

## **BATTLE LAKE WATERSHED SYNERGY GROUP**

**May 7, 2009**

A meeting of the Battle Lake Watershed Synergy Group was held on Thursday, May 7, 2009 at the Lakedell Ag. Centre with Paul McLaughlin acting as Facilitator for the meeting.

### **Called to Order:**

- Paul called the meeting to order at 7:02pm.

### **Attendance:**

- In attendance were 27 residents, industry representatives and government officials. (see attached list)

### **Agenda:**

- Paul introduced the agenda and it was approved.

### **April's minutes:**

- Theresa Sacha of Advantage wanted to clarify what Arnold Renschler had stated at last month's meeting. Arnold had said that neither the BLWSG nor the Battle Lake Preservation Society had been notified about the well at 6-34-45-02-W5 by Advantage. Theresa noted that in the June 5/08 minutes, it shows that she had informed the BLWSG and the Battle Lake Preservation Society (via email to Michael Black). Also, regarding notification to residents, she informed the group that the Construction Supervisor told her that he had been in constant contact with the residents in the area.
- Paul accepted the changes to the minutes.
- Approval of existing minutes.

### **Review of Action Items:**

- **#89**—Paul has the freshwater injection information that Isaac Doble requested.
- **#92**—nothing yet on the Sub-Committee leads and rep from ERCB review administration of Group.
- **#97**—will discuss ESSO's invitation further during the Landowner's Updates.
- **#110 & # 111**—discuss later with Landowner's Updates.
- **#113**—Darcy Allen informed the group that he had a package handout for the Synergy Website and that the rates to be on the website were as follows: \$250.00/pkg set up fee and \$100.00/annual renewal fee.
- **#114**—wait until the end of the meeting after discussing the website further, so see if industry will cover the costs.

### **LANDOWNER'S UPDATES:**

- **Archie Ruggles:** had nothing to report. He said that he had been away, and needed to be updated himself.
- **Dave Doze:** had nothing to report. He did express that he was pleased with the job the new Recording Secretary was doing.
- **Karl Zajes:** had nothing to report.
- **Terry Wildman:** nothing to report.
- **Bob Whiteside:** expressed his disappointment that the Trilogy hearing was postponed. He had postponed his holiday because of the hearing and had heard that the re-scheduled date was during his summer vacation plans. It was decided that the Trilogy hearing would be discussed further during the Industry Updates.
- **Jim Stevens:** talked about Park Management Review. And explained that there were some good policy changes to Pigeon Lake Park and Zeiner Park. There was also a finished update on the Fisheries Plan. A variety of upgrades are scheduled for the parks in the next few years. They have been getting tremendous support and assistance from Alberta Environment and it was much appreciated. Also, they were launching an active public education plan. They would be

available at the Lakedell Farmer's Market on Fridays from 4:30pm to 7:30pm until early September. They wanted to work with the public. He confessed that there were still some challenges but that they would still keep working away.

- **Michael Black:** passed on a message from Ken Jenny. Ken had talked to ESSO and Diana McQueen and some other people. Esso had contacted Alberg's. They told them they will announce their plans at June's meeting, and fill in the BLWSG at that time. Michael said that their plans looked okay. Ken also sent his regrets for not attending tonight's meeting.
- It was decided to hold off any questions for David Helmer until ESSO comes in June.
- Michael briefly summarized the concerns regarding ESSO's plans to David:
  1. *Blazing a road up the escarpment. They won't anymore.*
  2. *Hauling material out in the summer time. They will wait until fall when the road is frozen because they also have issues with the County.*
  3. *Contamination issue regarding LSD: 3-26-46-2-W5.*

### **AB ENVIRONMENT UPDATE:**

- **Dave Helmer** responds to **Action Item #74** re: Angela Foulton attending a meeting.
- He said that the "Well Placement policy" is under internal review. The Alberta Water Council provided some feedback on it, so it's under review. He says it's probably too early to start talking about it because there are some considerations that have to do the Wetlands Policy.
- He felt that it was still appropriate for someone to come out to discuss it but not until the fall.
- Guide 56 was updated to reflect where well placement is and to keep wells out of low spots and such. There's an update for that as well, although unrelated to the Wetland Policy, but in a wet year low

areas fill with water and then the wellheads are under water. It has been a problem in the past because of topography or past history has not been taken into account. (whether it had been a wetland or not)

