

Roseacre Wood Community Liaison Group

Meeting: Tenth meeting Wednesday 25th February 2015

Venue: Boys Brigade Hall, Carr Lane, Treales, PR4 3SS

Time: 7.00 – 9.30 pm.

Attendees:

Heather Speak (HS) Chair
 Angela Livesley (AL)
 Jane Barnes (JB)
 Gordon Smith (GS)
 Barbara Richardson (BR)
 Jacqui Stapleton (JS)
 Nigel Smith (NS)
 Bob Haresceugh (BH)
 Paul Hayhurst (PH)
 Elizabeth Warner (EW)

Sam Schofield (SS) Cuadrilla, Lancashire Communications & Public Affairs
 Manager
 James Adam (JA) Cuadrilla, Bowland Project Delivery Manager
 Leon Jennings (LJ) Cuadrilla, HSSE Director
 Mark Kerr Secretariat, PPS Group

In attendance:

Paul Entwhistle (PE)
 Joe Hamilton (JH)

<i>Item</i>	<i>Action</i>
<p>1.0 Apologies</p> <p>Apologies were reported from: Mark Reed, Joyce Stuart, Liz Oades and Peter Marquis</p> <p>2.0 Minutes of previous meeting</p> <p>The minutes from the previous meeting on January 14th 2015 were approved subject to GS requesting the following addition:</p> <p><u>ANPR/traffic management:</u> In response to a question from GS, JA explained that ANPR would not be included in the traffic management plan because it was not Cuadrilla's preferred method of managing traffic. GS asked for the rationale behind that decision and JA commented that the traffic management plan would explain what was proposed and that there was no obligation to explain why other possible traffic management methods had not been included.</p> <p>It was agreed to park the issue until the traffic management plan was submitted at which time its contents could be discussed in more detail.</p>	

3.0 Matters arising

- 1.0 Item 3: Community benefit, p.2: NS confirmed that he had not yet provided a draft letter for the Secretariat to send to Alan Oldfield, Chief Executive, FBC requesting assistance in considering options for administering any community benefit payments.

This item was carried over to the next meeting.

2.0 Item 3: Monitoring array sites, p.2: Following a question from GS about air monitorin, as agreed the recent response to BR had been circulated to CLG members.

3.0 Item 5: Community Update; Flow-back rates, p.3:

JA explained that successful shale gas plays in North America were characterized by low, average (10-40%) flow back volumes. If the Bowland Shale play was successful it was expected to have similar low flow back volumes. The amount of daily flow back is controlled by the operator by controlling the volume of fluid flow at the well head.

In response to a question from GS asking what assumptions had been made to justify the 40% flow-back rate, JA confirmed he had already received a detailed response.

In a discussion the following points were made:

- JA said that a 40% flow-back rate had been submitted to the EA and that the 70% flow-back rates quoted from Preese Hall had been as a result of additional activities, i.e. “killing”and “swabbing”, and that these activities were not planned.
- In response to a question from PE, JA said that the operator controlled the flow-back rate at the well head and that the rate determined the level of waste leaving the site. By curtailing the flow-back rate on-site, waste storage and traffic movements can be controlled to ensure compliance with any planning conditions, e.g.traffic movements.
- EW commented that given that the Preese Hall flow-back rates had not been anticipated, why had the possibility of up to 70% flow-back rates not be replicated in relation to RW. JA agreed to provide a response to this.
- PE asked how many wells operated at a 70% flow-back rate? JA commented that only Preese Hall had been fracked in the UK in recent years and JA added that typical flow-back rates in the USA were 10-40%. EW questioned the relevance of this given that the geology was not comparable.
- BR opined that the UK Government considered that 25-75% flow-back rates should apply with the higher end being a worst case. JA stated that 10-40% was the range being applied by Cuadrilla and approved by the EA.
- GS stated that the EA says “up to 80%” whereas UKOOG claims “25%” and HS commented that flow-back volumes were a significant concern.
- BR observed that flow-back rates would be an issue for the life of the site all the more so during the production phase. SS commented that the level of flow-back would be a factor in the viability of field production – very high flow-back rates would make production less

Include on agenda for 16/4 meeting

JA to provide response

likely.

- In response to questions from HS and PE, JA explained that there would be 300m² of temporary storage for fresh water. In addition, there would be the 675m² on-site storage facility for flow-back water which would take c.8-10 days to fill.
- JA confirmed that fracking fluids comprised 99.95% water and sand and 0.05% polyacrylamide as a friction reducer. LJ added that hydrochloric acid at 10% dilution was used to help clear the cement from the well and was classified non-hazardous.
- JA added that no additional chemicals would be used during production and that all fracking fluids had to be declared to the EA and were detailed on Cuadrilla's website.
- BR asked why more chemicals are used elsewhere in the world and SS stated that the common claim by some opponents of shale gas that "600 chemicals used in fracking" does not reflect current practice in the shale industry where the use of water, sand and a friction reducer are the norm. He added that applications would have to be made to the EA for any other chemicals and that they would have to be non-hazardous.

1.0 Item 5: Community Update: Community benefit, p.3:

UKOOG's "Community Engagement Charter: Oil and Gas from unconventional reservoirs" detailing the industry's community benefits package had been circulated in advance of the meeting.

