

DRAFT
AST & Community Committee July 5 Meeting Notes

Lamont Recreation Centre Meeting Room
6:30 to 9:30 pm

1. Welcome & introductions

- RMC welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced two new committee members.
- Principles to guide meeting discussions, ground rules and the committee's mandate were reviewed.

2. Report on June 7 Meeting Action Steps

Facilitation Team Action Steps

- Proposed agenda was developed and distributed to committee members in advance of this meeting.
- Invited Mayor of Bruderheim and the Fire Chief of Lamont– the Mayor indicated in writing that he felt it would be a conflict of interest and did not wish to participate – Fire Chief John Helton was in attendance and welcomed.

Worley Parsons Komex Action Steps

Air-related summary

- WorleyParsons Komex representative shared that if there were more questions in relation to their presentation of June 7, 2007, they would be available at the break to answer them.

Responses to June 7 unanswered questions were distributed to members in advance of the meeting and the following is the question & answer discussion:

The question of whether or not the bullets in the “What is the basis of Worst Case Scenario” question outlined what would be examples of “worst case scenario”?

It was explained that this section had attempted to answer the question of how one would model/build up a worst case scenario

In reference to the question of “Are the Ambient Air Quality Objectives based on a healthy person?” a question was posed with respect to “whether or not it would have included asthmatics?”

It was explained that the assessment would have been structured to include the most sensitive population and therefore, the human health portion of the assessment does include the most sensitive fraction of the population. By doing a distribution of effects on people a line can then be drawn to protect the most sensitive such as asthmatics. The assessment was built as much on health effects as nuisance effects.

AST Action Step

- As per a committee member’s request during the June 7 meeting, AST developed and distributed the “*Facility Designed Basic Safety Provisions*” document for review. The following represents the question and answer discussion.

What is the amount of water consumed?

AST shared that they would need to do a calculation to determine the amount of water consumed. We will consume about 12 US gpm at full production.

Action Item: AST to provide calculation of water consumed at September 13 meeting.

Does the pond replenish itself?

Yes.

How many employees are on for night/weekend shift?

There would be a minimum of four employees per night/weekend shift.

How many people would be employed?

There would be a minimum of 21 “full-time” people.

What kind of dust suppressor would be used?

IPAC dust suppressor would be one of the suppressors used. It is manufactured in Vancouver. If participants would like an information sheet, one can be supplied or they can look in the EIA documents as submitted to Alberta Environment.

Would sulfur be scooped into bucket and then sprayed?

Yes – sprayed upon discharge

Would this mean that dust would only be suppressed at this point and dust released when scooping or traveling would not be sprayed / suppressed?

Yes because only a minimal amount of dust would be generated during reclaiming or travel. Under normal conditions visible dust would fall within 200 meters of the source generation assuming there are no barriers to capture same.

Committee Member's

Action Step:

As the committee member wanting to present Sulphur Glut/Future Sulphur Markets information to the committee was not in attendance, this action step is carried forward to the next meeting.

3. DRAFT June 7 meeting notes review

Questions

Did you consider previous sulphur fires in worst case scenarios?

We used North American industry standards and experiences as we have different systems, demands and guidelines in North America. We used National Fire Protection Code (NFPC) Guide 655. Scale tests as compared to existing similar facilities as well as their fire records were used as part of our analysis. We focused on facilities using the Sulphur Development Institute of Canada (SUDIC) “premium” product specifications. “Premium product” refers to the highest designation for formed elemental sulphur in terms of the least amount of dust generated through multiple handling and transporting of formed elemental sulphur such as that found at Pacific Coast Terminals in North Vancouver.

How close are SO2 monitors to the stockpiles?

The monitors would surround the stockpiles.

Suggested Changes to June 7 Notes:

Suggest removing the reference to discussions on the adjacent chlorate plant under section 4 of the June 7, 2007 meeting minutes?

Committee member thought that the reference to the adjacent chlorate plant shouldn't be removed altogether but rather be relocated.

Suggest changing “India” to “South Africa”: in reference to the question of “Did you consider previous Sulphur fires to determine your worse case scenario as the fire in “India” proves the need for a larger scope for worse case scenario?”

RMC asked if, subject to incorporating the above changes, the meeting minutes could be adopted and committee members agreed

Action Item:

Change “India” to “South Africa”

Move adjacent chlorate plant discussion to “air” section of the notes from the “special considerations” section

4. Review of Meeting Purpose & Proposed Agenda

- RMC reviewed the purpose of the meeting (determine process or forum on how to get information out to community members and review remaining priority issues).

