

Wressle Community Liaison Group

Meeting note

Date: Tuesday 9th November 2021

Venue: Virtual MS Teams meeting

Attendees:

Community	
Jeff Storey (JS)	Resident & Chair
Jessica Hardiment (JH)	Resident
Wayne Gammon (WG)	Resident
Louise Price (LP)	Resident
Agencies	
Howard Goulbourne (HG)	Environment Agency
Andrew Law (AL)	North Lincolnshire Council
Councillors	
Carol Ross (CR)	Broughton Town Council
Paul Tattersfield (PT)	Broughton Town Council
Egdon representatives	
Mark Abbott (MA)	MD, Egdon Resources, Egdon
Martin Durham (MD)	Technical Director, Egdon
Paul Foster (PF)	Planning consultant
Rachel Smith (RS)	Community and communications

NOTE: the following is not a verbatim report of the meeting but intended to capture the principles of the questions asked and the salient points of issues discussed.

1. Apologies

Apologies were received from Terry Howe, Helen Renshaw and Martin Brooks.

2. Update on production operations – Egdon Resources

Mark Abbott updated the group on recent activity.

MA – It is a couple of months since our last update. Oil production has been ongoing since the last meeting. There have been no H&S issues on site and we are exceeding expectation on production. We have not been able to flow test at a maximum rate as we are still using test equipment, but during September the well reached a rate of 884 barrels per day and c.0.5 million cubic feet of gas per day. The gas management is causing some issues as the installed flare is not performing as expected. The choke has been adjusted to reduce the oil flow through the separator to ensure effective incineration of the gas in the flare.

We are installing some pressure gauges next, so there might be a crane on site associated with this and a wire line truck. Modifications to the site's production facilities will include the installation of a customised new separator, bund and associated pipework. The well is free flowing and seeing strong pressure from the reservoir. We have received planning permission for a gas engine which would enable us to convert the gas to electricity and export it from the site. We are also looking at more environmentally advantageous solutions, for example, piping into the local gas grid – without having to incinerate it.

We will close the well down while we install the new production equipment, and as such there will be more people and equipment on site. We'll also be installing some insulation to the surface pipework to enable the oil to flow more easily in colder temperatures.

We're aiming, in around 6 months, to get automated systems in place to allow the site to be manned during the day only and automated for the rest of the time.

To date, we have not seen any produced water which we might expect in due course, and everything is working well and ahead of our expectations.

We understand that a question has been raised about an NGO representative going around oil and gas sites filming for methane emissions. Egdon's security guard saw somebody filming and asked them to move on as they were trespassing on the farmer's land. Subsequently the NGO reported that there was some methane seen to be coming from the degasser tank. We do monitor and record on an hourly basis and as we see how the gas is released from the oil as it decompresses. The OGA gives consent for venting etc and there is a small amount which is permitted. Egdon's emissions are within the limits of its permit.

JS ran through the question that had been received from Terry Howe: *"Could Egdon clarify why unofficial methane monitoring was barred and will Egdon be undertaking its own testing (methane)?"*.

MA: We have not barred anybody, but somebody was trespassing so they were asked to move on. The second part was to ask if we monitor emissions, and the answer is, yes we do – Egdon has a responsibility to undertake this.

There have been online pictures and footage showing this technology which picks up emissions and people had been testing it at various oil and gas sites around the country. Wressle was highlighted as having a small emission from the de-gasser tank which is normal and we do monitor it.

3. Community Fund

JS - After the last meeting (*where Egdon sought representatives for the community fund committee*) I shared some Facebook posts and again 2-3 weeks ago to try to generate interest in the fund and to seek committee representation. We have had very little feedback on the post and nobody has volunteered to sit on the committee.

Martin Hempstock has reported about the Broughton Community and Sports Association – wondered about the BCSA being involved. They have a system set up.

LP – I would be to sit on the Wressle Community Fund Committee but would possibly be compromised as I also represent the Girl Guides (as leader) and they would welcome funding from Wressle.

JS – could we include in the Terms of Reference (ToR) to enable committee representatives to opt out abstain from decisions in which they have a personal interest in? It's hard to detach the community from the community.

LP – I would be really happy to sit on it if the Girl Guides are able to bid to the fund.

