

**DRAFT**  
**AST & Community Committee June 7 Meeting Notes**

**Lamont Curling Rink Lounge**  
**6:30 to 9:30 pm**

**1. Welcome & introductions**

- RMC welcomed everyone to the meeting - introductions were made as there was a new committee member as well as a representative from WorleyParsons Komex present
- The principles to guide meeting discussions, the ground rules to create a framework for constructive dialogue to take place and the AST & Community Committee's mandate were reviewed. No changes to these were suggested.

**2. May 3 DRAFT Meeting Notes, Purpose of Tonight's Meeting & Agenda Review**

Review of DRAFT May 3 AST & Community Committee Meeting Notes

- It was noted that one community member, absent with regrets was incorrect. This name should be removed from the meeting notes.
- With this change, the May 3 meeting notes were finalized and formally adopted by committee members.

Report on Action Steps from May 3, 2007 Meeting (recorded as part of June 7 meeting)

- i. RMC developed the DRAFT May 3 AST & Community Committee meeting notes and compiled member survey feedback and distributed these documents along with a copy of the power point presentation to committee members via email, fax or in person.
- ii. RMC drafted and sent a letter to both the Fire Chief of Lamont and the Mayor of Bruderheim inviting both to participate in the committee process.
  - The Mayor of Bruderheim responded to RMC invitation letter sharing that the Council had voted and decided not to participate as they did not want participation to be seen by residents as supporting the proposed development.
  - RMC drafted a second letter acknowledging receipt of response, respect for the decision that was made and shared that involvement in the committee does not reflect support and/or opposition to the proposed project. The offer to have an observer present at a meeting to gain a better understanding of the process was made.
  - An invitation letter was also sent to the Lamont Fire Chief. No response was received. RMC attempted to reach via phone but was not successful.
  - RMC shared that she would try to reach both parties by phone as follow-up. Committee members agreed this was the best approach.

**Action Step 1: RMC to phone both Mayor of Bruderheim and Town of Lamont Fire Chief prior to July 5<sup>th</sup> meeting to discuss their possible participation on the committee.**

- iii. RMC developed Proposed June 7 meeting agenda and distributed via email, fax or in person to committee members for review
- iv. RMC, with the assistance from WorleyParsons Komex developed a proposed work plan – air related and distributed via email, fax or in person to committee members for review
- v. The Town of Lamont, the Town of Bruderheim and Lamont County were contacted to request if meeting notes could be posted on their respective websites as a means to get committee meeting information out to broader community members. The Town of Lamont shared the request would be brought to the next Council meeting for consideration. There was no response to the email request from the Town of Bruderheim. The County responded that internal protocol doesn't allow for private company information on their website.
- vi. Originally thought to be the Friends of Lamont website is actually the Fathers for Life website. FOLC representatives sitting as committee members shared that it is not their place to determine whether it is okay to post meeting notes on the site.

Review of the purpose of tonight's meeting

- Review and finalize air-related work plan
- Identify the best way to get air-related information out to broader community members

Agenda Review

- RMC reviewed the proposed agenda
- RMC shared a committee member's request to present information to the committee on 'sulphur glut'.
- RMC re-iterated her role as facilitator – a third party that helps manage the process to support the committee achieving its objectives. It is the committee members that own the process – make consensus-based decisions which include finalizing and adopting a meeting agenda.
- As such, RMC stressed it was the role of meeting participants to consider and make a decision regarding the committee member's request to present information. Susan shared that this type of request could be made by anyone, at any time and so it would be helpful if the group considered the request in this broader context.
- The following captures some of the key points made.
  - Meeting participants wanted to understand the reasons behind the request – response was that for this committee member sulphur glut is a key issue inherently linked to location concerns and they are interested in having a *dialogue* on the subject.

- One committee member shared that the purpose of the group was to act as conduits / liaisons and therefore, should a presentation and discussion occur on sulphur glut, they felt it should happen in a broader forum with all community members invited.
- Another meeting participant asked whether the committee members wanted to revisit the priority issues and consider sulphur glut as one of the priority issues – this person stated that should the group decide to move forward with topic of sulphur glut, they would like to see a forum where multiple perspectives on the subject were shared so that people could hear all sides and then go away and make up their own minds.
- RMC shared there were several multi-stakeholder groups within the province with structured public forums that presented multiple perspectives on a particular topic.
- A few meeting participants felt that it was important to stick with focusing on the priority issues identified through consultation activities and noted during the May 3 meeting to ensure the committee was aligned with the broader community interests.
- Another committee member wondered if the block issue would not be addressed by the experts as they move through results of the air, water etc tests
- WorleyParsons Komex felt that it would be useful to first have an understanding of the global sulphur market, which would then provide a basis for discussions of possible market directions.
- The following proposed solutions were presented:
  - hard copy of the presentation as leave behind to committee members;
  - have presentation at the conclusion of July 5 meeting for those interested;
  - committee member sulphur glut discussion which includes presentation from committee member and presentation of other perspectives;
  - sulphur glut presentation discussion with broader community members which includes presentation from committee member and presentation of other perspectives;
  - address sulphur glut once a couple of the priority issues have been worked – group is new and need to build confidence of group
  - No decision was reached

***Action Step 2: Committee member to provide sulphur glut power point presentation to all committee members.***

***Action Step 3: All committee members to further consider and subsequently make a decision on sulphur glut topic.***

### **3. Committee Structure and Process review**

- RMC shared that WorleyParsons Komex would appreciate having his presentation moved up in the agenda as they had an early morning meeting in Calgary the following day.
- Committee members agreed to have presentation and committee discussion on the air-related work plan next.