- RMC quickly reviewed the agenda items with no suggested changes, additions or deletions to the proposed agenda.

5. Structure & Process Review

Meeting Notes Distribution and Resulting Discussion:

- RMC asked how committee members would like to handle the distribution of meeting notes and make available to the public or not?
- Benefit to making notes public would be to illustrate openness and transparency (committee principles) – reduce risk of not attaining the “building of more positive relationships”
- There could be a risk that notes would be viewed as propaganda and could be confusing as the notes don’t capture all the details. If they were presenting answers one may feel differently.
- A point was raised that the community trusts the committee and therefore the notes do not need to be distributed and that attaining a ‘bonified’ committee status can be obtained other ways
- RMC asked whether or not it would make sense to revisit this question later with committee members agreeing to revisit later.

Action Item: Re-visit the question of whether or not meeting notes should be distributed and how do we get information out to the broader community

How do we get information out to the broader community discussion?

- The table below captures the comments made on the benefits and drawbacks of process / forum options discussed. It does not capture all benefits and drawbacks – only those mentioned during the discussion.
- It is important to note that one option does not exclude another – there may be several options that could be used.

Process Option	Benefits	Drawbacks	Additional Comments
Expert presentations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • good format to deal with the fact that responses to questions are not usually a yes or a no • able to answer questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • difficult to get people to present on this project that hadn't done the work / the studies • challenge to have same questions and responses every time • possible challenges in having regulator expert presentations due to the perception that regulators may be reluctant to participate • may be challenged to capture all questions and responses in a way that everyone understands including those not in attendance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • obtain experts in the field who have reviewed the project so as to act as a peer review • important to let the public have access to experts to get their questions answered. • invite someone in from AENV - would explain how the system works • it is about finding a neutral party - how do we present it in a way that's credible? Regulators more familiar with requirements than a professor?
Written descriptions to support presentations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • gives people a take away to take time and digest information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • if written descriptions are distributed on their own then doesn't provide a credible way that allows people to ask questions and have them answered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • could be used on their own in a newsletter (below) or they could be used to support presentations
Newsletters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • gives people a take away to take time and digest information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • doesn't provide a credible way that allows people to ask questions and have them answered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • could resolve questions / responses challenge: newsletters have contact information of project representatives that could answer questions, document the questions and then share question and answer with the broader community

Process Option	Benefits	Drawbacks	Additional Comments
Open Houses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • good format to deal with the fact that responses to questions are not usually a yes or a no • can have a informal portion of the Open House and a presentation • able to answer questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • have done Open Houses in the past but hasn't worked – had questions, wrote and distributed responses – concerned it won't work this time either • may be challenged to capture all questions and responses in a way that everyone understands including those not in attendance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • perception that questions were changed and responses did not provide enough information / details • perception that people were given 'trust me' answers • consider using the Open House to re-pose the questions and see if we have the questions right • need to boil the questions down in advance of an Open House • HAZCO has an exhaustive list of questions and concerns – might be a good starting point - seed the process with original questions and then work the process from there
Series of information presentations over a day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • good format to deal with the fact that responses to questions are not usually a yes or a no 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • same comments as noted in Open Houses – have done this before – what is it about HAZCO process that hasn't worked? • may be challenged to capture all questions and responses in a way that everyone understands including those not in attendance 	
Panel Expert / workshop format	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • responds to different types of people and their styles of learning – possible different learning style options • good format to deal with the fact that responses to questions are not usually a yes or a no 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • drawback would be if someone has two concerns they would have to choose workshops and could miss one • may be challenged to capture all questions and responses in a way that everyone understands including those not in attendance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • create 5-10 workshops such as “is my family safe living next door” workshop • could repeat workshops throughout the day to deal with drawback

- RMC asked if anyone would like to work with Facilitation Team to come up with some ideas for how to create an information sharing process. RMC went on to say that they didn't think it would be too time consuming – could arrange a conference call and/or correspond via email.

Action Item: *Subcommittee will form and be comprised four committee members and RMC. Subcommittee will have well-flushed “information sharing” plan in advance of September 13 meeting.*

6. Next Meeting Date

- After some discussion, it was agreed to cancel the August 2 meeting and that the next two meetings would take place
 - Thursday, **September 13** starting at 6:30 pm in the **Lamont Recreation Center Meeting Room**
 - Thursday **October 4** starting at 6:30 pm in the **Lamont Curling Rink Lounge**

7. Remaining Priority Issues

- WorleyParsons Komex presented the process that has been used to study the remaining priority issues along with the results of these studies. Questions posed by committee members along with the responses have been captured below.

