



Mossmorran & Braefoot Bay Community & Safety Liaison Committee Meeting

Date: 24th September 2020

Time: 18:30

Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting

Present: Councillor Alistair Bain, Convener – Fife Councillor (AB)
Councillor David Barratt (DB)
Nigel Kerr – Fife Council (NK)
Ian Brocklebank – SEPA (IB)
Craig Burnett – Shell (CB)
Irene Burt – Cowdenbeath Community Council (IB)
Fred Clarke – Kelty Community Council (FC)
Peter Franklin - Dalgety Bay Community Council (PF)
Tom Kinnaird – Benarty Community Council (TK)
Alex MacDonald – Burntisland Community Council (AMacD)
Mairi McKay – Shell (MMcK)
Stewart Neil – ExxonMobil (SN) by phone
Alex Rhodes – Shell (AR)
Louise Russell - ExxonMobil (LR) by phone
Tricia Smith – Crossgates & Mossgreen Community Council (TS)
Wendy Thornton – SEPA (WT)
Lala Gandilova, Shell Environment Advisor

Secretariat – Lesley Kirk, Fife Council

Apologies: See below

1. Apologies for Absence

Jacob McAlister (ExxonMobil), Angie Roy (Cardenden CC) email received 28.09.20

2. Declaration of Interest

None.

3. Minutes of Previous Meeting

Minutes accepted.

4. Current Situation Reports

4.1 Councillors

AB: A recent discussion had taken place with the Irish Environmental Protection Agency regarding the review about SEPA. A report to follow in due course. No complaints received from the general public. One email inquiry regarding a Bill going through Parliament.

DB: No complaints received from the general public. Noticed a bit of flaring recently but as this was planned it seemed to be accepted without too many complaints.

4.2 Shell UK Ltd (CB)

Report Q3 attached with minutes. Advised reaching completion of Module 1 'Turnaround' with no process or person safety incidents. A full plant shut down occurred on the 11th and 12th August due to the severe weather event. Essentially it is business as usual in terms of processing across the plant, workforce, site visits, community notices and the feedback we have received.

MMcK advised there is information in the report of their continued support with the Trussell Trust who operate foodbanks across the country. Shell are currently supporting Dunfermline Foodbank as there are satellite locations in the surrounding area. This area of ongoing support was identified in conversations by Community Councillors, Fife Council and others.

MMcK reminded partners of their Community Grants Fund which is available for local organisations and registered charities. If you know of any organisation who may benefit from the fund please contact MMcK in the first instance.

DB requested more detail, to help understand why the weather event caused the flaring, what kind of future events would trigger the same scenario and what is being done to prevent this happening again.

CB replied stating he would try and provide some context. The Shell plant at Mossmorran was built 40 years ago, and at that moment in time was a combination of pipework, valves, safety components etc and over the subsequent 40 years Shell have continued to invest yearly in the maintenance and replacement of those original components in order to keep up with modern technology and best engineering practices. As engineering practice and technology has evolved to become inherently safer, the fundamental design and integrity of the plant has also improved. We now see the plant as being safer today than the year it was built as a result of this evolution of thinking and available technology. In terms of the viability of the plant, its not a question of age as the equipment is upgraded / replaced over time, it is a question of viability in terms of how long Mossmorran continues to play a vital role in the UK Energy Infrastructure. We believe our strategy allows us to continue to operate Mossmorran safely as we work through the energy transition, and how long that is going to be is a difficult question to predict an answer to. In line with the site visit of the Mossmorran Action Group, Shell would be happy to walk through or talk to the community members about our safety systems and why we believe we can demonstrate FNGL is a safe site.

AMcD requested clarification on:

Page 3, reference to 3 'rescue from height' exercises, was this from onsite personnel only or was there engagement from the Fife Fire & Rescue Service. CB confirmed onsite rescue team only. In 2019 three or four of the local fire brigades have been on site for specific site visits, they were not involved in these exercises.

Page 8 reference to Shell Twilight Basketball – the scheme has been running very successfully in Levenmouth, Dunfermline and Lochgelly. Is there any prospect of this being extended to any other locations?

