

AST & COMMUNITY COMMITTEE MEETING

**January 24, 2008
Lamont Recreation Centre Meeting Room
6:30 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.**

1. Welcome & Proposed Agenda Review

- RMC welcomed everyone, introductions were made and agenda reviewed.

2. Follow-up & Review of Action Items to September 13th Meeting

- September 13 action items were reviewed (see list noted in ppt presentation attached).
- An action item outstanding from the June 7/07 meeting was whether a committee member still wanted to present information on Sulphur Glut. The committee member advised that he doesn't believe there is as much interest at present. Although they still have concerns, they are satisfied because AST/HAZCO and some committee members attended one of their previous presentations.
- RMC asked if there were any suggested changes to the September 13 draft meeting notes. No recommended changes were put forth.

Meeting Notes' Review Process

- RMC commenced a discussion on when and how feedback on draft notes may be provided.
- Receiving comments by fax in addition to e-mail was suggested and meeting participants agreed to provide feedback on notes well in advance of the next scheduled meetings.

3. Regulatory Process Update

- Alberta Environment (AENV) has completed their first technical review and has issued a Supplementary Information Request (SIR).
- AST/HAZCO will be meeting with WorleyParsons Komex in the very near future to review the SIRs with a meeting being scheduled with AENV shortly thereafter. It was further explained that there are typically two rounds of review with the next review expected in about three months. Once the second review has been completed and accepted, AENV could release a statement that AST/HAZCO has met the Terms of Reference (ToR) and the project could then be referred to the Natural Resources Conservation Board (NRCB).
- A committee member asked if it would be possible to get a copy of the SIR's from the local HAZCO office.

4. Purpose of tonight's meeting & overview of Committee work to date

- RMC discussed the purpose of the night's meeting which was to determine the committee's next steps.

- RMC reviewed the committee's mandate, ground rules, etc. and history to date including the Environmental Impact Assessment Information Forum held October 11, 2007 (see attached ppt presentation).

Environmental Impact Assessment Information Forum Discussion

- A number of committee members were very surprised by the low turnout even though the Forum was well planned.
- Committee member thoughts as to why the turnout was low included:
 - time has passed and level of interest has waned;
 - individuals have moved on to other issues – possibly more important issues;
 - people are forming their own opinions versus being influenced by only one perspective
 - there are “bigger fish to fry” i.e. development, land values, upgraders, etc.
 - timing of the event – harvesting season;
 - people are not as concerned as they once were;
 - people are now waiting to see what happens through the regulatory process;
 - people are resigned to the fact that this is an industrial area;
 - perception that information may not be credible;
 - some of those with concerns and issues who do not attend do not want to have their issues and concerns addressed; and
 - people feeling that their comments don't matter.

5. AST & Community Committee Next Steps Discussion

- RMC sent a survey to 18 committee members on October 23, 2007 for the purposes of obtaining feedback on what the committee's next steps should be.
- RMC reviewed the survey results (see ppt presentation). Survey respondents' feedback was quite varied although there were 2 or three options that many thought were viable.
- RMC re-iterated that the purpose of the night's meeting was to make some decisions on how to proceed.
- RMC shared some key questions felt to be important when making decisions:
 - Are there other stakeholders that should be engaged? Recent election results had the committee losing some of its members.
 - Is the proposed project still a significant concern?
 - Are there other engagement models that might be more effective in informing and resolving concerns?
 - Are there general concerns about other industry operators? Are the issues bigger than the proposed AST project?
- A committee member commented on the proposed Kinder Morgan Canada (KMC) project and felt it should be examined whether or not there should be two operators in the area and wondered how they could leverage the two companies to come together to build a better facility. This committee

member went on to share that they thought KMC had certain elements in their proposal and wished AST had these same elements. Finally; as they understand, the Alberta Government wants to set up an Alberta Sulphur Commission to figure out how to manage this resource and believed that this committee should look into participating in that commission.

