



Dongara Mid-West onshore gas community workshop – 24 October 2012

Community information and engagement expectations

Bruce Taylor and Peter Stone, CSIRO Ecosystem Sciences

20 December 2012

Copyright and disclaimer

© 2012 CSIRO To the extent permitted by law, all rights are reserved and no part of this publication covered by copyright may be reproduced or copied in any form or by any means except with the written permission of CSIRO.

Important disclaimer

CSIRO advises that the information contained in this publication comprises general statements based on scientific research. The reader is advised and needs to be aware that such information may be incomplete or unable to be used in any specific situation. No reliance or actions must therefore be made on that information without seeking prior expert professional, scientific and technical advice. To the extent permitted by law, CSIRO (including its employees and consultants) excludes all liability to any person for any consequences, including but not limited to all losses, damages, costs, expenses and any other compensation, arising directly or indirectly from using this publication (in part or in whole) and any information or material contained in it.

Contents

Acknowledgments	iii
Executive summary.....	iv
1 Introduction and background	1
2 Identification of issues and interests at different scales	3
3 Gathering stakeholder feedback on current and future engagement.....	4
4 Distilling the key messages from the Mid-West region workshop – from engagement perceptions to principles.....	5
4.1 Understanding different types of stakeholders and their needs	5
4.2 Providing trusted, independent and timely information to stakeholders.....	6
4.3 Recognising the value of local knowledge	7
4.4 Matching engagement with the stage development	7
4.5 Building local as well as state-wide capability to provide effective engagement	7
4.6 Taking a coordinated and transparent approach	8
4.7 Engaging communities when questions of ‘risk’ and ‘uncertainty’ are important.....	8
5 Final comments and next steps.....	10
Appendix A Participant information sheet	12
Appendix B Issues and interests identified during the Mid-West Onshore Gas Community Workshop Plenary Session – “What are the issues?”	13
Appendix C Summary of discussion group feedback on engagement preferences	16

Tables

Table 1 Types of stakeholders5

Acknowledgments

The Dongara Mid-West Onshore Gas Community Workshop was hosted by Western Australia's Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP), in partnership with the CSIRO and the Australian Petroleum Production and Exploration Association (APPEA).

The authors would like to thank participants for their engagement with and investment in the workshop.

Executive summary

The early stages of onshore gas development are a time when there is considerable real and perceived uncertainty, each of which tends to stimulate community demand for information and engagement with decision makers in government and industry.

In response to this demand, Western Australia's Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP), the Australian Petroleum Production and Exploration Association (APPEA) and CSIRO jointly hosted a workshop in Dongara in October 2012. Its purpose was to inform government and industry about community expectations for information provision and community engagement. Insights were gained by asking participants to address four main questions:

1. What are your concerns and interests with respect to onshore gas development? What are the issues that are important to you?
2. How would you like to get information about issues of concern?
3. How and with whom would you like to engage to identify future needs?
4. What support would that require?

The workshop provided clear insights into community concerns and interests, which are documented unambiguously in this report. The register of concerns and interests has been structured so that it can be used to develop comprehensive plans for the provision of information, and also to identify information gaps.

The community articulated its demand for more information about the concerns and interests identified, and expressed a strong preference for information derived from and potentially delivered by sources without regulatory or industry development roles. A range of different methods for providing information were identified, including physical and digital material, as well as interactive workshops and experiential farm walks.

Workshop participants expressed their expectation of greater engagement with decision makers from industry and government. Greater engagement, it was felt, would enhance the capacity for relevant local knowledge to inform approaches to industry regulation and management.

To best reach their target audiences, engagement methods and approaches should be tailored to meet the needs of different sectors of the community. It is also important to consider designing engagement methods and approaches so that they can evolve to continually meet the needs of the community, which will change as their experience grows and as development proceeds.

Workshop participants recognised that existing networks and structures in government, industry and community may provide a useful means for developing on-going and enhanced methods for engagement.

Many of the concerns expressed at the workshop appear to be strongly linked to questions of uncertainty regarding the location, timing and extent of future development scenarios, and the likely magnitude of risks or impacts associated with development. The construction of a range of development scenarios for the region as "possible futures", accompanied by analysis of associated impacts, may help to focus discussion about impacts and responses, and so best prepare community, industry and government for considering and planning the future.

1 Introduction and background

The early stages of onshore shale gas development are a time at which there is considerable real and perceived uncertainty.

In the exploration phase, the industry has yet to formulate coherent plans for industry development and expansion. Government typically has yet to fully establish the regulatory frameworks that support community confidence. In the absence of particular development plans and regulatory frameworks scientists can find it difficult to apply their knowledge to specific technical questions.

In such an environment, the broader community may feel that development initiatives are gaining momentum and that their expectations of access to information and engagement with decision makers are not being fully met.

This is not conducive to the establishment of open, trusted and informed communication channels that enable the challenges and opportunities arising from gas developments to be identified and addressed through effective regulation, research and management.

Community meetings, June 2012

In recognition of this, a series of community meetings was held in June 2012 in the Mid-West (Dongara, Eneabba and Gingin), attended by representatives of the community, government, industry and scientists. They identified the benefits of further multi-party forums for fostering open information exchange amongst these parties.

They also identified the need for a process by which community, industry and government can develop methods for establishing mutual engagement, with the goals of:

- identifying concerns relating to onshore gas development and associated information needs and gaps
- fostering a fact-based discussion that draws on knowledge of community concerns and expectations to inform operational and regulatory approaches to development of onshore gas resources.