MMcK replied a colleague John Raine who runs their Social Investment has close links to Sports Future Scotland who organised the twilight basketball. Areas are looked at to see if there is a demand for this sort of engagement for young people in the community. MMck will feedback to ascertain if any other surrounding areas could benefit e.g. Burntisland.

AMcD stated this would be extremely beneficial as there have been a number of instances of anti-social behaviour reported in the Burntisland and Kinghorn areas which has involved a high number of young people travelling by train from the Kirkcaldy area. More than one community could be benefit from a scheme like this.

McMck will follow this up.

TK stated following on from DB's question relating to the shutdown, was the lighting strike locally at Mossmorran or was it somewhere else on the national grid which caused the issue. If it was a local strike are there more measures you can take to prevent this from happening again.

CB replied the lighting strike was not local to Mossmorran it was on the national grid infrastructure outside the plant boundary. From a Shell perspective it would be up to the national grid to provide an additional resilience on their infrastructure. CB continued advising he does have information on the exact location of the strikes from the grid which can be shared if required. Mossmorran looks to the national grid to provide power to the plant, we have the dual feeders for that contingency, there is not anything more on our side we can do to provide additional resilience.

TK asked there is no uninterrupted power supply for the level of the voltage that you use, CB replied yes that is correct. We do have UPS on the site but they essentially power control and monitoring systems. The size of the UPS to keep the plant running would be astronomical.

TK then asked what are the potential events that could happen at the plant if that power supply was to remain offline for any amount of time.

CB advised we saw the extent of the potential events, essentially, we safely shut down the plant and over a period of a time the ngls within in the plant would be safely put to flare if required. We do have a period of resilience but if the power was out and this was to last a week or a month then this would be a different scenario. The way the plant reacted is exactly what would happen in the future.

NK raised the following point. In the report an exercise for the rapidreach to notify the public in the information zone was tested and Nigel commented from the Community Engagement review carried out there is a complete misunderstanding in the community about public information zones. People within in the zone know what it is about but those outwith do not understand it. Nigel enquired if this could be looked at by both companies moving forward.

MMcK replied this was worth noting and would be happy to follow up on this. MMcK reiterated people who live in the public information zone are aware of it as the rapidreach system is tested every year but it will be good to correct any misinformation.

CB agreed with MMcK. It is something which has been raised from the community previously because there is a large public information zone around Grangemouth and people are very familiar with it and it raises the question why there is not a large information zone around Mossmorran, it is simply because we do not have the potential to impact more people. It is definitely a point worth clarifying and getting more information out to the community.

4.3 ExxonMobil (SN) by phone (SN)

Report Q3 attached with minutes. SN said it was great to see so many community councils attending this evening and encouraging to see new members also. SN hopes this will be a good foundation to building continued understanding moving forward. SN thanked NK for all his work on reshaping the Committee. SN stated we shared our report last week but is very happy to take any questions. One point to highlight following CB's comments re the severe weather event on the 12th August slight differences at their plant we didn't experience a lighting strike just like Lochgelly and Cowdenbeath, we lost power from the grid. Our plant operates in a connective cycle, with the loss of power to some of our machines the plant done exactly what it is designed to do when it loses that equilibrium, stopped production, went to flare and whilst safely in flare it allows our team to realign the cycle back to production which was done the next day. As with events like this we will investigate the matter to see what lessons can be learned.

SN advised an announcement was made this week advising we are on schedule to begin the £140 million investment in April 2021. In summer we announced we would need to delay the work as a direct result of covid. The scale of the project is significant, equipment and machinery being built all over Europe which has been delayed at factories or at ports, we are also bringing in the region of around 850 to 1000 personnel to Fife and at the height of the pandemic it was not feasible to move these people. As a result we had to reschedule and align with scheduled maintenance in the North Sea which is extremely important as it minimises disruption for communities and the environment and minimises disruption to the gas supply over the winter months which includes the installation of the new noise reducing flare tip.

