



# Public Safety and Sour Gas Quarterly Progress Report

October – December 2002

**ALBERTA ENERGY AND UTILITIES BOARD**  
**Public Safety and Sour Gas Quarterly Progress Report**

January 2003

Published by

Alberta Energy and Utilities Board  
640 – 5 Avenue SW  
Calgary, Alberta  
T2P 3G4

Telephone: (403) 297-8311

Fax: (403) 297-7040

Web site: [www.eub.gov.ab.ca](http://www.eub.gov.ab.ca)

For information requests specifically related to Public Safety and Sour Gas, contact the **Public Safety Implementation Team**:

Valerie Sikora: (403) 297-3726 (general inquiries)

Harry Lillo: (403) 297-3721

Marilyn Craig: (403) 297-3194

Gary Neilson: (403) 297-8552

e-mail: [eub.publicsafety@gov.ab.ca](mailto:eub.publicsafety@gov.ab.ca)

# Contents

Introduction.....	1
Status of Recommendations—Summary Tables.....	1
Health Effects and Sour Gas Research .....	3
Sour Gas Development Planning and Approval .....	5
Sour Gas Operations .....	8
Emergency Preparedness .....	9
Information, Communication, and Consultation.....	12

**BLANK PAGE**

## Introduction

This is the third quarterly progress report on the Alberta Energy and Utilities Board's (EUB's) Public Safety and Sour Gas (PS&SG) initiative for the 2002/03 business year. The report covers work under way from October through December 2002. Projects are based on the 87 recommendations made by the Provincial Advisory Committee on Public Safety and Sour Gas (Advisory Committee) in December 2000.<sup>1</sup> As of the end of December 2002, work has been completed on 16 recommendations, while work on 50 recommendations is ongoing.

The EUB is committed to improving how the public is informed about sour gas related issues. To assist with achieving this goal, the EUB PS&SG project Web site at [www.eub.ab.ca/bbs/public/sourgas/home.html](http://www.eub.ab.ca/bbs/public/sourgas/home.html) provides general information on sour gas, progress updates on current PS&SG recommendation projects, links to publications related to PS&SG projects, and a link to the Advisory Committee's Web site [www.publicsafetyandsourgas.org](http://www.publicsafetyandsourgas.org). In order to help the EUB expand the PS&SG Web site and offer information that our stakeholders find valuable, the Public Safety Implementation Team welcomes your comments by telephone (403-297-3726) or by e-mail to [eub.publicsafety@gov.ab.ca](mailto:eub.publicsafety@gov.ab.ca).

### Status of Recommendations—Summary Tables

The following tables summarize the recommendations that are complete and those that are ongoing as of December 31, 2002.

#### Summary of Recommendations Completed as of December 2002

Recommendation Category	Number	Description
Sour Gas Development Planning and Approval	6	Plant proliferation
	35	Prelicence review of critical well licence applications
	36	Licence application training/certification information requirement
Sour Gas Operations	25	Increase sour gas inspections
	26	Increase inspections of new and noncompliant operators
	27	Implement 100% inspection rate for critical wells near people
	28	Response to sour gas complaints
	68	Enhance EUB capability to monitor for complaint response/compliance
	85	Complaint/incident response program for Aboriginal communities
Emergency Preparedness	54, 60, and 61	Interim policy on ERP review and reduced EPZs
	87	Infrastructure and resources for Aboriginal community ERP
Information, Communication, and Consultation	29	Field staff in industry-landowner discussions
	37	EUB involvement in mediation of application issues
	86	Timely and meaningful public consultation for First Nations and Metis
		<b>Total Complete = 16</b>

<sup>1</sup> PS&SG Findings and Recommendations Final Report, PS&SG Advisory Committee, December 2000. Available on the Internet at <http://publicsafetyandsourgas.org>.