Community workshop, October 2012

With the above goals in mind, Western Australia's Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP), the Australian Petroleum Production and Exploration Association (APPEA) and CSIRO jointly hosted a workshop in Dongara (October 2012). Their joint involvement was important, because each provided a piece of the puzzle required to understand and respond to community information needs and expectations:

- DMP, as the lead regulator, has a role in developing a regulatory environment that reflects and protects broader societal expectations and interests.
- APPEA, as the peak gas industry body, has close involvement with planned development activity and seeks to commence on-going engagement so that industry practice can inform and be informed by community expectations.
- CSIRO has specialists in community engagement and is an independent source of information about the industry and its potential social and environmental impacts and opportunities.

Together, these three agencies invited the broader Dongara region community to a workshop that aimed to establish methods for identifying and addressing community concerns with a view to:

- informing the Western Australia (WA) Government's strategic framework for supporting and regulating onshore gas development
- informing industry of community expectations regarding industry codes of practice and the establishment of a social licence to operate
- identifying information needs and gaps as a means of informing communication and research priorities

- making recommendations on methods to support further engagement and dissemination of credible, competent and objective information.

Specifically, the workshop asked participants to respond to the following questions:

1. What are your concerns and interests with respect to onshore gas development? What are the issues that are important to you?
2. How would you like to get information about issues of concern?
3. How and with whom would you like to engage to identify future needs?
4. What support would that require?

An overview of the approach used during the workshop is outlined in the *Participant Information Sheet* provided in Appendix A. A finer-scale understanding of the workshop can be gained via the agenda and the PowerPoint presentations used to stimulate discussion on the day of the workshop, both of which are available on the DMP's website:

- http://www.dmp.wa.gov.au/documents/Mid_West_UCG_Workshop_program_241012.pdf
- http://www.dmp.wa.gov.au/documents/Workshop_PowerPoint_presentation.pdf.

The workshop was attended by approximately 60 participants, including members of the local community, gas industry, local and state government, and NGOs, representing a wide range of interests.

The workshop was facilitated by CSIRO staff, who also compiled the verbal and written feedback received both on the day of the workshop and in the weeks leading up to the preparation of this report. Opportunity was given to all stakeholders to register their interests and concerns regarding industry development, the proposed regulatory framework and related community concerns. Those who were not able to attend the workshop, or were not comfortable with sharing their views in an open forum, were afforded the opportunity to provide written submissions, of which three were received.

The remainder of this report identifies and interprets the information gained via the workshop and written submissions.

2 Identification of issues and interests at different scales

The workshop provided participants with the opportunity to identify their concerns and interests with respect to onshore gas development. In the first instance, representatives of Indigenous, local government and landholder/community interests gave 15 minute presentations during which they identified concerns from a particular stakeholder perspective. This was followed by a plenary session of approximately 60 minutes during which issues were identified and elaborated by all workshop participants. Time did not appear to have constrained the identification and elaboration of issues: participants appeared to have exhausted their 'lists of concern' during the verbal session, and no new concerns or issues were identified (though many were elaborated) in subsequent written submissions.

Issues and interests were identified using 'scale' (e.g. global to local) as an organising principle, because experience suggests that structure of this type helps to draw out, via discussion, the greatest range of issues and interests.

The issues and interests identified by workshop participants, via verbal and written feedback, included greenhouse gas emissions, energy security and alternatives, societal values and goals, infrastructure, governance, policy and regulation, environmental impacts, consultation, property rights and compensation. Details of these issues and interests were provided in a standalone document in November 2012, which is available on the DMP's website:

- http://www.dmp.wa.gov.au/documents/Onshore_gas_workshop_plenary_issues_and_interests.pdf.

The table of issues and interests identified in the standalone document is also reproduced in Appendix B of this report. Please note that the inclusion of issues and interests in the table does not indicate the frequency with which issues were raised, or suggest their relative priority or importance. Furthermore, it does not imply that all workshop participants agreed that the issues and interests are relevant or important.

Notes on individual concerns and interests have been expanded by the facilitator to reflect the content of the plenary session. All documented points of concern and interest were made available to all workshop participants approximately a fortnight after the workshop, with a view to seeking additions and corrections. The feedback received in the month following the release of the points and concerns elaborated on points identified during the plenary session of the workshop, rather than identifying 'new' concerns. Notwithstanding that, the list in Appendix B does not represent a final, agreed or definitive list of issues and interests that may be investigated or communicated through future community consultation processes.

3 Gathering stakeholder feedback on current and future engagement

In addition to the identification of issues outlined in the previous section, the workshop also gathered stakeholder views on current and preferred future engagement. All workshop attendees contributed to one of five small structured group discussions, each with around 12 participants. In each of these small groups, participants explored and discussed their responses to the following questions:

1. How do you describe your current level of participation across a spectrum of inform-consult-involve-collaborate-empower?
2. How do you describe your preferred future level of participation along that same spectrum during the next 1-3 years?
3. What are the practical considerations or steps required to meet both your current and future engagement needs?

The key points from those discussions were recorded (in written form) by each group and then reported, verbally, by a spokesperson for each of the groups, to the workshop as a whole. In addition to the small group discussions, participants were also given the opportunity to make individual written responses to these questions on separate, prepared feedback forms. Fourteen of these responses were received.

While the process was designed and intended to be an inclusive one, it is important to note that a small number of written submissions received from participants and comments voiced at the workshop expressed concerns about the 'limited number of local people' attending the day and the absence of 'local voices' in the discussion.