AMcD raised towards the end of the report there is reference to ExxonMobil's continuing engagement with a number of link schools. From recollection ExxonMobil had identified 7 link schools who have benefitted and AMcD asked if they are still link schools by definition or have the link schools been reviewed due to the increase of community interest in ExxonMobil over the years.

SN replied the report clearly shows we are still committed to support schools particularly STEM subjects. Our link school programme still does exist and we take a variety of different approaches on how we support these schools, we have slightly extended our engagement with schools in Kirkcaldy and Dunfermline due to schools approaching us. We are very conscious of who are core schools are in the communities and they are the ones we will continue to assist. We are happy to look at other areas if required.

AMcD thanked SN and said if the opportunity arose it might be helpful if the programme could be modified in some way without diminishing the past support Exxonmobil has given to a large number of schools, AMcD said he was merely suggesting there may be a wider community base now than when link schools were first established a number of years ago.

SN stated Louise is reaching out to the link schools and the wider community but happy to pick this up offline.

DB raised the two noise complaints in the report from the 29th May which concludes these were reviewed and was shown to be consistent with the routine plant operations at that time. Can you explain what activities attributed to this, can anything be done differently.

SN this was from the last report but stated we continuously monitor noise and use a Team of independent specialists who are linked with Napier University. Whenever a noise complaint is received we do our own noise analysis to ascertain the issues and we would address these accordingly e.g. on the 30th May we deployed the noise specialists in the community to determine if we were at fault, and if so, what steps we can take to ensure the issue is resolved, very happy to share more information offline.

NK thanked the chair and confirmed he had met with XXXX and Kylie recently and was unaware of the amount of noise monitoring carried out, which is extensive, both within the factory and the community setting. NK explained it was something he was keen to learn to find out exactly what has been done in the past and feed that knowledge into the new expert advisory group on noise, vibration and light.

4.4 SEPA (IB)

WT advised IB would update on the report attached.

IB stated the important news from this week is we issued a variation notice to Exxonmobil in response to their application for changing the date of the installation of the new flare tip to April 2021. The condition requires after 8th May the elevated flare must be operating with the new flare tip. IB said we understand why the date has been put back, this was due to covid and it important that work is undertaken during planned shutdown to minimise the amount of flaring and the potential impact on the community. The website will be updated shortly with more information and when it is on the public register a link will also be added which will show the notice and outline clearly the expectation on the delivery of work.

AMcD asked for a summary of the results on the engagement with the Irish Environment Protection Agency, was this specific to Mossmorran or was it on a wider remit.

WT replied this was specific to Mossmorran. SEPA asked them to be involved as they have had similar flaring issues in Ireland. They have collected a lot of information from companies and community representatives and hope to have the report finalised by the end of October.

4.5 Questions

No questions.

5. **Review of Mossmorran Committees/Groups – update and outcome from Environment & Protective Services Sub-Committee on 17th September 2020 (link to be provided when live)**

5.1 Recommendations

NK stated he presented the review to the Environment & Protective Services Sub Committee last week and thanked everyone for their support and assistance with the review process which included community councils, companies, SEPA and others. It provided open and honest constructive feedback which was greatly appreciated. The recommendations were accepted in full.

The recommendations approved are:

1. This should be the umbrella organisation for everything that happens in terms of engagement with the community issues concerning Mossmorran. This came out very strongly in the review. It was felt there were too many committees, governance was not clear as to where questions could be put.
2. 3 Expert Advisory Groups will be set up, EAG on air quality, EAG on noise and vibration and light and EAG on communications.
3. Independent chair should replace the existing elected member role. It was recognised that the member role worked really well and the current chair should be applauded but it was felt as this was a new committee someone completely independent, not connected with Council, SEPA etc would be a good way forward. Current chair will continue until a replacement chair is identified by this Committee.
4. NK will continue to support and attend this committee and ensure specialist staff are available to attend the advisory groups.
5. A new funding model should be explored and implemented by the Committee. This will allow provision of secretariat support, undertake research or specific pieces of work identified by the expert advisory groups. How do we fund these and take them forward, NK advised more discussion is required.