Item 4.0 The purpose of the CLG

Following a brief discussion it was agreed that the Secretariat would re-circulate the CLG's Terms of Reference.

Item 5.0

A) Cuadrilla preferred route

JA clarified the process by explaining that LCC had requested a traffic management plan on 11 December but that comments on the proposal from the Highways Officer had not been received until 21 December. LCC planning officers' report on 21 January had identified concerns about the proposed route so an alternative route was identified (inbound through Broughton and outbound through Clifton, halving the traffic through Clifton/Dagger Lane). However, JA confirmed that the original route remains Cuadrilla's preferred route.

Following the alternative route suggestion LCC would be requesting additional information from Cuadrilla in order to undertake a Reg 22 consultation exercise. Although LCC's request had not yet been received, it was anticipated that the additional information would include data on traffic, ecology, and noise modelling and attenuation proposals.

JA commented that Cuadrilla's traffic management plan would reiterate the original route as preferred but include safety audits of the Broughton route as an alternative.

Secretariat to circulate ToR

HS commented that Canal Bridge was not a suitable route and questioned why traffic through Elswick could not be considered as a serious option as it is the shortest route. JS supported HS and added that the Elswick route was 6 miles shorter. She added that since the Clifton route had been suggested 55 additional houses had been granted planning permission.

JA commented that the original proposed route was still Cuadrilla's preferred route and only one alternative (the Broughton route) was being looked at. He added that 11 potential routes, including the Elswick route, had been considered and explained at the public information events.

NS suggested that the options should be revisited even if the Broughton route was approved because it is not supported by the community.

SS observed that the preferred route allowed use of Inskip for HGV traffic unlike using the Elswick route. EW commented that traffic issues, unlike geology and EA factors, had not been sufficiently taken into account in Cuadrilla's site selection as every route to RW was a problem.

HS asked about consultation on the Broughton route and JA confirmed this was LCC's responsibility and that an advert would appear in the local press but that he understood that LCC would also be making direct contact with residents along the route.

PE questioned the process by which Cuadrilla sought to defer LCC's consideration of the applications. He also claimed that LCC was waiting for Cuadrilla to supply the additional data on traffic routes (not Cuadrilla waiting for a request from LCC) and that Cuadrilla was dragging its feet putting into doubt any prospect of a determination by LCC on 17 April. JH confirmed that he shared PE's view.

JA commented that this was not the case and that Cuadrilla had submitted a paper requesting a deferral in order that additional information could be supplied to support its case as quickly as possible, 2 days after first seeing the planning officers' report.

PE commented that he would seek confirmation of this from LCC.

JA added that under the Reg 22 requirements a minimum of a 21 day consultation was required for LCC to consider responses received but that it had not set any dates for this process. He added that LCC's request to Cuadrilla for an extension to the determination timetable had been made to 30 April.

GS considered it abnormal for an applicant like Cuadrilla to take these steps but JA countered by saying that LCC had requested additional information on noise, traffic and ecology.

B) Scheme assumptions

JA confirmed that the only changes to the planning applications submitted were for additional proposals in relation to noise attenuation measures and a possible alternative traffic route.

JA responded to a question from HS about increased landscaping by explaining that the existing proposals already included mesh fences with landscaping barriers to the same height of 4m. But that second level of solid walls for noise attenuation was located closer to the rig (7-10 m away). Following a comment from CPRE the rig and the noise attenuation measures could be coloured to blend in with the surroundings.

BH asked if consideration had been given to utilising noise cancelling devices in the closest properties. PE commented that the real need was to stop the noise at source.

GS observed that the LCC Officers report had mentioned the use of a smaller rig with reduced average fracking fluid levels and fewer fracking stages. JA commented that no changes were proposed in this regard to the application, although it may be possible to use a smaller 35m rig depending on availability and commercial arrangements.

In response to a question from BR about both sites using the same rig, JA commented that the rig could be moved between sites after each well had been drilled.

6. Feedback from the experience of CLG members to date

PE commented about the intrusion caused by security around the RW site and the media interest generated.

7. Programme update:

Preese Hall: JA confirmed that restoration works were awaiting improved weather conditions and would be completed by the end of April.

Singleton: JA confirmed that permission to extend the existing permission had been refused but Cuadrilla was waiting to receive the formal reasons for refusal from LCC.

LCC's determination timetable for RW and PNR: JA explained that LCC had not decided on any new dates as a consequence of its decision to defer determination but that the timing to accommodate an extension until 30 April already looked unachievable.

8. Community Update:

No additional issues were raised.

Item 9 – AOB

Groundwater protection zones: PE asked about the effect of the EA's ground protection zones and whether RW was in zones 1-3. LJ explained that neither RW or PNR were in zones 1-3 and if they had been the EA would not have approved the permits. He added that Cuadrilla was aware of potential legislative change in this regard but were awaiting details of the secondary legislation required which was not expected until after the General Election.

Community benefit: SS confirmed that Cuadrilla had approved the principle of providing some legal support to the CLG so that progress could be made in determining a process for distributing any community benefit monies in planning permission was granted.

Item 10 – Date of next meeting

The date of the next meeting was agreed:

Thursday 16th April at 7.00 pm, Boys Brigade Hall, Carr Lane, Treales, PR4