Both the material from the group discussions (see Appendix C) and the individual written submissions were reviewed and analysed by CSIRO research staff and form the basis of the proposals in this report, which have been augmented by CSIRO staff expertise in natural resource-related development and engagement.

In the following section, the key messages identified from these processes are detailed as a set of guiding principles to inform future engagement practice in the region.

4 Distilling the key messages from the Mid-West region workshop – from engagement perceptions to principles

Group discussions and written submissions indicated a range of engagement preferences, various descriptions of current levels of engagement and a variety of future engagement preferences and needs. In this section the consistent and significant themes from the discussions are identified and presented as a set of principles that could be used to frame the design of an engagement strategy for the region. As well as being informed by the responses of workshop participants, each of these principles has a strong basis in the international literature on public participation in resource development.

4.1 Understanding different types of stakeholders and their needs

Identifying the full suite of individuals, groups or communities who are currently or may be potentially affected by onshore gas development is an important step in developing an engagement framework. Table 1 lists some of the different types of stakeholders potentially impacted (positively or negatively) by onshore gas development in the Mid-West region. These stakeholders range from landholders who are directly affected due to exploration, development and related activities on their properties, through to the broader, regional communities who may be affected by more indirect impacts. Importantly these ‘types’ or categories are not mutually exclusive; a person or organisation might be considered as belonging to one or more of these ‘types’.

Table 1 Types of stakeholders¹

REF	TYPE OF INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP AFFECTED	EXAMPLES
A1	Individuals or groups with legal responsibilities, interests or title in land subject to exploration or development	Native Title holders or claimant groups
A2	Individuals or landholders who are directly (currently or in the future) impacted by drilling or related infrastructure and activity on their land/property	Landholders (e.g. farmers) with drilling/exploration on their property
A3	Those landholders in the immediate vicinity (i.e. neighbours) of development activity (e.g. drilling) and whose concerns may include noise, amenity, access, uncertainty issues, or risks to shared resources (e.g. water supplies)	Neighbouring landholders or land managers
B1	Local communities in close proximity to development likely to experience direct impacts (e.g. increased traffic,	Residents of local communities, towns or service centres; locally based business, community or

¹ This generic list of stakeholders has been developed from the discussions at the Dongara, Mid-West Workshop in October, 2012. Type ‘A’ stakeholders are those with direct material and legal interests in development. Type ‘B’ stakeholders are those that have direct (but secondary) or managerial interests in the development. Type ‘C’ stakeholders are those that could be considered, broadly, as the interested public, but also those state-wide or national organisations that represent, in some way, regional community interests in the region on a wide range of issues. These are preliminary suggestions only and should be developed further through discussion with the parties prior to use. This table does not include the gas industry networks, companies or related operators active in the region as a ‘stakeholder’ for the purposes of engagement planning. However, it was clear from concerns raised at the workshop that specific consideration needs to be given to how the State Government, industry representative bodies such as APPEA, and the community generally influence and communicate with these companies.

REF	TYPE OF INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP AFFECTED	EXAMPLES
	demand for services) or indirect impacts (e.g. change in labour profiles or resident population; economic benefits)	service organisations and networks
B2	Entities with statutory planning, infrastructure provision, service provision, community development or management responsibilities for land, people or other resources on areas subject to exploration and development	Local governments, state government agencies, regional development commissions
C1	Organised interest-based groups who represent different sectoral, geographical or land use interests in the region (and outside the region)	Agri-industry 'peak' groups or conservation interests (at local, state-wide or national levels)
C2	Other stakeholders with general and indirect interests in the development	Other interested citizens

A number of factors need to be taken into account when designing an engagement process, such as the:

- different levels of 'interests' or 'standing' associated with each of the stakeholder types
- significant differences in the stakeholders' needs, rights and obligations, resources and capabilities
- significant differences between stakeholders within each 'type'.

As such, engagement processes need to consider issues of literacy, financial capacity, and that the location and timing of engagement opportunities do not disadvantage particular members of the community. While attempts may be made to provide 'equal' access across the range of stakeholders it is important to recognise that not all stakeholders are starting from the same base level. Given this, equity of engagement may not arise from a single standard level of engagement, and may require interaction tailored to the needs of particular groups.

4.2 Providing trusted, independent and timely information to stakeholders

The provision of trusted, independent and timely information to stakeholders was considered an important immediate and on-going need in the engagement process. While both government and industry are custodians of considerable information about development, and are willing to assist in the dissemination of that information to the community, there are some important issues that need to be considered.

First, the goals, content and emphases of information provided by government and industry may differ; this may create confusion and increase the potential for conflict amongst stakeholders.

Second, workshop participants stressed the importance of information that is generated and provided by an independent and trusted source – a source not associated with the regulation or development of the resource. This issue becomes more significant on topics where 'facts' or 'accuracy' are contested or where the decision-stakes are high.

Third, participants indicated the information needs to reflect:

- local as well as national and international experiences and cases
- present both existing and best-practice circumstances
- present information that allows informed consideration across a range of future development options, risks and scenarios.

Information demand relating to an extensive list of issues is currently high amongst stakeholders (see Appendix B). Participants at the workshop also identified that information needs were likely to increase as the development proceeds - particularly for people who have development on their land. There was

general agreement that different people would seek, and could manage, different levels of information depending on their circumstances (see section 4.1 Understanding different types of stakeholders and their needs).

Alternatives to providing information in written or digital formats were also highlighted as worthy of consideration. Important for several groups at the workshop was the opportunity to see what is happening at sites of exploration and development. The opportunity to visit and “walk” development sites with government, industry and landholder representatives to get a first hand perspective was identified as being important to a range of stakeholders.