6. Annual Report to be produced and submitted to relevant Area Committees and the Environment and Protective Services Sub Committee to ensure suitable governance.
7. Constitution and Terms of Reference need to be amended to reflect these changes.
8. Greater effort should be made to encourage community councils to send representatives along and ensure they are aware they can send any member as a delegate.

NK continued by stating, two questions were asked at Committee which he agreed to raise at this meeting:

1. If we could consider when looking at the Terms of Reference and Constitution that we include a section if you are on this committee you will not accept gifts or hospitality in relation to Mossmorran.
2. Councillors suggested the community possibly put some blame on the employees of Exxonmobil and Shell for the flaring and because of this some employees needed support. Perhaps trade union representatives from the companies (GMB and Unite) should be represented on the committee. NK advised this committee was all about engagement and liaison between the companies, regulators and the community and felt it was not appropriate for Trade Unions to sit on this committee. Convenor of the Committee agreed with this.

AB asked the group if they had any views which regard to question 1.

DB confirmed he had no objection to the first proposal but highlighted there are instances when Shell and Exxon have legitimately provided hospitality for Educational visits etc

AMacD said historically we have followed Fife Council's lead e.g. if it ok with Fife Council elected members to attend an event with hospitality then it is fine for us as well. Networking events are hugely beneficial for everyone. As far as providing employee support then it is important but not sure if it is appropriate for this committee. This needs to be addressed by another agency.

TK stated with regard to gifts, which can total hundreds of pounds in the hospitality boxes, if the whole group were invited what message would this give the communities. There is no grey area, these are expensive gifts and there is a point to them, can we at least acknowledge that and be honest about it.

AB advised my view is that it is up to the individual. There is a lot on the committee who are not Fife Councillors or Community Councillors, everyone has to make their own mind up on this. I don't think it is something we could put in the Constitution. AB suggested discussing again at a future meeting which would give everyone a chance to think about it. AB continued stating with regard to Trade Unions being represented on this Committee, my view is this committee is a go between the companies and the communities and I don't think there is space for Trade Unions.

TK stated if the Trade Unions have something to contribute there is value in that. I would have them on.

DB said the issue may have arisen at my suggestion but the response NK gave at Committee, I accepted, and in particular the role of the EAGs the HSE as NK rightly pointed out they would feed into HSE and they have a role to play in this new format. It was a fair compromise.

NK confirmed HSE are now members of this group but unfortunately he had been unable to make contact with David Breen. HSE like ourselves are up to their eyes with covid issues at the moment. NK reiterated they will not talk about employees but will bring the element of plant safety to the table.

CB said from a Shell perspective we have not offered hospitality or gifts for a number of years and we would not intend to restart this, no issue from Shell.

SN echoed CB comments, Exxonmobile have not offered hospitality for over a year with no hospitality plans going forward.

AB thanked Exxon and Shell and stated with regard to DB's point inviting people to the plant for educational purposes, I hope tea/coffee can still be laid on to encourage people to come along.

SN picked up on DB's point and said when we are clear of this situation we would like to welcome representatives onto the plant particularly as we head towards our investment as we would want to show this up close. We do hope this can be continued and the issue of personal hospitality is another matter.

DB asked NK timescales for finalising this and going to Committee, will this group have an opportunity to come back later after this meeting before it is finalised, or is a decision needed over the question of gifts and hospitality.

NK replied there is no timescale. The decision lies with this committee rather than Fife Council except for when the Terms of Reference and Constitution goes back to Fife Council for approval. NK said we need to drive forward, we can't wait until the next meeting, sub-groups need to be set up to look at specific actions/volunteers to sit on the groups:

- Required changes for Terms of Reference and Constitution – I agree it will be difficult to be put something in about gifts and hospitality worded in such a way we don't exclude educational visits to the companies or other educational items outwith the companies
- Volunteers for subgroups
- How the EAG will be set up – who chairs, representations on them. It was raised at the last meeting the Council should be represented on them, but as they are technically groups, EAGs will come back to this group for approval.
- Independent Chair and agree a process for filling that position in terms of person spec, ensuring they are completely independent and agree how the position is filled e.g. by interview. The final decision would need to come back to this group for approval.

