry Critcher, Community Member
Pat and Jim Strasky, Community Members
Kim and Rod Strasky, Community Members
Corey Quinton, Community Member

Summary of Discussion:

Director, Len Hiebert opened the meeting, welcomed everyone and explained how he has been actively talking with industry. He will be meeting with Encana on Thursday (Dec. 13, 2018) and offered to gather questions at the end of the meeting to take back to Encana.

Maria Reschke opened the discussion by providing the status of items currently being reviewed by the Internal Working Group (IWG), a committee within the BC Oil and Gas Commission (Commission) assigned to consider recommendations brought forward by the Farmington Community Working Group (FCWG). The IWG requested additional feedback on two items.

The first item to be clarified was regarding the 21 day time frame set for land owners to respond to Consultation and Notification (C&N) letters. The FCWG stated they are not always able to retrieve their mail from rural boxes in a timely enough way to have the full advantage of the 21 days, particularly during seeding and harvest. The group suggested 30 days rather than 21.

As a second item, the group suggested a sign-off requirement to document and prove the delivery of all letters to the Commission to ensure industry is complying with C&N requirements. The group expressed a lack of trust in the information industry is

providing to them. This led to a conversation regarding the Commission finalizing the C&N to ensure land owners have a better understanding of future projects and to place responsibility for adequate engagement on the regulator.

Some additional discussion took place regarding how overwhelming it can be to manage multiple C&N letters at a time and provide responses back to industry. Adding to that burden, land owners receive notification on subsequent amendments shortly after a permit has been issued. To minimize the number of notifications, the group suggested a limit on the number of amendments issued within the first year of a permit being issued. The group also noted the instructions on how to provide a written submission to the Commission is not made very clear in C&N letters. They requested improvements be made in written submission instructions industry is required to provide to land owners.

Concerns and

Recommendations: The FCWG began discussing lighting issues and some of the concerns they are currently facing. The conversation resulted in a number of recommendations which are recorded below. The FCWG also agreed that more discussion and research with regards to lighting will need to take place before the recommendations can be completed.

Concerns	Recommendations (not complete)
Lighting not mentioned adequately in C&N.	
How/where lights shine - next door land owners not considered.	Control of lights on site, set distance (flashing lights).
Lighting affects the breeding and movement of wildlife and livestock.	
- Irregular lighting from flares. - Flashing lights on farm site, bounces off granaries. - Visual effect of reflection of flares. - Flares can be startling to land owners - fire on land.	Light dispersion modelling.
Cumulative effect of just lighting.	Regulation of lights - measurable for lumens and distance off location.
Irregular lighting and the effects on crop growth.	
Safety hazard for local traffic when lights impede vision	Consult with WorkSafeBC on measuring light.
	Leases not grandfathered in with lighting plan.

Next Steps:

The FCWG closed the evening with some discussion on meetings in the new year and the potential to have industry attend. The group was still hesitant to agree and felt they

would like to see some changes on the ground before they sit at the table with industry. Director Hiebert shared a few items regarding what he has been hearing from industry and the changes they have been making and felt it would benefit the group to hear this as well. The Commission confirmed it has also been communicating FCWG concerns to industry, who is anticipating an opportunity to sit at the table and hear community concerns directly. The final consensus was to meet again in January to discuss a few more issues and come to agreement on what they would like to discuss with industry, then have industry join the February meeting.

Meeting dates and potential agendas were set as follows:

January 15 - discuss roads and traffic

February 12 - meet with industry

March 12 - air quality/emissions