4.3 Recognising the value of local knowledge

In addition to the value of rigorous scientific and legal information in the engagement process, participants also identified the value associated with recognition and inclusion of local and indigenous knowledge. These types of knowledge can provide an intimate understanding of the immediate environment and assist in tailoring generic avoidance or mitigation strategies to those particular local contexts. The contributions of this knowledge were described by participants in various ways including:

- historical and practical knowledge of land and water resources (e.g. groundwater) and their interaction at local and site specific scales
- social, cultural and spiritual values associated with the landscapes and locations in the region
- knowledge of the impacts of earlier types of development on ecosystems and communities in the region
- knowledge of the efficacy of different land management, rehabilitation and development practices suited to local ecosystems and production landscapes.

These types of knowledge can assist to reduce costs or negative impacts of development and to inform on-going management (e.g. rehabilitation) of development sites over time.

4.4 Matching engagement with the stage development

Workshop participants identified that different stakeholders were, at present, exposed to different levels of involvement in onshore gas exploration and development activities. That is, where some stakeholders are already ‘in the midst of development’ and negotiating with gas companies, others are still anticipating or uncertain about future development on their property. For these reasons it will be necessary to acknowledge and plan for engagement needs at different stages of development (e.g. pre-exploration, exploration, development, post-development) as the intensity, content, goals and methods of engagement will differ through these stages.

Considering the different needs at various development stages will also help all parties to anticipate how these needs are likely to change over time and how to plan for the major transitional periods between these phases. In addition to tailoring engagement methods to the stage of development, consideration may also be given to tailoring engagement to the needs of diverse stakeholders, as described above.

4.5 Building local as well as state-wide capability to provide effective engagement

Investing in, resourcing and supporting local entities and networks to meet primary engagement needs was a recurrent theme amongst participants. Here, building on existing local organisations and networks is an important step. Several workshop participants pointed to the potential enhancement of local government’s role as an important ‘hub’ for community engagement. However, these ‘local points of contact’ must be supported by and linked to appropriate engagement and information resources at the regional, state or national levels to be effective and viable. Ideally, support for local engagement operators would need to

extend for the active life of the exploration and early to mid-development phases, with succession planning for suitable changes to these arrangements as development matures or community needs change. This suggests an on-going (perhaps 3-5 year) commitment to resourcing these local engagement operators.

A key need for building or maintaining local capacity identified by workshop participants was ensuring the local presence of state agencies and their officers in the region. This was in response to perceptions that the state's lead regulator (DMP) is not always visible in the local area where development is occurring or may occur. This was seen to create both practical and 'symbolic' issues for local residents. These issues include perceptions relating to the adequacy of local oversight of development, information flows, and the capacity of government to understand and represent local sentiment and needs.

4.6 Taking a coordinated and transparent approach

Participants reported that they were presently faced with multiple 'communication channels' for onshore gas development and related issues. There was a desire for information flows, and engagement processes more broadly, to be better coordinated or indeed consolidated across the range of government, industry and community information providers. This desire also related to improved coordination of consultation and feedback processes from communities to governments. Community participants acknowledged that industry and government cooperation through the workshop process itself was a positive and practical example of such cooperation. There are important benefits that can be gained through more efficient and 'streamlined' engagement processes. However, these benefits will need to be considered against the sometimes inherent messiness of engaging communities with diverse needs and interests where industry and government themselves have diverse and sometimes divergent drivers, obligations and responsibilities.

A concern related to coordinated information flows was the means by which communities could be notified of onshore gas industry risks, accidents or breaches of their operating licences or regulations².

Transparency in this regard was coupled with the desire for industry accountability to be demonstrated to the public at large, not only to the regulator. Coordination of information flows (where possible) and transparency in industry reporting and dissemination of those reports were together seen as important conditions for responsible operation of the industry in the region.

4.7 Engaging communities when questions of 'risk' and 'uncertainty' are important

Many community concerns expressed at the Dongara workshop appear strongly linked to questions of uncertainty associated with future development scenarios (location, timing, extent) and the likely magnitude of risks or impacts associated with development. In these sorts of circumstances the frequency of information sharing and general contact between the regulator, industry and the community needs to be greater than in a situation involving the development of a single project involving clear timeframes and spatial extent, for example.

² Internationally, there is a 20-year history of notification of corporate environmental or safety breaches to the community (mandatory public disclosure requirements) as part of environmental licensing conditions. Some commentators believe such approaches have improved private sector compliance with, for example, water quality pollution regulations (e.g. under the *US Clean Water Act*). For such a scheme to work monitoring systems and compliance checking procedures need to be adequate.

Attempts could also be made to identify low, mid and high development scenarios for the region as “possible futures” for which some analysis of the likely impacts can be estimated. This would provide some focus for communities and local governments to plan, prepare for, and debate the various responses their communities might implement over time given these different scenarios. In this way, scenarios, while not reducing the uncertainty of actual future development trajectories, improve communities’ (and governments’) preparedness and responsiveness for different outcomes. This kind of scenario-based and participatory impact assessment at the regional scale could be informed, in part, through mechanisms established to provide independent scientific information. Furthermore, such an approach could be aligned with the more ‘consultative’ and ‘involvement’ oriented strategies of any future regional engagement plan.