#### 4. Proposed Work Plan – Air Related

- WorleyParsons Komex presented the process that is used to assess air quality (please refer to attached power point presentation).
- The following is a summary of what was discussed:
  - Air Quality Issues
    - Emission of criteria pollutants
    - Acidification caused by sulphur deposition
    - Emissions related to a sulphur fire
  - Review of criteria pollutants
  - Background air quality - Fort Air Partnership
  - Air Emissions relative to Ambient Air Quality
  - Emissions Sources
  - Results of Air Emissions Modeling
  - Special Considerations
    - adjacent chlorate plant
    - worst case scenario
    - public and worker health, livestock
    - impacts to water and soil quality

#### ***The following questions were raised by committee members:***

*Is the assessment of fine particulate matter done during the sulphur processing or the loading and unloading of the sulphur?*

- The assessment of fine particulate matter considers both the forming process and the pastille handling activities.

*Does the air modeling consider the local terrain?*

- Yes.

*What was the rationale for locating the Lamont monitoring station and is this location representative of the site conditions?*

***Action Step 4: WorleyParsons Komex to include answers to above two questions in summary that will be given to committee members in advance of July 5<sup>th</sup> meeting.***

*Are the ambient air quality objectives based on a healthy person?*

***Action Step 5: WorleyParsons Komex to include answer in summary that will be given to committee members in advance of July 5<sup>th</sup> meeting.***

*Why use that particular size re: fine particulate matter?*

- This particular size represents the range of sizes that are potentially harmful to our lungs.

*Would the sulphur pile be included in the tests?*

- Yes, the entire sulphur handling and stockpiling process was considered when estimating fugitive dust emissions.

*How much fine matter particulate would be reduced without an open sulphur pile?*

- A comparative assessment was not completed in this case. The proportion of fine particles that could be emitted to the atmosphere was estimated based on a measured grain size distribution. This method of estimation is not sensitive to the handling mechanism.

*What is meant by ground level?*

- Ground zone refers to the breathing zone – up to 1 to 1.5 metres above ground

*But what about the concept that what goes up must come down?*

- Substances are much more diluted when they are emitted well above ground level and then disperse and return to ground level.

*There is considerable concern that heavier gases would sit in the valley and therefore would not be detected by the regional monitors. Can the model monitor valley quality?*

**Action Step 6:                   WorleyParsons Komex to include answer in summary that will be given to committee members in advance of July 5<sup>th</sup> meeting.**

*How did you estimate fine particulate matter - was the sulphur crushed?*

- Yes

*Does background mean that which exists today?*

- Yes

*How do future upgraders factor in?*

- They are assessed in the cumulative effects study.

*Then is that cumulative air modeling done at point emissions or stations?*

- The cumulative effects portion of the EIA considers both the Project's potential affect on regional air quality and the potential affect of announced and approved projects on the local air quality.

*How can we determine that 10% won't be affected by future development?*

- Any future proposed developments will have to undertake the same assessment.

*Do you list all companies that you have taken into account?*

- Yes

*Is there an account taken on livestock health?*

- Yes and no. An existing study commissioned by Alberta Environment was used to evaluate potential impacts to livestock.

*When you reference worst case scenario, do you mean a sulphur pile fire?*

- Yes

*Is wind speed considered?*

- All wind patterns were reviewed.

*What is the distance from the fire that would require evacuation?*

- 1.5 km

*Do sulphur fires emit gases?*

- Yes. Sulphur dioxide.

*If sulphur has to melt before it burns then how does it become a fire? Are there flames?*

- Sulphur fires may be started by sparks. There is a small, smoldering flame.

*Can a spark be caused by friction during loading?*

- Yes. Even static electricity can produce a spark.

*Why is the evaluation zone so round versus oval?*

- Because it takes into account all possible wind directions.

*What is the basis of the worst case scenario?*

**Action Step 7:           WorleyParsons Komex to include answer in summary that will be given to committee members in advance of July 5<sup>th</sup> meeting.**

*Did you account for sulphur spilling or blowing from rail cars?*

- No. The pastilles will not blow out of the rail cars but occasionally they can leak out of car drainage valves.

A meeting participant recommended that AST's 'practical' solutions to manage risk be included in the summary that will be provided to committee members in advance of the July 5<sup>th</sup> meeting.

## 5. Next Steps

- After some consideration, the meeting participants decided that the July 5<sup>th</sup> and August 2<sup>nd</sup> future meeting dates would stand
- Location of July 5<sup>th</sup> meeting has yet to be determined but committee members will be advised in advance of the July 5<sup>th</sup> meeting.
- It was agreed that the July 5<sup>th</sup> agenda would include the following:
  - refine the work plan – air related and determine method for getting air-related information out to the broader community members
  - further discuss and make decision on sulphur glut topic; and
  - identify how committee process / meeting information will be shared with the broader community members.