MA - you frequently find this in any community, that a small number of community-minded people end up doing lots of things so some conflicts of interest will need to be managed. It is important that people have a fair opportunity. To enable this there should be a clear ToR.

JS – could we not have a community fund board but funds go straight to BCSA and they take responsibility for disbursements. Could Egdon donate directly to BCSA?

MA – we can have a look at this in the first instance. If they are a registered charity that helps with the tax status etc.

LP – a lot of the members also have interest in the sports club etc so could be conflicted.

WG – I sit on the BCSA committee, and I filled out a conflict of interest form for the Taekwondo Group which I represent and I cannot therefore vote on its funding. So we have those systems in place.

JS – MH might have to retire from the CLG as he is chair of the BCSA.

MA – We are keen to have more information about the groups and would be happy to discuss this.

4. Update – North Lincolnshire Council

Andrew Law provided a brief update. Planning permission is in place and relevant permits in place. No outstanding issues for NLC. No issues on the site or reports or suggestions of any breaches of planning.

Operating in line with its conditions and not causing any problems at all. We would only get involved if there was an issue.

JS – Will the planning change?

AL - The planning permissions for the site to operate, as it does at the moment, are all in place but there may be changes if, for example, if they were to move away from the gas engine but that would be if there is a change.

WG - Do you do periodic planned reviews?

AL - No we don't at NLC. We rely on reports from third parties who identify possible planning breaches and we get the updates from the EA. We don't undertake spot checks. This our standard process.

WG – How can third parties do that?

AL – When issues are raised to the enforcement team we would go on site. And the EA raise issues if they find them to us.

MA - from a reputational perspective, we take our regulatory responsibility very seriously and stick to the letter of our consents, conditions and permits such as the OGA, EA and H&S Executive. Our reputation is paramount to us.

5. Update – Environment Agency

Howard Goulbourne updated the group. I was onsite week last Friday and everything is fine. There are issues with gas management which we are in discussion about, as the flows are not stable in the test phase and we're working through the equipment for production. I do not have any concerns.

As MA mentioned the vents and the flare are consented by the OGA but what goes through them is regulated by the EA. Anything discharged or incinerated is reported to the OGA and EA and assessed on a regular basis.

With reference to the article on Drop or Drop – the equipment they used does not quantify or identify a specific gas it is just a visual representation of an emission. The technology does not measure concentration or a rate of emission. It is just a visual representation.

6. Questions arising

PT – Could the fund be used to pay the community precept? So, for example if there is £120,000 per year it would be £100 on the rates bill for every household. The fund would be a discount for every household which would be equally shared.

LP - We would have to run this by the Council (NLC) because of previous issues; but we could take this to the two councillors.

RS asked (for the minutes) if the precept would be the whole of the community fund or what would remain after other payments have been made.

JS – leftovers rather than the whole fund.

JS – can payments be made to the local parish council for kids play areas for example?

MA – our preference would be for it to go to specific projects rather than generally into council coffers. We are paying business rates so we are making donations through a different route. Money going into general coffers would not be the way we would want to donate, but we are happy to make donations to specific community projects.

LP – for example we are looking for funding for the changing facilities at the Phil Grundy Centre which is around £90k.

MA – So, funding for such a project might come from a variety of source such as Sport England and the Egdon fund.

WG – Has BCSA been in touch to ask about funding for the MUGA?

RS – Not as yet but a meeting has been requested.

JS said that a question had been received through the Chairs of the group. It as a two-part question (*and is essentially the same as the question posed by Terry Howe – answered above*).

a. Why was the CTFA researcher not allowed to measure emissions?

MA - this is the same case. They turned up and were trespassing.

- b. How long are we in testing and when does production begin?

MA –There is a point when flow testing moves to production. Currently we are producing oil under an extended well testing consent from the OGA. We need to update the production forecast and then we submit a Field Development Plan to the OGA for its approval. Once the FDP is approved, the field moves from flow testing to full production. We are in the process of removing the test equipment and replacing this with the final bits of the permanent production facilities.

7. Schedule and date of next meeting

Tuesday 1st February 2022, at 6pm.

8. Any Other Business

No issues arising.