5 Final comments and next steps

The seven principles detailed in section 4 provide some broad guidance for the development of an engagement strategy by government and/or industry. This guidance is based on the perspectives of those community and government stakeholders who participated at, and provided written submission to, the workshop, and from knowledge of 'good practice' public participation in resource development contexts informed by the international research literature.

It is not the intent of this report to be prescriptive about the particular methods or processes that should be adopted in the Mid-West region. We acknowledge that both government and industry will have specific and different engagement goals related to their respective statutory authority and corporate responsibilities. To move towards a more specific set of practices, both DMP and APPEA could consider what the implications of applying these principles are to their current practice and responsibilities, and to the goal of providing opportunities for appropriate and adequate participation during the life of industry development in the region.

In very broad terms the authors suggest that, at the current stage of the development process, two needs are critical. First, addressing gaps in information provision and, second, establishing adequate consultation mechanisms.

The initial focus of information provision could include, for example:

- Information about the status, risks, benefits and likely progress of development in the region.
- Improving access to independent scientific knowledge to inform discussion and decision-making (e.g. a single portal through which independent scientific information can be accessed).
- Providing access to actual development sites to improve understanding of the local characteristics of development (e.g. through "farm walks" and similar approaches).
- Coordinating existing government, industry and community networks for information dissemination.

Some starting considerations regarding consultation mechanisms could include, for example:

- The short-term or periodic use of public meetings and/or community workshops to disseminate information and seek feedback from community stakeholders.
- Improving stakeholder awareness of and supporting input to submission processes and impact assessment procedures required by regulation.
- The contribution of other parallel or recent consultative processes to understanding community aspirations, concerns and values (e.g. local government processes for undertaking local planning involving community input).

Whilst the above needs are the highest priority, attention to the design and development of methods for supporting meaningful community stakeholder *involvement* may also be beneficial. Doing so could allow for forward-looking and participatory consideration of:

- How development might proceed?
- How impacts and risks may be monitored, reported to the community and managed?
- The resources required to support on-going information sharing and community participation, including mechanisms to help improve coordination amongst industry and government processes.
- The relationship of unconventional gas development to other priority natural resource, environmental and economic development issues and planning in the region, including the consideration of cumulative impacts.

To address these more complex needs, more permanent and 'purpose-built' processes may be required. These may involve, for example:

- Augmenting existing regional community advisory committees or structures that exist in the region (e.g. for water resource planning, native vegetation management, natural resource management or economic development).
- Aligning with existing local and regional organisations that currently implement projects, have existing engagement networks and/or invest in these areas.
- Considering the role of more formal and structured approaches to scenario-based participatory assessment at the community and regional levels.

This report has not attempted to specify the means by which information should be provided or the means by which engagement should occur. It seeks to provide data and insights that can be used to support decisions about information provision and engagement processes.

Appendix A Participant information sheet

Unconventional Gas Community Workshop

Wednesday, 24 October 2012 – Port Denison

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Mid West Onshore Gas Community Workshop

The purpose of this workshop is to understand your thoughts and opinions about community engagement, to guide the method and frequency of government and industry engagement processes relating to Western Australia's onshore gas industry.

Government, industry and CSIRO are jointly coordinating community workshops on the potential development of Western Australia's onshore shale and tight gas industries. The involvement of these three parties ensures information gaps can be met with trusted, expert information.

These workshops will offer fact based discussion to help identify community concerns by providing access to expert advice on current exploration and potential future development of the State's onshore shale and tight gas industries.

Workshop attendees will also consider ways to support further engagement and access to information to address ongoing public concerns.

What is onshore shale and tight gas?

Shale and tight gas is the name used for gas obtained from certain types of low permeability rock formations.

Tight gases are usually found in low permeability and low porosity sandstone and limestone, while shale gas occurs within shale-type rocks that are commonly associated with traditional oil and gas sources.

Technical improvements over the past thirty years, including horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing, have improved the commercial viability of these gas resources.

Western Australia is currently in the very early stages of on-shore shale gas development, which has the potential to make a major contribution to Western Australia's strong economic growth.

What is involved?

There is considerable debate on this topic, with contrasting opinions that create uncertainty for the community.

Information sharing

This is why it is important that open, trusted and informed communication channels are established. This workshop is intended as one of the first steps in enabling the challenges and opportunities arising from on-shore shale gas development to be identified and community preferences for ongoing engagement to be established.

The workshop will last approximately 5 hours (refreshments and lunch will be provided).



Government of **Western Australia**
Department of **Mines and Petroleum**



Unconventional Gas Community Workshop

Wednesday, 24 October 2012 – Port Denison

Concerns

Following the welcome and introductions, there will be presentations from government, industry and a range of community representatives, intended to provide general information about the industry, the proposed regulatory framework and related community concerns. This will be followed by a general discussion, during which community issues and concerns will be raised and recorded.

Your feedback

Next, a range of methods for supporting community engagement will be presented and workshop participants will form smaller groups of about 10 people, to discuss which of those they prefer and expect. Five groups will report their findings to the workshop; the remainder will be asked to report back whether and how their discussion differed from those five.

The workshop program has been structured to ensure that those who do not formally address the workshop will have the opportunity to have their views heard, recorded & considered. In addition, you can make a written submission should you want to express your interests and concerns. Written submissions can be made anonymously if required but is not preferred.

Written submissions will be considered by all workshop partners and should include (a) issues of concern; (b) aspirations for community engagement and; (c) preferred future community engagement methods.

Written submissions can be emailed to: onshoregas@dmp.wa.gov.au or sent by post to:

Department of Mines and Petroleum
Community Engagement Feedback
100 Plain Street
East Perth WA 6004

Participation and withdrawal

Participation in this workshop is completely voluntary. You are free to withdraw from it at any time without prejudice or penalty. Your attendance at the workshop indicates that you consent to participation.