- Another committee member shared their struggle with the idea that the government wants to form a Sulphur Commission. They are suspicious about government's decision-making and worries that this will be used as a means to fast track the approvals processes.
- A different committee member shared they were unaware of KMC's proposal but committed to checking into it. Apparently a small notice had been in the newspaper. Several commented that it is hard for landowners to find out about new plans coming into the area
- It was mentioned that if KMC has a good process, then why not bring everyone to the same table and that it may be a good idea to have ordinary people get a group together to look at the cumulative impacts of development in an area.
- A committee member hoped that at the end of the day this group would become a broader synergy group and further felt it could be valuable for the, community and industry to have this kind of forum for discussions to take place thereby revisiting the idea of this committee focusing on issue identification and/or resolution processes. The regulatory process typically produces a winner and a loser but this committee could possibly facilitate the development win-win solutions.
- Another committee member shared that the question really is how this group could address concerns from local residents about all development in the area. A broader group would potentially get more residents involved as well as increase the likelihood of being able to facilitate change.
- RMC shared a bit about Synergy. Their experience is that companies typically pay more attention to issues raised through a synergy group.
- RMC then asked meeting participants if they felt it was a good idea to re-focus the committee to outstanding issues and how to resolve them.
 - Many thought focusing on identifying issues and seeking to resolve them was a good idea
 - Several felt that many issues were individual issues and as such should be discussed one-on-one and were not for group discussion
 - Many meeting participants indicated that the concept of forming a synergy group appealed to them

MEETING BREAK

- RMC summarized that what has been heard so far which was:
 - Thought that most meeting participants like the concept of becoming a synergy group
 - Thought that many meeting participants also like the idea of focusing on identifying and resolving issues
 - didn't hear anyone who wanted to disband

- RMC shared that maybe there was an option to problem solve AND move towards becoming a synergy group in a parallel process.

Issue Identification & Resolution Discussion

- RMC understood that 18 statements of concern had been filed. Members suggested AST/HAZCO and RMC go through these concerns to get a solid understanding of the issues remaining with the possibility of reviewing the issues and determining if there is an opportunity to address some of them, recognizing that not all of them would be resolvable.
- A committee member asked whether committee members wanted to get involved in problem solving the issues. Meeting participant responses to this question were varied and included:
 - When RMC asked if there are several interested in the same issue, would it not make sense to send out an invitation to everyone interested in that issue to participate in the discussions? Some meeting participants agreed this made sense. Others still preferred a one-on-one approach.
 - The issues need to be narrowed down to specific concerns in order to be able to meaningfully respond to them. Currently, many of the issues are very general providing little direction.
 - One committee member shared that they felt the focus should be on AENV's outstanding issues.
 - Another committee member shared that they thought the only real issues left are very site specific issues.
- RMC summarized the tasks associated with issue identification and resolution.

Action item: RMC and AST to develop a list of issues based on what has been said in the statements of concerns and make available at the next meeting.

Action item: RMC and AST to contact the Town of Lamont, Lamont County, Maxim Power, etc. with an invitation to join the AST & Community Committee

Action item: Facilitation Team to coordinate a meeting via polling committee members on their availability in approximately two months time.

Action item: Committee members to let someone know in advance of the next meeting if they are not able to attend.

Action item: Committee members to consider inviting a neighbor to the next meeting

Synergy Group Discussion

- RMC shared that there are approximately 80 synergy groups in Alberta. There is also a provincial association called Synergy Alberta (www.synergyalberta.ca). Its' mission is to foster and support mutually satisfactory outcomes in Alberta communities by providing information, mutual learning, communication, skill development, facilitations and resources. Its' vision is that Synergy is the catalyst to achieve a principled, balanced and sustained approach to resource development for Albertans. Working together we can achieve more.
- RMC shared that he knows someone at the St. Albert ERCB office that would likely be willing to come and explain the synergy concept.
- RMC also shared that these groups take a bit of time getting set up.
- A committee member indicated that given the high level of interest in exploring this option, it would be a good idea to get some additional information on Synergy.

Action item: ***AST to fax a copy of the SIRs to committee member.***

Action item: ***Facilitation Team to bring some information about Synergy to the next meeting given the committee's interest in possibly transitioning to the synergy group model.***