### Summary of Recommendations Under Way as of December 2002

Recommendation Category	Number	Description
Health Effects and Sour Gas	9, 59	Health effects information on H <sub>2</sub> S and SO <sub>2</sub>
	10, 11	Develop sour gas research strategies
	12	Establish coordinated, consistent medical response to H <sub>2</sub> S exposure
	67	Develop personal H <sub>2</sub> S exposure monitors
Sour Gas Development Planning and Approval	5	Task force investigation of improved surface/subsurface planning
	7, 32, 33	Applicants for wells to provide project and area planning information and to consider use of existing infrastructure
	17, 18, 19	Standardize dispersion and risk assessment modelling
	34	EUB/government/agency coordinated policy and application review
	38, 41-44	EUB hearings and decisions
	39, 40	Rewrite <i>Guide 29</i> and make hearings user friendly
Sour Gas Operations	21	Review requirements for older sour gas pipelines, ensure that there is adequate attention to corrosion failures
	22	Review adequacy of third-party damage prevention for sour pipelines
	24	Publicize requirements to convert existing pipelines to sour service
	30	Accelerated enforcement where noncompliance threatens health and safety
Emergency Preparedness	15	Follow-up on major releases
	55, 56	Assess capability to implement ERP and increase ERP audits/tests
	57, 63, 64	ERP guide and requirements to coordinate responder roles
	58, 62	Review process for defining EPZs, and require ERPs to show H <sub>2</sub> S/SO <sub>2</sub> evacuation zones
	65	Capability to monitor significant release events
	66	Clarify and coordinate monitoring roles and responsibilities
Information, Communication, and Consultation	3	EUB/IOGC/INAC/First Nations jurisdictional issues
	16	Review, organize, and enhance access to EUB data
	31	Increase the availability of information regarding enforcement actions
	45-48	Perception of EUB's neutrality
	69, 70, 71, 74	Establish EUB public consultation staff resource team
	72	Landowner questions
	73	Establish EUB information office
	79	Determine local benefits from sour gas development
	81	Develop public materials on role of EUB (CD-ROM, videos)
		Total Ongoing = 50

## Health Effects and Sour Gas Research

### Recommendations 9 and 59: Update Health Effects Information on H<sub>2</sub>S and SO<sub>2</sub>

#### *Lead Agency/Branch – Alberta Health and Wellness*

Alberta Health and Wellness (AHW) established a multistakeholder expert advisory committee to evaluate the current health effects literature on H<sub>2</sub>S and SO<sub>2</sub>. A consultant was retained to review the current literature on H<sub>2</sub>S and SO<sub>2</sub> health effects and report to the committee. The review on short-term exposure to H<sub>2</sub>S is complete, and the final report, *Health Effects Associated with Short-Term Exposure to Low Levels of Hydrogen Sulphide (H<sub>2</sub>S): A Technical Review*, is available on the Alberta government Web site at [www.health.gov.ab.ca/public/document/H2S\\_report.pdf](http://www.health.gov.ab.ca/public/document/H2S_report.pdf).

AHW is also currently engaged in a process that will assist with the revision of the H<sub>2</sub>S health effects tables. The EUB will use these revised tables in addressing the recommendations on standardized dispersion modelling, emergency response planning, and setbacks (Recommendations 17, 18, and 19; 55 and 56; 52 and 53; 58 and 62; 57, 63, and 64; and 87). The timeline for delivery has been revised to the end of January 2003.

Phase two of the literature review now under way focuses on SO<sub>2</sub>. The available literature is extensive and requires more resources and time than first anticipated. However, AHW, in partnership with Alberta Environment, is undertaking the review of the SO<sub>2</sub> literature, with a targeted deadline of spring 2003 for completion of the review and preparation of a report. Fall 2003 is the deadline for the revision of the health effects tables on SO<sub>2</sub>.

### Recommendations 10 and 11: Develop Sour Gas Research Strategies

#### *Lead Agency/Branch – Alberta Health and Wellness*

The work to address these recommendations was scheduled to start during the first year of PS&SG. This work has begun now that the review of the health effects data (Recommendations 9 and 59) is near completion. AHW is pursuing this recommendation with other partners in research.

### Recommendation 12: Establish Coordinated, Consistent Medical Response to H<sub>2</sub>S Exposure

#### *Lead Agency/Branch – Alberta Health and Wellness*

AHW has made initial contact with representatives of Alberta Human Resources and Employment and the province's Chief Medical Officer of Health to discuss the appropriate response to this recommendation.

### Recommendation 67: Develop Personal H<sub>2</sub>S Exposure Monitors

#### *Lead Agency/Branch – Alberta Health and Wellness*

The project team first undertook an assessment of existing tools and was able to identify gaps in current technology. In order to fulfill the intent of Recommendation 67, a consultant was hired to develop a portable H<sub>2</sub>S personal exposure monitor. A prototype unit has been developed and lab tested. An advanced prototype unit has been field tested and the results are promising.