- **Action Item #98:** Regarding reclamation. He didn't get a satisfactory answer. He was told they use "appropriate specs", but Dave wasn't sure if that meant they use the current specs or previous specs. He suggested that Al Malcolm be contacted directly for a better answer regarding reclamation and what specs were being used, current or 1994's.
- Karl Zajes stated that 1995 is the criteria but new criteria are being worked on. It was hoped that the criteria would be in place by 2009 but certainly by 2010. It is being used in the field now. They have a meeting on the 21<sup>st</sup> and the 27<sup>th</sup>. Karl said he was on that committee and wants to keep everyone working on a level playing field. They are working on common goals.
  1. *Cultivated*
  2. *Grasslands*
  3. *Forested*
  4. *Peat lands*
- **MEC License:** The MEC License is "Half Stall Recovery". No decision has been made yet. The TDL given to them in December was valid until April 30<sup>th</sup>. AB Environment is still waiting for information from MEC. When the new info is reviewed then a decision can be made. Anyone who submitted a Statement of Concern of directly affected will receive a notice of a decision, including the Company.
- Paul commented that he had talked to John today and confirmed the well is completely shutdown, because of the withdrawal of that license. The group was told that water well services approximately 50 oil wells.
- MEC was also commended for going over the analysis so thoroughly. And that the group's resolve is more and more firm regarding that alternative methods be used regardless of costs.

- It was asked what would happen if the license wasn't renewed, would MEC be forced to shut down production? Dave wasn't sure what the ERCB would say. A review would need to be done. Larry Goulding stated the ERCB has taken action on it. He said there's a group in Calgary that takes care of it. Nothing would take place immediately, a timeline would be followed.

### **ERCB UPDATE:**

- Steve Harrington reported that Don South, a Visual/Noise guy will be at the **2009 Spring Noise Conference in Banff, May 19–22**. Anyone who wants more info on the conference can contact Steve directly.
- **Drayton Valley Field Centre** is hosting an Appreciation Open House on Tuesday, June 2 from 3pm–7pm. The purpose was to thank everyone the ERCB deals with (the public, government and industry) through the course of the year. Food and beverage would be supplied.

### **INTERNATIONAL SOVEREIGN:**

- Dave Doze claimed that he received a package from International Sovereign regarding drilling on the well that they had previously said they wouldn't. International Sovereign had stated that prior that if they were drilling within the area, that they would attend meetings. Now that Dave has received said package, then they are drilling in the area, Dave asked why they aren't attending the BLWSG meetings?
- Paul will contact John Riad at Intl. Sovereign and invite them to attend. It was said that the company may not have attended a meeting since last October. **ACTION ITEM**

### **BMP—COMPRESSOR MANAGEMENT**

- Biggest concern expressed was the noise level. Where was it measured from? Current ERCB regulations are that the noise level of 40 dBA is measure 10 or 15 meters from the nearest house.

However, many members believed that the noise from a lease should not extend past the boundaries of the land it's sitting on. Current regulations do not take into consideration any new construction in the area and how those homes might be affected by the noise. Also, topography should be taken into account. The Battle Lake Valley really carries sound far, especially in the winter. Therefore, Noise Impact Assessments (NIA) should take these factors into consideration.

- Dave Doze expressed frustration over the roadblocks from the ERCB and industry regarding the BMP. He thought the purpose of the BLWSG and the Best Management Practices were to make industry more compatible with the area.
- He also talked about "The Landowner's Journal" by KAEPLA. In the paper it talked about "farming over and around pipeline structures". It seemed that the Landowner was held responsible, but yet not compensated, for the pipeline being there. So why would anyone want a pipeline on their property, especially if industry won't bury them deeper. Terry Wildman wondered who carried the liability for the line. Dave Doze wants the option to have the line removed. But because that wasn't the Board's regulation that wouldn't happen.
- Larry Goulding of ERCB reminded the group that: even if a pipeline is abandoned, it still belongs to the oil company forever.
- Paul summarized the intent of the BMP is to go back and determine if the 40 dBA is practical, but as Dave said, it's going beyond. With the acoustics of the valley, since the beginning of the BLWSG, noise has been an important issue.
- Paul encouraged industry and the ERCB to go back and discuss internally with their "noise" folks and educate ourselves about some of those issues because they are quite real. More information needed.
- Darcy Allen explained that a NIA (Noise Impact Assessment) has to be submitted with every application. It's a theoretical calculation based on the information supplied by the manufacturer of the

compressor and the engine. When asked if a noise survey could be done prior to installation of the compressor, Darcy Allen informed the group that the only time a noise survey is done prior to installing is when they are adding more horsepower or another source of noise under an existing licensed facility. Then under the new Directive 38 rewrites, that would need to be taken into consideration when submitting the NIA with their application. But no requirements are necessary to do a comprehensive sound survey analysis or measurement. Many times if there is already existing noise-generating equipment at a site, then they will do a measurement of what the baseline is for the sound pressures being measured from that site. As well as, any other significant noise impact, such as topographical considerations and any baseline information that the Board requires are added to your NIA.