Water Assessment – Questions & Responses

Why does the water need to be recycled? Is this because sulphur gets in it?

Run-off from sulphur pile is acidic thereby creating sulfuric acid through a bacterial process that can not be stopped. Because there is an acidification issue the run-off is collected and contained in ponds, neutralized and then either reused or discharged. There are provincial guidelines in respect to this.

How much gets evaporated into the air?

Only water will evaporate.

Is it possible to keep pile contained – i.e. have a roof over it?

Possibly; but we would still be required to collect surface water. Having the pile contained may only make the water a little less acidic. There would be no great advantage to having it contained.

Groundwater Assessment - Questions & Responses

If you make the statement that “it could impact groundwater levels” what is the answer?

Regular monitoring will be required to make sure water level doesn't drop to a point that would impact off-site users. The EIA addresses ground water quantitatively plus a minimum twice yearly monitoring would be required to calibrate that. It is not a situation where it would drop instantly – there would be warning. If groundwater removal is approved; there

would be regulatory conditions that would include thresholds with respect to quantity, quality and monitoring.

What is the process if facility gets built and sold to a different company? What happens if new owner isn't as conscientious as old owner? What recourse do folks have?

Operating conditions are requirements of an approval and therefore prosecutable. These things are regulated and when someone purchases a facility they still must abide by its operating conditions. There is what is known as the 'deep pockets' law in Canada which ensures that a facility is cleaned up and whoever owned the land (facility) with the deepest pockets will pay for the cleanup. However, this doesn't happen very often largely because of constant monitoring - it's a "real-time" check and balance that hinders deterioration regardless of the age or owner of the particular facility

Is the process for re-licencing very different from the licencing process?

A proponent can make a small, incrementally change versus a large, substantive change more easily with an approval.

Human Health Assessment - Questions & Responses

- Reviewed areas of assessment (priority pollutants, potential acute and chronic affects, potential impacts to country foods and vegetation consumed by people, and livestock as well as cumulative effects). Most contaminants are well below 1 (although above 1 doesn't necessarily indicate a problem just indicates the need for a more sophisticated evaluation)
- There were no questions posed.

Emergency Response Plan – Questions & Responses

How do you evacuate?

WorleyParsons Komex representative shared that they are not an emergency response planner but would try and answer the question. Their understanding is that an emergency response plan outside of the fence is discussed with affected parties. AST would work in conjunction with NR CAER and its mandate.

NR CAER is not a governing body correct?

Yes, that is correct. Ultimately it is AST's responsibility to communicate with people within the area.

Is there anyone who communicates with residents to explain what they are supposed to do?

Yes. AST would assume that responsibility.

Traffic Assessment – Questions & Responses

Were compaction tests done on Range Road 202?

No, it was strictly a volume study. Compaction tests could be done but not by Bunt & Associates as they are volume experts. Compaction tests would be a Lamont County matter though.

Soil Assessment – Questions & Responses

- Soils in the area are not great to begin with so there will be reclamation challenges. Would expect to see gradual acidification - sulfur dust landing on the field and resulting sulfuric acid. There would a need to maintain and monitor emission controls as well as liming of the soil in order to mitigate this in the immediate proximity of the plant.
- Some adjacent properties wouldn't allow access for base line study purposes. Representative indicated that there is still time – if anyone would like a baseline assessment done
- Other than some discussion around who wouldn't allow access to their properties for a baseline study, no additional questions were raised.

Social Impact Assessment – Questions & Answers

Was consideration made to take into account peoples' perceptions?

No, the assessment was based on observable health effects

Clarification was made to above question in that it was meant "with respect to property values"?

In that regard, yes. The assessment was based primarily on that concern and its perceptions. Industrial buyers wouldn't be turned off by the facility but the intermediate or buffer zone may be perceived to be minimally impacted.

Based on the study, only the buffer zone would perceive it to be a risk then?

Yes – in reference to property values.

The committee member agrees with this as it is "the out of sight out of mind principle"- but what about those of us that can see the facility? Does the EIA address the property value issue?

Yes, it addresses the property value issue but not the visual perception issue.

8. Next Steps

- Subcommittee will develop an information sharing plan in advance of the September 13, 2007 meeting. It was requested that other committee members be open to the idea of contributing if called upon.
- The focus of the September 13 meeting will be to determine 'what the process will look like' in getting information out to the broader community.
- A request was made to have a copy of WorleyParsons Komex power point presentation.

Action Step:

Distribute presentation to committee members at the same time the DRAFT notes are distributed.