

AST & COMMUNITY COMMITTEE MEETING

May 14, 2008

Lamont Recreation Centre Meeting Room

6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.

DRAFT NOTES

1. Welcome & Proposed Agenda Review

- RMC welcomed everyone.
- Introductions were made. Meeting participant shared that they were recently hired by HAZCO and will be working on this project as well as other HAZCO sulphur projects throughout Alberta, Canada and the United States. They indicated that he is attending tonight primarily as an observer
- The proposed agenda was reviewed and adopted.

2. January 24th Meeting Follow-up

- January 24 action items were reviewed
- Comments or changes to the January 24 meeting notes were discussed. It was noted that a meeting participant's name had been spelled incorrectly.

Meeting Note Distribution Process

- One participant noted a comment from a community member that committee information is not being distributed to the community and asked about meeting notes being made available to the broader community members.
- RMC stated that it wouldn't be that hard to remove all references to committee members in the notes and have copies available at the local HAZCO office for anyone interested in reviewing them.
- Following some discussion regarding confidentiality considerations for members, the committee determined that a version of the meeting notes, with member references removed, would be made available to any interested parties with copies available at the HAZCO office.

Action item: Two versions of the committee meeting notes are to be developed. One version would be for committee members with attribution included. The second version would be with no attribution for public distribution.

Committee Membership

- It was noted that some committee members are not advising in advance as to whether they are able to attend an upcoming meeting. The Facilitation Team (RMC) would request that members advise as to their availability for attendance at future meetings.
- On behalf of the Committee, AST/HAZCO extended an invitation to the Town of Lamont, Lamont County and Maxim Power regarding participation

in the meetings. The Maxim Power representative shared that they would like to be a member of the committee but they live in Calgary and likely wouldn't be able to make most of the meetings. This representative did share they would like to be kept informed by e-mail and as such, Maxim Power will be added to the committee distribution and be communicated with by email.

- RMC apologized about unilaterally picking this May 14th date. RMC was in Edmonton and so May 14 worked well for their availability.
- Committee members shared that neighbours in proximity to the proposed site were not interested in attending. RMC extended the invitation to feel free and invite neighbours in the future.

3. Proposed Project and Sulphur Market Update (Rob Mann)

- AST is meeting next week to initiate selection of the final engineering design firm.
- The sulphur market is experiencing significant supply shortages due to demand for phosphate fertilizers and other uses.
- It takes 1/3 of a tonne of sulphur to produce 1 tonne of phosphate.
- In January the price for sulphur was \$425 a tonne. It is now \$650 a tonne at Port of Vancouver.
- Currently, there is not enough Sulphur forming capacity in Alberta to meet export demand.
- The Province of Alberta receives a 15% royalty on sulphur net backs.

4. Regulatory Process Update (Sylvia Holowach)

- The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is still being reviewed.
- AST submitted their responses to the Supplementary Information Requests (SIRS) on April 23rd. Alberta Environment (AENV) and the Natural Resources Conservation Board (NRCB) started their review of the submission on April 28th. These agencies will take approximately 6 - 8 weeks to review AST's SIR submission.
- When their review is finished one of two things may happen:
 - AST's SIR submission will be seen to have answered all AENV and NRCB questions and the EIA will receive confirmation of completion of the Terms of Reference; or
 - there could be a second round SIR request which would take another 6-8 weeks.
- Once the EIA has received completion of the Terms of Reference, AENV and the NRCB would publish a Joint Notice. Stakeholders would once again have 30 days to submit additional comments (additional statements of concerns) on the proposed project.
- Once stakeholder submission is reviewed a Notice of Hearing would be issued 30 days prior to the Hearing.
- A committee member asked if the second round of statements of concerns can be the same as the first round or do they have to be different?
- AST representative shared the statement of concerns can be the same.
- AST representative also shared that the SIR filing is available at the local HAZCO office as well as on the HAZCO website. It was noted that

accessing this information from the HAZCO website did have challenges as the information is difficult to download. Therefore, the AST representative stressed that there are copies at the local office for review.

- It was noted that a hearing on the project could potentially fall in Q4 of 2008 (fall/early winter) or January/Feb 2009 and that the facility cannot be build until the regulatory process has been completed.

5. AST Recent Consultation Activities (AST representative)

- AST representative provided an update on the company's recent consultation activities which included:
 - AST response letters were sent to all stakeholders who submitted a statement of concern in September and October of 2007. Issues of concern were summarized in the letters and an invitation to meet with AST/HAZCO to discuss these concerns was offered.
 - a project update letter was sent to people residing within a 2 km radius of the proposed facility site, those who submitted a statement of concern, key stakeholders (i.e. elected officials, industry) and AST & Community Committee members; and
 - as follow-up to the January 24 meeting discussions, a letter was sent to those committee members that indicated a desire for an invitation to meet with AST/HAZCO.
- Committee members shared a view that the letters with the invitation to meet with HAZCO representatives were a positive step in addressing local concerns. They asked if there was any interest to date from stakeholders to meet with AST/HAZCO. AST representative said there was stakeholder interest to meet directly with AST/HAZCO to discuss issues noted in their statement of concern.

6. AST & Community Committee Next Steps Discussion

- The original mandate for the committee was reviewed. RMC went on to share that there has been quite a bit of discussion on where the committee should go to in the future. The potential options are:
 - develop into a broader multi-stakeholder group (ERCB synergy model);
 - or
 - keep the current committee structure that is focused on dialoguing around issues and concerns.
- Committee members indicated they wanted to discuss issues privately versus in this more public forum
- RMC shared that the committee can still focus on broader issues
- At the January 24 meeting there was a commitment made to share information about synergy with committee members. Committee members present indicated they had received the information and that it covers what synergy groups do and how they are formed.
- RMC said that synergy groups are typically formed more around upstream oil & gas activity. The first one (Sundre Petroleum Operators Group [SPOG]) in Alberta was initiated due to the Shell Caroline project. SPOG now has staff

and a full-time office. There are now over 70 synergy groups. There is also a provincial group (Synergy Alberta) that supports synergy at the local level.

- AST representative shared that their initial hope when the committee was started was to expand this group beyond AST/HAZCO. They indicated they would still like to see this happen although currently, there does not seem to be a great deal of interest from other industry in the area. AST/HAZCO is also interested in keeping this group to focus on project updates, issues and concerns.
- RMC shared that the synergy group needs to be community driven – it needs to have community energy to make it work. The next step would be determining the level of community support to establish a synergy committee.
- A participant asked how synergy groups are resourced.
- RMC noted that most groups require very limited budgets which are typically provide by company participants. It is mostly time and energy that is needed to keep them going. There is a need to have fairly significant support from multiple operators to make it work
- RMC recommended the following:
 - maintain the group’s current mandate around information sharing;
 - promote opportunities to present and discuss issues based on people’s desires; and
 - schedule another meeting in summer or fall to discuss how the regulatory process is proceeding.
 - Revisit the potential for a broader Synergy type groups as the regulatory process scheduling and decision making for the AST project has been determined.
- Committee member agreed and said it didn’t make sense to do anything else until the SIR process is complete or near completion. They added that community members are typically busy over the summer.
- AST indicated there may be enough to report by mid-August.
- Based on the schedules of those present, there should be a meeting late August
- Committee member said RMC should pick a date and stick to it and if people can’t make it so be it. It is too difficult to poll participants to find a date that meets everyone’s schedules.

7. Next Steps

- Next meeting will be **Thursday, August 28th at 6:30 p.m.**

Action item: AST to send out a reminder letter to all the new people who were invited to join the committee about the August 28th meeting.