- Paul asked the group if they should invite an expert to talk to the group about “noise abatement”. Someone could explain how sound is increased, because sound is not directly additive.
- Steve suggested that he could see if Don South was available to talk at the next meeting.
- Many landowners’s expressed that they would want a sound survey done before installation to ensure that the sound stays contained on the lease that is being paid for it.
- Industry to go back and see how these practices could be implemented. **ACTION ITEM**
- Michael mentioned that what he understood when the last noise expert was in that these issues could be addressed but it would be costly.
- Terry Wildman stated that in Europe, they build concrete walls around their leases and that is very quiet. He also expressed that a Baseline Testing should be added to the BMP.
- Darcy Allen concurred that the 2 things that were currently in the BMP but that currently do not happen right now were:

*1. A Baseline testing of any residents within 1.6 km of a compressor prior to installation.*

*2. To model a Noise Contour of 40dBA or less at edge of the lease boundary.*

- More discussion in the future. And Steve to invite a noise expert to our next meeting. **ACTION ITEM**

## **BMP—DUST & TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT**

- Shane (Baytex) wanted to confirm that the practices listed were for high activity periods, such as rig moves and pipeline work, not everyday operations and have that stated in the BMP clearly. They can't post speed limit signs themselves, but they would tell their crews at the time of big moves.
- Shane also said that the counties often have regulations in place. And that prior to some of their operations, they have had dust suppressant put on the road to help deal with the dust because of the increased traffic.
- It was pointed out that the Counties don't like long term use of water because the road gets soft. And calcium chloride can cause problems to the road if a grater goes over it incorrectly.
- Should the BMP be vetted through the County of Wetaskiwin to their approval? Darcy Allen stated that the only code of practice that the County has is regarding rig moves and convoys. It says that the company has to supply water to the roads in front of resident's homes during a rig move. Is written into their Road Use Agreement.
- Dave Doze brought up the 1993 situation with Petro Canada talking about Coal bed Methane experiments in the area. They were going into the anvil coals, which are wet coals. The water required to go into those well was staggering. Should this issue be addressed in the BMP different than as "high activity use"? Because some of the routine activities can be considered high depending on the activity. And Darcy will try to put more details into the BMP. Weather should be considered, too. Dust suppressants can cause different problems to roads and people. Moreover, when Landowner's are reading the BMP with industry, it would start a conversation



between them and they could discuss what will affect the landowner.

- If the operator has long term heavy haul routes, could it be identified on a map, could possible affected residents be consulted, as well as, the municipality. The BLWSG should be involved, too.
- Dave Doze wonders if when a project anticipates an increase in traffic then they should approach the BLWSG with what the company will do to address any possible concerns. Darcy has included that in the BMP. Also, turnarounds, because it increases traffic.
- Regarding signage on operator's vehicles, Darcy said it may not be feasible if they work for multiple companies. Michael Black on wished for a sign saying "contractor operator". So that strange vehicles can be identified.
- It was suggested that landowners should feel free to approach the vehicles or take record license plate numbers.
- Mike Jenkins of MEC pointed out that their operators would have a work order. PennWest gives operators written permission to be on the lease.

## **COFFEE BREAK**

Paul called for a coffee break at 8:17pm. Resumed meeting at 8:36pm.

## **INDUSTRY UPDATES**

### **ENCANA**

- Darcy Allen stated that there has been no progress on the Horizontal Well Program as of yet. And he reminded the group that they would be going out to investigate the areas further this summer. As well as, any alternative well sites, etc.
- Darcy brought a publication regarding Coal Bed Methane operations. It was available at the back of the room. He also brought an EnCana newsletter. He explained that readers were encouraged to go online after reading the newsletter and fill out

the survey (let them know what you thought of the newsletter) and they would have an opportunity to win a \$500 gift certificate to any local business of their choice. Pamphlets available at the back of the room or ask Darcy for them.

## **PENNWEST**

- Routine down hole operation at 03-08-46-01-W5.

## **SCOLLARD**

- Myles Aitken had nothing to report.