AB said he was happy to assist with the Independent Chair if the group are happy for him to do so and would like to see a Councillor represented at each of the EAGs.

DB confirmed he was happy to join any and suggested it may be easier if this could be followed up by email and people can put their names forward. NK agreed to send out communication.

6. Community Engagement Proposals

NK stated a lot of this work came from the feedback from the review which highlighted two issues:

1. Communication and trust
2. Perception against reality

We think our messages are clear but obviously they are not being perceived clearly by the communities, the proposal in this paper is to look at this. NK said my view is this committee needs to be the loudest voice in the community. Some of the messaging could be counterproductive, what is clear is there is fear and anxiety in the community on various issues and people should not have to live like that, it is up to us as a committee to ensure we convey the key messages which is understood and this paper is to identify some of the concerns. NK continued stating I think we know quite clearly what these are e.g. air quality, noise, light, vibration, concerns about cancers and other issues, what we don't know is why people feel like this, not the visible effects e.g. noise, light vibrations are quite clear it is the other issues air quality, cancers, what is driving that belief. NK suggested producing a road map, this is where we are now and looking to the future, as a committee, what would a success look like e.g. everyone feels engaged, they feel comfortable, feel secure, no anxiety of what is going on at Mossmorran and how do we build a road map from where we are now to that position. NK said there are three recommendations in the report on how we bridge that gap. NK welcomed the committee's views.

WT stated SEPA have made a commitment to have drop-in sessions which was raised at a public meeting organised by Mossmorran Action Group in response to concerns on air quality and what monitoring we were doing at that time. The drop-in session allowed us to share what our monitoring equipment does and share the results, but it also brought wider issues from the community and made us think about maybe widening what engagement we should be planning and thinking about under guidance from this committee. Drop-in sessions are a commitment to the community but unfortunately we have been unable to drive this forward due to covid.

NK replied what we do now with Mossmorran should be done through this committee, maybe different workstreams but they are feeding into this liaison committee.

SN said we have previously spoken quite extensively around this issue but it may be good to share with the other committee members. There is a clear consensus across all parties that what is really important is communication. We wholeheartedly support the principle of communicating with our communities to build a better understanding and if we start communicating collectively we already have information with Fife

Council, SEPA, the two companies, independent air quality group, a huge amount of good information we need to get out there. My view now is our focus perhaps should be on an independent expert who can work with the committee on what is the best way to communicate to reach the audiences we need to reach. We need to recognise this cannot be done just digitally as not everyone is able/has connectivity, we need to find different channels, we have the tools there. SN continued from a company perspective we are very supportive of coming under the umbrella of the committee that is where we will start to build trust if all partners are seen to be working together to help our communities get to a place they feel more comfortable.

NK replied interesting suggestion about an independent expert to reach communities, we tend to use IT so maybe we are missing out on whole cohorts of people. Also, we need consider how we are do the messaging as perhaps we need an expert to assist with that too.

AB asked SN about the company videos which were put together, is there any way these could go out.

SN replied yes, they are on our website. When we put these tools online we actually contacted all community councils and asked if they could share it through their own networks. We would be keen to know if this was actioned as it helps the communities to see and engage. We could find other ways to push these materials out and perhaps the communications sub-group could discuss on how we can do that.

TK enquired if it would be helpful to have a situation audit from both companies just to draw a line under what has gone past and say what the future holds for the Mossmorran site. Often a question that is raised is regarding the life of the site, having expired a number of years ago people would like to know how much longer the site is seen by the companies as being viable.

AMcD said he couldn't believe the same questions were being asked over and over again. The communication process until now has not been great but it has improved. In his view the best material produced was a report from Wood Consultant. It was crystal clear, well circulated and well read. AMcD went on to say it has to be a continuous process, from my part, I do read as many of the reports as I can and I don't have any significant issues. We need to know what the permit actually states, what are the limits, how many times are these limits approached, breached etc asked in the past how does Mossmorran compare to similar industries elsewhere e.g. what is the industry benchmark, is Mossmorran older, younger, is Mossmorran more or less at risk of contamination. This is never going to be resolved with a one-off statement it must be a continuous process.

