

THREE NOOKS FARM COMMUNITY LIAISON GROUP

AGENDA for 10th Meeting expected
to be held at Horton Village Hall at 6pm on Wednesday 2nd April 2014

1. Agree previous minutes
2. Address actions from last meeting
3. Site operation update
4. Any other business
5. Arrangements for next meeting

Minutes of Meeting – 12th February 2014 at 6pm at Horton Village Hall

Attendees	Role / Organisation
Dave Hawley (DH)	Biddulph Town Councillor
John Jones (JJ)	Staffordshire Moorland and Biddulph Town Councillor (Vice Chair)
William Goldstraw (WG)	Horton Parish Council
John Fryer (JF)	Horton Parish Council
Howard Beswick (HB)	Horton Parish Councillor
Hal Wilson (HW)	Local Resident
Chris Wilson (CW)	Local Resident
Gerry Foskett (GF)	Local Resident
Roger Carter (RC)	Local Resident
Mike Pownall (MP)	Local Resident
Tony Bryan (TB)	Seven Star Natural Gas Limited (SSNG)
Laura Green (LG)	RSK Environment Ltd
Tom Gibbons (TG)	RSK Environment Ltd

Item	Agenda Item	Action
1	Previous Meeting Minutes	
1.1	Gill Heath and Debbie Holihead not able to attend due to the weather.	
	JJ stood in as chair in Gill Heath's absence.	
	The previous minutes were agreed.	
2	Matters arising	
2.1	There were no actions arising regarding the last meeting minutes.	
3	Site Operations Update	
3.1	TB provided the site operation update: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The drill rig left site in early September- A component was replaced at the end of November- Liaison has been taking place with the Environment Agency to agree	

the permit for flaring and testing

- The well testing and flaring took place only 2 weeks ago
- Gauges were installed to monitor the gas and these were only removed on the 10th and 11th February.
- The flaring has shown that there is gas present and they are now waiting on the testing results to indicate how much gas is in the reserve and therefore how long it may be viable for.

- 3.2 HW asked what else is in the reserve as well as gas.
TB explained that 90% is methane gas, currently no water is coming up. The gas is coming up of its own accord.
- 3.3 HW asked as the pressure decreases in the reserve will anything be introduced down the well to assist with retrieving the gas.
TB explained nothing will be put down the well to get the gas out as the pressure drops. The electric generators function at a pressure of 100mbar and the current pressure is circa 30bar, however in the future water may come up with the gas which could reach a level that makes it less commercially viable.
- 3.4 DH asked at what pressure the reserve will become unviable.
TB explained that it is a balance between pressure and the water. Water is expected to be encountered in the gas between 5 and 8 years into extraction. A calculation into the commercial viability relating to the water to gas ratio will be completed when water is encountered.
- 3.5 MP asked what will replace the gas underground.
TB explained that water will replace the gas. This is in the sandstone, there is no void and thus no chance of collapse.
- 3.6 HW asked will the water relating to this project be saline.
TB stated the water will probably be fresh and not saline. Such water has been encountered on other projects however this salinity is location dependent. The water will be tested once it appears and will be removed to a licensed facility.
- 3.7 Will there be contamination to our water supply?
TB stated the gas comes through an inner separate pipe with no leakage to the external environment. Currently the well is in a suspended state with 4 consecutively larger pipes acting as barriers to ensuring it is secure.
- 3.8 How long will the field reinstatement take?
TB said that the reinstatement is likely to take 3-4 weeks, this will take place once the weather has improved and the site has dried out.
- 3.9 When will the gas test results be available?
TB stated the results are currently being analysed and they will be released into the public domain once the company directors have signed off the information.
- 3.10 What were the repair works in November for?
TB explained this was to replace one section of the inner most pipe which had a faulty seal. The test pressure was greater than the actual gas pressure and so there was no leakage. In addition the leak was between the inner most and the next pipe out and thus is contained within the well.

4 Any Other Business

- 4.1 HW noted that flaring took place over 4 days yet it was stated that the flaring

would be a planned 3 days and on the 22/01/14 the website said it would be 4 days.

TB explained that there was one day of well clean up, this involved getting the gas to flow which included some flaring and then 3 subsequent days of well testing which also involved constant flaring, this was as planned. During the testing one day had to be aborted due to the wind direction, and thus the period of flaring was increased by a further day.

HW explained his concern with this was the noxious gases associated with flaring.

- 4.2 HW asked why, when the testing had been expected to take place as soon as the well pipe was replaced in November, there had been the further delay of the permit.

TB explained that the permit was a new requirement as of the 1st October 2013.

HW asked why the documents for the permit included documents dated February 2013 if the permit requirement was not known about until October 2013.

TB explained that some of the documents which supported the permit were documents which had been prepared for the project as a whole earlier in the year. He also added that delays were also due to the Environment Agency who were still preparing some of the permit requirements until recently.

- 4.3 JJ stated that the project had being undertaken without any serious incident and had been conducted openly and with consideration to residents. He asked for this fact to be minuted.

- 4.3 HW wanted confirmation that nothing was removed from the site during the testing process, in particular water.

TB explained that the well had been left with water in it and that this had to be removed in order to allow the gas to flow. Also the septic tank had been emptied, both were removed from site by a specialist licensed contractor.

CW wanted to know where the water had gone and what treatment has been undertaken.

TB

TB confirmed that he can find this out from the waste transfer notice if required.

HW explained the cause for concern is related to the recent media publicity around water disposal on other drilling projects. (Not related to Seven Star)

- 4.4 HW asked if any stone would be removed from the site as part of the project.

TB confirmed that the stone would be not be removed from the site.

- 4.5 MP asked why there had been a fire engine on site.

TB explained that this was a precautionary measure and they had attended to acquaint themselves with the set up on site. The fire brigade had been notified in advance of the flaring taking place. Also the police have been to visit the site due to recent press on the industry in relation to security and potential terrorism.

- 4.6 RC asked if flare gas monitoring took place during the flaring and if the information could be brought to the next meeting.

TB

TB explained that liaison had taken place with the Environment Agency with regard to complying with the conditions of the Permit. The data was being compiled to submit to the Environment Agency . The emissions data was to

be provided by calculation rather than monitoring.

5 Arrangements for Next Meeting

5.1 Tentatively arranged for Wednesday 2nd April 2014 6pm at Horton Village Hall.

Meeting closed at 6:40pm

Chairperson Contact Details – Gill Heath

Tel: 01538 381601 or 07932 165472 | email: gill.heath@staffordshire.gov.uk