## **CONOCOPHILLIPS**

- Rick Stevens stated “business as usual”. However, because of the fire that had gone through Ma-Me-O Beach reserve, there had been concern regarding a pipeline that was running nearby. But it seemed to be fine because of the frost that was still in the ground. Someone was still checking it.

## **ADVANTAGE**

- Theresa Sacha stated that the gate at 5-17-46-2-W5 should be closed now. Dave Doze agreed that it was. She also said the company claimed that they weren’t aware of it, but have remedied the situation. They have closed the gate and posted a sign saying it should stay that way.

## **TRILOGY**

- Sue Dsikun explained that because of a new gas analysis that they became aware of at the last minute, they had to postpone their hearing. They felt that it needed to be reviewed carefully and have since applied for a new license yesterday based on the new H2S 0.44. Site is still DD 14-23-46-02-W6M. Hearing is adjourned until possibly July 14&15.
- Michael Black expressed his disappointment over a hearing during the summer. Bob Whiteside echoed the same statement.

- Sue said that the ERCB chooses the dates, not Trilogy.
- Tim Wood (Trilogy) explained the new H2S Release Rate doesn't work with his information anymore. The H2S Release Rate Assessment is required to only look at the representative pool.
- Larry Goulding (ERCB) told the group that he and Steve will send off names to Michael and Bob to make formal complain about when the new hearing is.
- Bob was concerned that there would be changes again.
- Tim Wood stated that he didn't expect anymore changes. He also said why there are fluctuations in the H2S samples. Sometimes if the well produces more water, there will be a higher H2S sample. For safety reasons, they are required to take the maximum samples into effect. They originally thought 0.11 was the highest and then it became 0.44.
- Karl Zajes questioned the unpredictability of the well, could another assessment be done that will come in higher. Tim did not expect it to change.
- Resident's preferred a hearing in mid-September so that they wouldn't have to cancel their summer plans or miss the hearing.

## **BAYTEX**

- Shane Koss had nothing to report.

## **MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS**

### **BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES**

- Discuss "Flaring" and "Weeds" in June. (**ACTION ITEM**)
- Michael Black thanked Darcy Allen for working so hard on the BMP.

### **ATTENDANCE LIST**

- Michael Black wondered if we should make some changes to the Attendance List because some of the residents have only to the very beginning of the meeting. He questioned if they should still be on the list.

- Paul said that he would email the list and put it to the people that if they still wanted to be a part of the group then they should respond to Paul. And then the list should be archived. **ACTION ITEM**

## **WARBURG SURFACE RIGHTS GROUP**

- Karl Zajes informed the group of the WSRG Annual Meeting would be at the Warburg Hall at 7:30pm next Tuesday. Annual of the Surface Rights Board and the annual report of the Landowner Compensation Board would be there and maybe a report on Carbon Capture that's proposed for Genesee Power Plant and area.

## **WEBSITE UPDATE**

- Synergy Alberta Conference in Red Deer, October 26–28. Darcy suggested that it was worth attending. Membership forms available at the back of the room. Corporate fee is \$500.00/yr. Synergy group membership fee is \$50.00/yr and Friends of Synergy Alberta is \$5.00/yr. BLWSG is not currently a member therefore no voting rights yet at the annual meeting. If any members want to attend the Synergy Group and need corporate sponsor their registration and accommodations then talk to the industry reps if they'd like to go on the company's behalf.
- Discussed the website fees again. \$250/set up and \$100/annual fee. Paul asked if industry will cover the fees on a rotation basis. **(Action Item #114)**
- In order to become a member, BLWSG needs to follow Synergy's Alberta guidelines. Log on to synergyalberta.com to see the guideline. Benefit is networking with other synergy groups. Post minutes, BMP, agenda.
- Darcy suggests that we need someone who will contact the webmaster at Synergy for updates. Some groups facilitate the cost by charging annual fee of \$1/individual members and \$1000/industry members.

- Shane of Baytex offered to pay \$250.00 for the first year. Paul thanks them for agreeing to pay the bill for the first year.
- Website Sub-Committee is necessary. Myles Aitken (Scollard) volunteers. In June, look for more committee members.