AB said I think we all agree it has to be continuous, different people take an interest in the plant at different times. AB stated he would like to see something to show how the plants effects the gas network for the rest of Scotland, for the rest of the UK in fact a full explanation of the gas coming from the north sea from oil rigs and gas rigs into the country and down to the plant and what it is used for. There is huge amount of uses for the outputs especially from Exxon and I think this needs to be explained a bit more, after Covid 19 and the requirement for PPE.

CB replied stating he would try and provide some context. The plant 40 years ago was a set of steel and valves of infrastructure and since then we have gone through a process of replacing a large amount of the infrastructure to keep with up modern

technology and best practices. We now see it as being safer today than the day it was built as we are keeping up with engineering practices, its not a case of age, its more around viability in terms of how much gas we can process. How long can we operate in Mossmorran indefinitely if we continue to invest in the way that we do. How long is it viable, difficult question to predicate an answer. As like the Mossmorran Action Group we would be happy to walk through and talk to community members about the safe distance work we have on site.

IB picked up on the point, we have gone through a number of concerns with people again and again, we have shared a lot of information with people and I think the key thing which comes out of NK's paper is the idea of actually engaging the community, talking to them, trying to understand why the communication so far hasn't answered the question for many people. Therefore, how can we develop a route map that states this is how we can work and share information with you to help you better understand. Not everyone agrees with the conclusions all the time but at least if we can work with the community to get them the best information in the best way this will allow this group to work effectively.

NK said in relation to understanding how the plants fits into the national infrastructure we talked about having a presentation at the December committee to look at the whole system approach, NK confirmed he had contacted local companies. NK continued by stating this was perhaps a question for CB but as things go forward with deep carbonisation, climate emergency etc things will change anyway and we won't know what the future looks like.

DB said with regard to the question on remits, communication, about what and who, we have talked about how Shell and Exxon can better communicate in terms of the plant operations and safety etc there is also the question around how this group should communicate to the community, the group is not here to communicate for Shell or Exxon we are here to hold Shell and Exxon to account. We must be able to convey what this group does and perhaps a communications strategy is required. Do we need a Facebook page, Fife Council posts in-depth discussion around everyone's remits?

AB agreed with DB and stated that is why we need the communications subgroup. The issue in the past has been how we report out to the public and how we go about it. Facebook would need a volunteer, not a councillor, SEPA, or the companies, it would need to be a community councillor. AB stated SEPA have a very good website, they put up the majority of questions anybody has asked regarding about Shell and Exxon which is a great start but who would be willing to take this on. It has taken us three years to get Fife Council to include this committees' minutes on their website and would require funding. This may be a role for the new convenor.

TK said it is conspicuous by their absence Mossmorran Action Group, do they not have a role in this going forward?

AB replied no, they don't have a role on this committee. Perhaps the committee could look at this again. It had been looked at a couple of times but it was decided that Mossmorran Action Group were not representing all of the community.

TK said just as you previously stated reporting into the community a lot of people do, which does not need to be one outlet, we do need multiply different media sources so

communities can pick up information but a lot of people do refer directly to the Mossmorran Action Group website.

AB commented there are eleven community councils on this committee, each one is notified of meeting dates and each one could report out on their Facebook pages etc There is no reason to have anyone else in my opinion. Perhaps you could put this forward as an agenda item for the next committee meeting.

NK advised he had engaged with the Mossmorran Action Group and it was brought up as part of the review, I asked the question with everyone which met with different opinions but the majority felt although Mossmorran Action Group had a really good profile and website they did not represent the community officially whereas community councils do. It becomes difficult to single out one group, however NK agreed with DB's comment regarding companies having their own communications. NK said this committee needs to be the main voice, independent and trusted. This may lead to the messaging being different from the companies but we need to feed that through the new comms group. NK confirmed he decided not to include Mossmorran Action Group in the membership from the discussions which had taken place.

7. Any Other Business

AB thanked everyone for attending and the meeting closed.

