

**DRAFT**  
**AST & Community Committee May 3 Meeting Notes**

**Bruderheim Boardroom**  
**6:30 to 9:30 pm**

**1. Welcome & introductions**

- RMC welcomed everyone to the meeting
- Introductions were made as there were new committee members in attendance
- Principles to guide meeting discussions were reviewed and agreed to by all
- Ground rules to create a framework for constructive dialogue to take place were reviewed and agreed to by all
- The committee's mandate was reviewed.
  - i. A question was raised as to what was meant about problem-solving opportunities. Were these opportunities to be solely around communication or could there be project problem-solving opportunities?
  - ii. AST said yes - should a project problem-solving opportunity arise it would be explored.
  - iii. RMC shared that although problem-solving wasn't a primary objective the group would explore problem-solving opportunities when presented.

**2. Agenda review**

- The proposed agenda was reviewed and adopted by all.

**3. Committee structure and process review**

Committee Name

- All participants agreed that the committee name will be changed from AST / Community Committee to **AST & Community Committee**

Feedback to Facilitation Team between meetings – Transparency

- Meeting participants discussed the idea of transparency as it relates to feedback provided to RMC between meetings.
- It was agreed to by all that any feedback provided would be shared with all committee members.

***Action Step 1: RMC to provide survey feedback received in advance of May 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting and distribute to all committee members.***

Committee Meeting Notes Development and Distribution

- One committee member shared that the DRAFT January 31 Proposed AST / Community EIA Consultation Committee meeting notes did not reflect their perception of the January 31<sup>st</sup> meeting participants' desire to wait until after the EIA Report had been filed to form a committee. This committee

member went on to ask whether committee member agreement needs to be attained before any information is made available to the public. The answer was yes because this committee (formed April 3) uses a consensus-based decision making method.

- When asked how the adoption of the January 31 meeting notes would be handled, RMC explained from her experience the following:
  - i. It is important to note that the January 31<sup>st</sup> meeting notes were issued as draft only
  - ii. Typically, meeting notes are a record of what was discussed during a meeting.
  - iii. Given that everyone has their own unique perspectives, any suggested changes to committee meeting notes would be recorded in subsequent meeting notes.
- It was agreed that on a go forward basis, no committee meeting notes would be made public until they have been adopted by the committee members and a specific plan has been adopted as to *how* these notes will be made public.
- Suggestions for getting adopted meeting notes out to the broader community members were:
  - i. Lamont County website
  - ii. Town of Lamont website
  - iii. Town of Bruderheim website
  - iv. Local Hazco office
  - v. Hazco website
  - vi. FOLC website

***Action Step 2: Lamont County representative to find out whether committee meeting notes can be posted on County website and report back to the committee at the June 7<sup>th</sup> meeting.***

***Action Step 3: FOLC representative to find out whether committee meeting notes can be posted on the Friends of Lamont County website and report back to the committee at the June 7<sup>th</sup> meeting.***

***Action Step 4: AST to find out whether the committee meeting notes can be posted on both the Town of Bruderheim and the Town of Lamont websites and report back to the committee at the June 7<sup>th</sup> meeting.***

Process Discussions Agenda Item

It was proposed (and agreed to by the committee) that “process discussion” be a standing item on the agenda for each meeting. Two process issues were identified by RMC to be discussed at the May 3 meeting. These included:

- How can committee meetings be opened to the broader community?
- How can the committee ensure that information presented about the project is credible?

Other process items had been submitted by a meeting participant for discussion. These included:

- A question regarding whether or not a committee member could “veto” or stop a decision by the rest of the committee? (answer - yes, under a consensus decision making process, any one individual can block consensus and therefore block a decision)
- A question was presented regarding who approves materials from the committee? (answer – committee does under the consensus decision making process noted above)
- Who approves meeting materials from the committee (such as meeting notes?)
- Can any member of the committee propose information to be sent out by the group?

#### Credible Information

The process of providing “credible” information about broad community issues or concerns was discussed.

- It was raised in the context of the decision making as noted above (i.e. who approves material being presented through the committee process)
- One committee member commented that committee members do not have the capacity to determine if the information is credible and asked how this would be handled
- Experience with other synergy type groups in the province was reviewed to determine how they addressed this issue.
- Using Alberta Environment and/or university academic experts to review or comment on information was noted as an example of how committee members might determine whether information is credible

#### Committee Mandate

- There was additional discussion about the committee’s mandate and whether or not to add a purpose to the existing mandate
- It was agreed to by all that the first bullet would incorporate a purpose and therefore the committee’s mandate would now be as follows:
  - Enhance communication through the sharing of “credible” information - clarify questions about the proposed project and find effective ways to share information *to create a more informed dialogue in the community*
  - Problem-solve / issue resolve when these opportunities present themselves
  - Build more positive, go-forward relationships amongst all

#### Parking Lot of Other Process and Structure Items for Future Committee Meeting Discussions

- A number of process issues were discussed and captured on a work list to be carried forward and addressed at future meetings.

#### 4. Questions, Issues and Concerns Discussion

- RMC reviewed their purpose in sending out the survey in advance of tonight's meeting
- The intention was to try and determine what the committee would address first - what the committee participants and the community would see as the priority issues to be addressed first. Since all questions cannot be answered at the same time, RMC wanted to get feedback from the committee on where they should start. The priority setting process was only to be about sequencing or ordering questions to address community information needs. It was not intended to limit the number of issues or questions to be addressed.
- RMC reviewed the questions, issues and concerns heard to date through the EIA consultation activities (one-on-one visits, phone calls etc).
- RMC pointed out to meeting participants the differences in priorities between those that resided within 1.5 km of the proposed facility site and those that resided beyond 1.5 km of the proposed facility site.
- A request was made by a committee member for the Facilitation Team to forward these lists to all committee members.

**Action Step 5:** *Facilitation Team to send committee members the list of issues and concerns.* (Completed – see attached power point presentation.)

- There was considerable discussion around which questions, issues and concerns to start with first.
- When asked, AST shared that typically a group such as this would start with air – “what goes up, must come down”
- Committee members ultimately decided on the following (in order):
  - i. Air
  - ii. Water
  - iii. Health
  - iv. Emergency response
  - v. Vehicle and rail traffic
  - vi. Soil
  - vii. Property values
- It was also agreed to by all that RMC would draft some of the key air questions which have been identified through consultation activities to date. As these air questions have links to many other issue areas, it was determined appropriate for the committee to establish information on air issues first and then develop a work plan from there.

**Action Step 6:** *RMC to draft a proposed set of AIR questions (as a proposed work plan) for discussion and feedback at the next meeting.*

## 5. Next Steps

- Participants agreed to the following upcoming meeting dates:
  - Thursday, **June 7**, 2007 starting at 6:30 pm – location to be determined
  - Thursday, **July 5**, 2007 starting at 6:30 pm – location to be determined
  - Thursday, **August 2**, 2007 starting at 6:30 pm – location to be determined

*Action Step 7: AST to find out meeting space option availability and to book space depending on this availability.*

*Action Step 8: Facilitation Team to draft letter to Mayor Jack Lambert, Town of Bruderheim and to John Helton, Lamont Fire Chief and invite both into the committee process.*

*Action Step 9: RMC to send committee members a copy of the power point presentation along with the DRAFT May 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting notes.*  
(Completed – see attached.)

DRAFT