## MEETING ADJOURNED

- At 9:23pm, Paul adjourned the meeting

## ACTION ITEMS

#	ACTION	RECOMMENDED DATE	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DONE
	<b>From April 2 Meeting</b>			
63	Determine items to be posted to website	Each meeting	All in attendance	
	<b>From December 4 Meeting</b>			
92	Sub-committee leads and rep from ERCB review administration of Group	Prior to Jan8/09	Leads & ERCB	
	<b>From April 2 Meeting</b>			
111	Contact Dave Helmer re: BLWSG's objections to ESSO	After June's meeting		
	<b>From May 7 Meeting</b>			
115	Invite International Sovereign to the meetings.	Prior to June's meeting	Paul McLauchlin	
116	Industry discuss internally how to implement noise practices in BMP		All industry reps.	
117	Invite noise expert to next meeting.	Prior to June's meeting	Steve Harrington	
118	Discuss "Flaring" & "Weeds" BMP	June 4/09	All in attendance	
119	Email all members on attendance list to see if they still want to receive update.		Paul McLauchlin	

**IN ATTENDANCE**

<b>INDIVIDUAL</b>	<b>REPRESENTING</b>
Theresa Sacha	Advantage
Mike Downie	Advantage
David Helmer	Alberta Environment
Terry Kreese	Baytex
Shane Koss	Baytex
Pat Schmaltz	Baytex
Darcy Allen	EnCana
Donald Letwinetz	EnCana
Larry Goulding	ERCB
Steve Harrington	ERCB
Alan Browse	PennWest
Raymond Karlson	PennWest
Michael Black	Resident
Dave Doze	Resident
Archie Ruggles	Resident
Jim Stevens	Resident
Bob Whiteside	Resident
Terry Wildman	Resident
Myles Aitken	Scollard
Karl Zajes	Surface Rights Conservation Soc.
Rhonda Herald	Resident
Clifford Ellis	PennWest
Rick Anderson	ConocoPhillips
Sue Dsikun	Trilogy Energy
Tim Wood	Trilogy Energy
Paul McLaughlin	Facilitator
Michelle Payne	Recording Secretary

## **BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES**

### **Compressor Management**

#### Concerns

This practice is intended to address public concerns regarding visual and noise management for the operator of oil and gas facilities.

#### Practices

- o In designing its Project Layouts (i.e. the position of pipelines and compressors for a project), The operator will take into account existing facilities, existing residents, information regarding construction of potential future residence sites, prevailing winds and local terrain and try to locate facilities to minimize the noise to residents. The operator's on-going community consultation will provide additional information on when and how Project Layouts will be reviewed with affected parties.
  
- o The operator will record and investigate all noise complaints. The operator will either mitigate the noise or for persistent noise, provide a Noise Survey done in accordance with Directive 38. Compressor operators will do baseline testing of any residence within 1.6 km before a compressor is installed. All residents within 1.5 km of a proposed compressor shall be consulted and informed of noise control measures undertaken at the compressor site.
  
- o The operator is required to select new compressors such that they have a maximum noise contour of 40 dBA Leq or less, at the edge of the lease boundary.
  
- o If a new residence is planned after a compressor is installed; the

landowner is encouraged to contact the operator to discuss potential noise impacts. Sound levels will be monitored and further mitigation efforts will be reviewed by the operator and may be implemented as required.

o Project Layouts, and their review with affected parties, may also include components related to the visual impact of compressors. There are many ways to change the visual impact of compressors, examples include; remote locations, facades on the buildings, berms, and tree belts. The operator will establish a dialogue and are strongly encouraged to consider input from parties and communities who are interested and affected regarding the visual impact of its compressors. These communications need to take place throughout the life cycle of the development.

## Background

Noise is measured in decibels (dB). For Noise Management in Alberta dBA Leq is the basis of measurement – it is a ‘time averaged’ sound level adjusted [for the characteristics of the human ear]. A typical human can hear noises between 0 dB up to more than 120 dB (130 db is the ‘threshold of pain’). See the attached chart for dB levels associated with everyday sounds.

In general, when the windows are closed, noise levels inside a house will typically be 10 dB lower than outside. Noise levels are NOT directly additive – in other words, if the ambient noise level is 35 dBA Leq and a piece of equipment that makes 30 dB is added, the total noise level will NOT be 65 dBA Leq, it will stay close to 35 dBA Leq. This is why new pieces of equipment can often be added in places that already generate noise without significantly increasing the noise level – the existing equipment ‘drowns out’ the new noise. As a rule of thumb, for point sources of noise, there will be 6 dBA loss for every doubling of the distance from the source. So, for example if a drilling rig noise is measured as 50 dBA at 200 meters from the rig, the noise level will be approximately 44 dBA at 400 meters.

Noise levels for industrial facilities are strictly governed by regulation. For facilities under jurisdiction of the Alberta Energy & Utilities Board, including oil & gas, the requirements are stated in the Noise Control Directive: Directive 38.