If you wish to withdraw, please notify the Chair or their assistant, and you are free to leave. If you do withdraw from the workshop, information that you have provided up to that point can be deleted if requested and will not be included in subsequent deliberations unless you give permission to use that information. You are, of course, free to leave the workshop at any time without 'withdrawing' from it.

Risks

Participation in this study should involve no physical or mental discomfort, and no risks beyond those of everyday living. If, however, you should find any question or procedure to be invasive or offensive, you are free to omit answering that question. If you have any concerns about any



Government of **Western Australia**
Department of **Mines and Petroleum**



Unconventional Gas Community Workshop

Wednesday, 24 October 2012 – Port Denison

aspects of the study, please contact Dr Peter Stone or Dr Bruce Taylor (see below for contact details).

Confidentiality

The workshop environment is designed to share ideas and, as such, it is the responsibility of workshop participants to ensure that they do not share confidential information about themselves or others. Written submissions will be considered by all workshop partners. All information provided at the workshop and in written submissions may be referred to in the CSIRO report arising from the workshop and, where necessary, information may be associated with its source.

How will my information be used?

The information you provide to us, via workshop participation or written submissions, will be used to write a general report on community views regarding areas of concern about onshore gas development and preferred methods for government and industry engagement with the community about those concerns.

That report will be made publicly available approximately 6 weeks after the workshop.

How can I find out more?

In addition to attending the workshop and reading the report arising from it, you are welcome to contact staff from the participating institutions.

The workshop and report outlined above is being funded by the Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP), the Australian Petroleum Production and Exploration Association (APPEA) and CSIRO.

Ethical clearance and contacts

The conduct of this workshop and report complies with the guidelines of the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research. If you have any questions concerning your participation in the study feel free to contact the researchers involved.

Thank you for your help with this study.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Peter Stone
CSIRO Ecosystem Sciences*
E: peter.stone@csiro.au
T: 02 9490 5512

*Peter Stone is also Director of the Gas Industry Social & Environmental Research Alliance, GISERA. He is facilitating the workshop in his capacity as Deputy Chief, CSIRO Ecosystem Sciences.



Government of **Western Australia**
Department of **Mines and Petroleum**



Appendix B Issues and interests identified during the Mid-West Onshore Gas Community Workshop Plenary Session – “What are the issues?”

SCALE	ISSUES	SPECIFIC ISSUES AND CONCERNS
Global	Carbon-GHG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greenhouse gas emissions associated with the use of a ‘new’ fossil fuel • Fugitive emissions associated with practices such as venting and flaring • Energy transition pathways from coal through gas to renewable energy sources • ‘Crowding out’ of renewable energy alternatives by the advent of a ‘new’ and relatively inexpensive fossil fuel
	Economy, trade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long term gas pricing and availability • Impact of price changes on industry growth • Impacts of price changes on the balance between domestic and export gas supply • Impacts of industry on environmental amenity and, hence, other industries such as tourism • Impacts on energy innovation (i.e. the propensity of innovators to explore alternatives to fossil fuels)
	Energy security; supply, demand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role of onshore gas in national and state energy security • Balance between export and domestic consumption and energy security • Balance between energy security and export revenue • Changing patterns of energy use as affected by population growth and per capita energy use • Recognition of existing international resources/reports
National	Energy alternatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Place of gas in national energy policy, particularly with respect to transition to renewables • Relative economic benefits (GDP, employment, etc) of gas for export and domestic consumption
	Societal values, beliefs, goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent to which gas availability may enhance or retard society’s capacity to think innovatively about energy sources and use • The degree to which large resource developments reflect or conflict with the national identity(ies); now and in the future
	Governance, policy, regulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whole of government approach: harmonisation of local, state and federal planning processes and regulations; State-level cross-departmental communication and consistency • Inclusion of local government in State level planning processes • Recognition of the need to adequately resource (capacity, funds) local government to respond to impacts and opportunities presented by onshore gas developments • Asymmetry of resourcing and capacity at local and state government impairs capacity for local input and response to plans and regulations made at higher levels • Recognition of local government as a representative of local needs and as a legitimate agent in pursuing those needs • Policy based on or informed by independent scientific assessment

