

## Wood Field Development Block 22/18

### ES Web Comments

ES Title:	Environmental Statement for the Wood Field Development
Operator:	Paladin Expro Limited
ES Report No:	D/2396/2004
ES Date:	December 2004
Block Nos:	22/18
Development Type:	Single well subsea tie back to the Montrose Platform via a new 9.5Km 6/8" production pipeline, a 2/3" gas lift line and a 4.4 Km combined power/chemical umbilical from Arbroath to Wood. Also the level of gas associated with the proposed Wood Development makes the installation of a Gas export line for the MON-ARB fields viable. Therefore the proposals include the installation of a new 6" gas export pipeline from the Montrose Platform to CATS pipeline system.

#### Synopsis:

Paladin intend to develop the Wood Field by means of a single subsea well tied-back with a new 9.5Km flow line to the Montrose Platform and thence through existing infrastructure to the Forties Charlie Platform, and onto the Kinneil Power Station. The Wood field is located in block 22/18 of the central North Sea and is approximately 9.5Km SSE of the Montrose Platform and 4.5Km ESE from the Arbroath Platform and lies in water depths of approximately 95m of water. Wood production fluids will be combined with fluids from Montrose, Arkwright and Arbroath fluids prior to processing. Produced gas will be used as fuel gas on Montrose Platform, for gas lift, with any excess exported via the new pipeline to the CATS pipeline system.

It is proposed to drill the single production well between July to October 2006 and it is anticipated drilling will last approximately 75 days. The tie back to Montrose is planned for Q3 2006, with first oil expected in Q1 2007. The peak average daily oil flowrate is predicted to be 821 scm/day (5166 bbls/day/640 tonnes) and 0.42Mmscm/day of gas, with an expected field life until 2016. We note the difference in the proposed production rates as detailed in the Field Development Plan (FDP) and are content that the data submitted in the FDP represents a more mature understanding of the reservoir and is not a significant increase and therefore do not intend to request a supplement to the ES.

It is proposed to drill the well using a combination of Water Based Mud (WBM) and Low Toxicity Oil Based Mud (LTOBM), with all LTOBM recovered with onshore disposal (458 tonnes). Approximately 1009 tonnes of WBM will be discharged to sea. Following drilling the well will be cleaned up over a maximum of 24 hour period with a maximum of 348 tonnes of gas and 620 tonnes of oil to be flared.

It is proposed that a 6" or 8" flow line will be trenched and backfilled and the 2"/3" gas lift line will be piggy-backed to the production pipeline. The combined control/power/hydraulic & chemical injection umbilical will run from the Arbroath platform and will also be trenched and backfilled. The new 10.8Km, 6" gas export

line from the Montrose Platform to the CATS export Line will also be trenched and backfilled.

The development of the Wood field means there is sufficient associated gas to make the installation of a gas export line from the Montrose Platform to the CATS pipeline system economic. As excess gas at Montrose is currently flared, the Wood development will enable the flaring and thereby the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with the flaring from the MONARB development to reduce substantially following the introduction of the gas export line.

Further evidence was requested to demonstrate the absence of potential EU Habitats Directive Annex 1 Habitat 'submarine structures made by leaking gases'. In particular clarification was requested with regard to previous survey work and Paladin were asked to present the results of recent site and pipe line route survey undertaken on their behalf. Additional information was also requested with regard to the potential for rock dumping, flaring during commissioning phases, and inconsistencies between text and graphs.

Paladin provided additional information in relation to the queries raised, in a letter dated the 14 March 2005 and in data submitted on the 1,4 & 21 April 2005. Following consultation and the provision of additional information, we are satisfied that this project is not likely to have a significant impact on any sites protected under the Habitats Regulations.

**Consultees:** The statutory consultees for the ES were the JNCC and FRS.

**FRS:-** FRS agreed that no significant environmental impacts should result from the development and has no objections to consent being granted.

**JNCC:-** JNCC requested further clarification on the survey work that had been previously undertaken and that Paladin provide further information to demonstrate that 'submarine structures made by leaking gases' (Annex 1 Habitat) are not present in the vicinity of the development, additional information on potential for rock dumping and quantities.

Following the provision of additional information as detailed above JNCC commented that they were content for the project to receive approval.

**Public Consultation** - No comments were received as a result of public consultation.

**Recommendation:** The project should be granted consent