Directive 38 contains a large amount of information regarding how noise levels are determined and what the noise limits are for various situations. Noise limits are dictated by factors such as current housing density, proximity to extraneous noise sources such as roads and airplane flight paths and seasonal and time of day variants. The strictest limit is Permissible Sound Level of 40 dBA Leq nighttime (22:00 – 07:00) and 50 dBA Leq daytime at the nearest or most impacted residence.

The operator recognizes that oil & gas facilities will have a noise impact. It supports the AEUB's statement in Directive 38: "While residents, particularly in rural areas, would generally prefer no increase in sound levels resulting from energy-related developments, it is sometimes not possible to eliminate these increases. However, if proper sound control features are incorporated into facility design in the planning stages, increases in sound levels can be kept to acceptable minimums." The operator undertakes a number of activities with regard to this directive during the planning stage. The operator preferentially locates new compressor facilities near locations that already have high background noise, such as existing industrial sites and roads. When this is not possible locations as remote as possible from residents are chosen. There are strong incentives for the operator to do this since there are cost advantages to sharing surface locations and noise concerns are challenging to deal with.

## References

ERCB Directive 38

Interim Directive ID 99-08

## Definitions

Heavily traveled road is defined in ERCB Directive 38 as "Generally includes primary and secondary highways and any other road where the average traffic count is at least 10 vehicles/hour over the nighttime period"

Battle Lake Watershed Synergy Group (BLWSG)

## Dust & Traffic Management

### Concerns

This practice is intended to address public concerns regarding the management of the impacts from dust and traffic during high activity periods.

### Practices

- o All contract operators shall prominently display signage indicating he/she is a contract operator.
  
- o The operator will designate (through signage) road sections that limit the operator traffic to 50 km/h. The designated road sections will be determined through consultation with local municipal officials and residents and past operator experience.
  
- o If the operator has long term, heavy haul routes, they will identify them on a map that will be shared with local residents (example: Major or Core Facilities).
  
- o The operator will communicate to the community its desire to consult with local residents to identify 'speed posted' and 'dust sensitive' road sections during high activity periods. As a minimum it will: provide a phone number with the operator contact; create a hand-out that describes the operator's traffic and dust management practices with the contact phone number, make this hand-out available to local community groups, at open houses and include it in notification and consultation packages; take out advertisements that provide the contact number in local newspapers or similar publications at least twice per year; post signs in areas during high activity periods that provide a contact number for traffic and dust concerns.

- o Dust control measure employed by the operator will use environmentally friendly and municipally (or other governing body) approved materials.
  
- o The operator will not move heavy equipment during school bus hours on school bus routes. In the event that a school bus is encountered during a movement of heavy equipment, they will pull to the right as much as possible and stop – so long as this is deemed the safest course of action for all parties concerned.
  
- o The operator will preferentially perform heavy equipment moves between 0700 and 2300 hours. During freeze/thaw periods, road use restrictions may require the operator to move equipment outside this timeframe. Even in these circumstances the operator will not move heavy equipment during school bus hours on school bus routes.
  
- o The operator will employ water spraying for dust suppression for traffic moves that involve a heavy equipment convoy of 6 vehicles or more on dry gravel roads.
  
- o Contractors and 3rd party services working in the area on behalf of the operator must prominently display placards, logos, and or unit numbers on vehicles, in an effort to visually identify the vehicle ownership. Contract operations staff shall identify the operator they are under contract for.
  
- o Landowners witnessing or experiencing undesired behaviours of oil field related traffic, should firstly contact the respective owner of the vehicle and or company directly. If concerns remain unaddressed, the landowner can contact a local energy company or police department of jurisdiction and report the incident. The operator can then assist in contacting the respective company, and follow up as required.

## Background

County, MD and Alberta Transportation regulations dictate what roads the operator can utilize in moving equipment on and off lease. For The operator, heavy equipment moves include rig moves, completion equipment moves and occasionally the move of a facilities building. Permits issued by the Municipality and/or Alberta Transportation are required for moving heavy equipment and in periods where road conditions are rapidly changing, the route for moving equipment may be designated only minutes before the move is made (typically this is early in the morning after county inspectors have been able to access road conditions).

With minimum disturbance practices where roads are not constructed to well-sites, the operator makes a strong effort to minimize damage to surface land. Regulatory requirements as well as road and lease conditions limit the operator's flexibility regarding timing of equipment moves.

## References

Municipal Road Use Agreements

Municipal Land Use By-Laws