SCALE	ISSUES	SPECIFIC ISSUES AND CONCERNS
	Governance, policy, regulation (continued...)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulations based on outcomes as well as best practice, not best practice alone. • Parity of access for mining versus petroleum • Risk management: transparent assessments of a wide range of risks (social, economic, environmental), methods for addressing them and potential residual risk • Long term liability for degradation and failure of gas industry assets (e.g. wells), and associated environmental impacts (e.g. aquifers) • Acknowledgement and management of government's conflict of interest as gas industry regulator and facilitator • Inclusion of independent voices during water planning processes [i.e. ensuring that a whole-of government approach does not dilute the voice of individual agencies in assessing impacts] • Matching compliance tools (e.g. monitoring, evaluation, sanction, fines) with scale of risk • Adequacy, responsibility for and transparency of monitoring and evaluation • Transparency of chemical regulations • Full disclosure of drilling plans/locations and other infrastructure (e.g. pipelines) by operators; simple and geographically relevant public access to this information
	Infrastructure: ports, roads, rail, power	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration of new energy sources (e.g. gas) into diversified energy solutions • Energy distribution networks capable of 'pushing' and 'pulling' energy to accommodate a range of future energy generation and use options • Protection of water security
Regional	Economy: enterprise mix, capital, labour, critical mass, transitions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role of gas development in contributing to sustainable regional development; ensuring that current planning is designed to leave a positive development legacy • Assessment of potential gas development to support new industries (e.g. fertiliser manufacture) and boost existing industries • Assessment of potential gas development to disadvantage existing industries (e.g. agriculture, tourism) or retard development of new industries
	Environment: surface and groundwater, biodiversity, marine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequacy of baseline environmental assessments (biodiversity, water quality and quantity, etc) before any exploration • Recognition of local values (e.g. local connections with natural assets; amenity and cultural values) as part of asset assessment process • Review of existing information on impacts of gas extraction on groundwater quality and quantity: from overseas if required, and interpreted as far as possible to local conditions • Potential for gas operations to induce seismicity (earthquakes)
	Community: aspirations, capacity, function, wellbeing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enduring engagement of stakeholders (community, local government, interest groups) with industry and government, via consultation, reference groups, etc • Planning to consider community well-being and long-term legacy • Maintenance and enhancement of regional amenity and lifestyle; attractiveness to live and work • Challenge of balancing economic development with, or using it to help drive, environmental, social and cultural goals • Assessment of geographic equity of income distribution (e.g. economic benefits generated at site of resource extraction [rural areas] vs. in service centres [Perth]) • Involving regional stakeholders with local knowledge in the community

SCALE	ISSUES	SPECIFIC ISSUES AND CONCERNS
	Community: aspirations, capacity, function, wellbeing (<i>continued...</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> engagement process, including resource use applications Provision of equal access to legal and regulatory information to ensure that local rights and interests, and the processes for protecting them, are understood; education frameworks to support this Managing divisions within communities about land usage and values, amenity and cultural identity Transparency with which the community is notified of gas industry risks/accidents/breaches of regulations; desire for accountability to public not just regulator Adequacy of local governance and resourcing Consolidating communication channels and formalising government/community/industry feedback processes Methods for fostering partnerships between government and industry to foster regional infrastructure development Recognition of the importance of local assets (such as Beekeeper's Reserve) to local amenity, identity and sense of place Recognition of a multiplicity of interests and voices; the need of government and industry to be informed by and address these
Local	Environment: air, water, land, visual/noise, amenity, health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management of public health and liability for threats to it Disposal of waste water from wells and hydraulic fracturing; risks of contamination of surface and groundwater Short and long term well integrity and potential impacts on groundwater quality and quantity Impacts of hydraulic fracturing on human health, especially through introduction of chemicals (native and non-native) into surface and groundwater Industrialisation of rural and natural landscapes
Other	Land access agreements; property rights and values; compensation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equity of access to legal advice and resources Recognising, managing and compensating disruption to existing businesses Recognition of Indigenous heritage Land access agreements; right of refusal Adequacy of compensation arrangements: impacts on house and land prices, as well as lost production; enjoyment of land and other assets and impairment of interests Transfer of risk and liability from gas industry to landholders (e.g. industry infrastructure [pipelines, powerlines] that may be damaged by landowners pursuing business on their land [driving headers] and cause third-party damage [fire etc])
Other	Information; consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to independent and trusted information Adequacy, relevance and trustworthiness of information is essential to sound decision making and engagement by communities Consultation requires time, and this requirement differs amongst interest groups Communication is resource intensive; plan and allocate resources for this Access to, and interpretation and relevance of existing international literature on onshore gas practices, impacts and opportunities Providing information to enable informed differentiation of thinking about different types of onshore gas development (e.g. conventional, shale gas, tight gas, coal seam gas, etc) Ensure that engagement methods are fit for purpose and fit for the community; one size fits all is not likely to be effective

Appendix C Summary of discussion group feedback on engagement preferences

	PERCEPTIONS ON CURRENT 'LEVEL' OF PARTICIPATION	PERCEPTIONS ON PREFERRED FUTURE 'LEVEL' OF ENGAGEMENT (NEXT 1-3 YEARS)	WHAT ARE THE PRACTICAL STEPS TO MEET CURRENT AND FUTURE ENGAGEMENT NEEDS?
<p>Discussion Group 1</p> <p>Members: local government, NRM and local representatives</p>	<p>We are now at the <i>"information"</i> stage of engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need information that is clear and of verifiable quality from trustworthy sources Information needs to be tailored so that it is relevant to local community and geography Information needs to be updated, timely, and we need to be made aware of changes as they occur (to regulations, industry activity, etc) 	<p>We're now at the <i>information</i> phase of engagement, we want to move through to the <i>"empower"</i> phase [with <i>"consultation"</i> along the way]. That will require i) better methods for accessing information; ii) better methods for accessing decision makers in government and industry; and iii) continued access to trusted information.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are challenges to making engagement representative (e.g. a range of views; a range of capacities to connect with engagement processes; some voices find it easier to be heard than others. We (local community) seek to influence the environmental conditions placed on resource consents because we bear the risks associated with environmental degradation We need to have a say on the 'legacy issues' such as on-going impacts/benefits on community services and health issues post-mining
<p>Discussion Group 2</p> <p>Members: local community (farmers; some currently affected by gas development, others not), DMP, APPEA, local government</p>	<p>At the <i>"information"</i> stage of engagement; we only know about 10% of that required</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need to learn from the US and Queensland experience about how to deal with change to landscape, community and environment in response to industrialisation of the landscape Site visits are critical to actually see what is happening 	<p><i>"Consultation"</i> should focus on the development at its advance stage (post-exploration) and should include early resolution or clear positions on potential problems with land use planning. This means communities working with state and local governments at this early stage to identify possible land use conflicts down the track</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both government and industry should be involved at the same time in engagement with community to improve clarity and reduce transaction costs Differentiate the engagement approach between i) during exploration and ii) post-exploration (during development) Differentiate the type and intensity of engagement required for community members directly affected by gas development [i.e. exploration development on their land] from that required for members not as directly affected Engagement will need to increase and become more intensive as development begins to unfold Face-to-face meetings and site visits to help inform community and local government (e.g. inform land use plans) More half-day workshops. Communicate with all the

	PERCEPTIONS ON CURRENT 'LEVEL' OF PARTICIPATION	PERCEPTIONS ON PREFERRED FUTURE 'LEVEL' OF ENGAGEMENT (NEXT 1-3 YEARS)	WHAT ARE THE PRACTICAL STEPS TO MEET CURRENT AND FUTURE ENGAGEMENT NEEDS?
Discussion Group 2 (continued...)			<p>community, despite the need to consult with peak or representative groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use groups such as POWER, local government and Aboriginal Corporations. • Empower local government. • State government processes and resources need to articulate with local government processes and resources
Discussion Group 3. Members: Eneabba, POWER members, mainly farmers	<p>Some landholders as already "involved" for over 12 months now in negotiating land access agreements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process is currently "us and them" (community vs industry) • Concerns about the lack of information and advice from regulators and local governments to landholders and communities. Most of the contact is directly between landholders and industry. • Landholders don't understand the Act, and don't feel that they have access to legal representation because it's too costly <p>There's a need for a lot more community engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We feel the effects of development, but decisions are made at a distance • We have local interests and knowledge that ought to inform those decisions • We think that visitors (gas industry people) coming to Eneabba seem to be afraid to engage with the community, and just keep to themselves 	<p>We see lots of risks from gas development, that will occur in our community and landscape, but we don't see how we'll get the benefits that people talk about</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We can't see how our population will increase • We can't see how our health will increase • Stress levels are already high in our community; mental health's a real issue • "everything that I've worked for, for years, could be devalued at the drop of a hat" 	<p>POWER would like to be in a position to offer support for people affected by gas development [i.e. have the resources to assist landholders involved in negotiations or consultation with industry]</p> <p>We think there's a difference between fair and appropriate compensation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We're not sure what 'fair' means; we want appropriate compensation based on genuine valuations of impacts on business, land value, and social disruption • We don't see how you can put a value on our water supply, or on the need to produce food to ensure future food security. The risks are just too great.
Discussion Group 4. Members: locals, industry and government people	<p>We are now at the "inform" stage of development, or possibly only the "pre-inform" stage.</p> <p>We need more information to get everyone onto the same page.</p> <p>There's always going to be a demand for information, so government and industry should keep doing this</p>	<p>Individuals will determine which others models for engagement they want to move on to, and that'll vary with individuals.</p>	<p>Try to use existing local channels of information more (e.g. use the local newspapers, local farming groups etc) and vary the method (e.g. not just informed or engaged by computer).</p> <p>Government and industry need to invest more time in getting to know local stakeholders [engagement needs to invest in building relationships not just 'participation']</p> <p>It would be a good idea for industry and government to offer tours to people, to show them what's</p>

	PERCEPTIONS ON CURRENT 'LEVEL' OF PARTICIPATION	PERCEPTIONS ON PREFERRED FUTURE 'LEVEL' OF ENGAGEMENT (NEXT 1-3 YEARS)	WHAT ARE THE PRACTICAL STEPS TO MEET CURRENT AND FUTURE ENGAGEMENT NEEDS?
<p>Discussion Group 4 (continued...)</p>			<p>happening</p> <p>It would also be good for industry and government people to address groups that are already set up in the local community (e.g. Lion's group), and then to distribute information given here to everyone else</p> <p>Local Council is a key "hub" for participation and community-level information</p> <p>Timing meetings so that attendees reflect local demography is important to avoid bias</p> <p>Development should try to boost the local economy wherever possible e.g. Eat, buy and stay local; Employ local people</p>
<p>Discussion Group 5. Members: not stated</p>	<p>We are now at the "inform" stage</p> <p>We need more scientific data to separate emotions from facts</p> <p>Regulation seems to be adequate, but communication of the science needs more work</p>	<p>What stage of engagement do we want to get to? That depends on who you are, where you are, and whether or not you're being paid to engage, to what degree you are impacted</p>	<p>There's a disconnection between planning and the community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For example, accommodation of workers had a big impact on the community, so engaging us in the approval process would be helpful • Local government engagement to date is not adequate and needs a formal role in the engagement structures <p>Our concerns in order of priority are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groundwater • Geographically/locally relevant risk assessments [incorporating local knowledge and local studies] • Making information available to locals • Interpret information and results for the community <p>To address our concerns, we need to be involved in the monitoring and evaluation process. We want access to cumulative impact assessments on environmental and human health</p>

CONTACT US

t 1300 363 400
+61 3 9545 2176
e enquiries@csiro.au
w www.csiro.au

YOUR CSIRO

Australia is founding its future on science and innovation. Its national science agency, CSIRO, is a powerhouse of ideas, technologies and skills for building prosperity, growth, health and sustainability. It serves governments, industries, business and communities across the nation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

Ecosystem Science
Peter Stone
t +61 2 9490 5512
e peter.stone@csiro.au
w www.csiro.au