Development of contaminant-specific personal exposure devices is resource and manpower intensive. Computer program development and technical issues need to be addressed in a timely manner. AHW has focused on the development of the H<sub>2</sub>S equipment as the contaminant of most concern. It is not feasible to develop multiple new contaminant exposure measurement technologies concurrently.

## Sour Gas Development Planning and Approval

### **Recommendation 5: Task Force Investigation of Improved Surface/Subsurface Planning**

#### ***Lead Agency/Branch – EUB Public Safety Implementation Team***

A senior government steering committee has now been formed to guide the work on Recommendation 5. The committee is cochaired by the EUB Chairman and the Deputy Minister of the Department of Energy; other members include Deputy Ministers from Municipal Affairs, Sustainable Resource Development, and Alberta Environment.

A working level committee comprising staff from each of the five organizations mentioned above has been tasked with addressing this recommendation under the direction of the steering committee. During this quarter, the team met regularly and is working on drafting the project terms of reference, which includes the scope of work, reporting schedule, and revised action plan. Further actions are planned to ensure progress is maintained in addressing this recommendation.

### **Recommendations 7, 32, and 33: Applicants for Wells to Provide Project and Area Planning Information and to Consider Use of Existing Infrastructure**

#### ***Lead Agency/Branch – EUB Applications***

An EUB team has conducted an initial review of a draft policy proposal to address planning and proliferation issues for sour gas development near people with some members of the Advisory Committee, industry, and community stakeholders.

More extensive consultation is currently under way with industry and public stakeholders. As part of this review, the EUB team is working with stakeholders to assess the feasibility of a management approach that would combine regulatory requirements with industry best practices. The team will continue to work with stakeholders to develop a proposal that best meets the intent of these recommendations.

### **Recommendations 17, 18, and 19: Standardize Dispersion and Risk Assessment Modelling**

#### ***Lead Agency/Branch – EUB Compliance and Operations***

Recommendations 17, 18, and 19 relate to the development and maintenance of standardized hazard and risk analysis protocols. The objective is to provide clarity to the public and industry by providing a benchmark for comparison in sour gas developments. The hazard analysis will form the basis for both the protocol to calculate an EPZ and the protocol for risk analysis with an incident frequency component.

This quarter the draft technical descriptions and formulations document has been peer reviewed, and the team continues to work with stakeholders to address issues identified at the June 2002 stakeholder workshop. Work continues on writing the software that supports the protocol, and internal testing should be completed and ready for peer review by April 2003. Subject to satisfactory testing, it is anticipated that the development work for the protocol to calculate an emergency planning zone (EPZ) will be complete by mid-2003. An automated user version of the software and protocol implementation will be undertaken as part of Recommendation 58—EUB approach for determining EPZs.

The second stage in addressing the intent of these recommendations is the calculation of the risk from sour developments. To date, focus has been on the protocol to calculate an EPZ, so further feedback on risk will be sought after the EPZ protocol has been completed. The risk protocol will also feed into the setback review under Recommendation 52.

The completion and implementation of this work depends on Recommendation 9, and the above schedule is based on the anticipated publication of results from that project.

### **Recommendation 34: EUB/Government Agency Coordinated Policy and Application Review**

#### ***Lead Agency/Branch - EUB Applications***

The project team has developed a draft protocol to address three issues:

- the involvement of regional health authorities (RHAs), Alberta Health and Wellness (AHW), and Health Canada in the development of EUB policies, practices, requirements, and procedures relating to health matters;
- early involvement of RHAs and other local government bodies in the preapplication process for sour gas developments; and
- a process for ongoing dialogue between EUB field staff and individual RHAs. The dialogue would be directed towards information sharing, awareness, and support on matters of mutual interest and would not be restricted to sour gas.

Representatives from the RHAs and AHW have participated in the development of the protocol and have taken the draft to their respective organizations for review. Recently, Health Canada has joined the team and indicated that its First Nations and Inuit Health Branch will become a party to the protocol. The EUB expects the protocol to receive final approval from all parties in early 2003.

The team has also drafted a process for responding to public health complaints at the local and field level and is discussing the feasibility of piloting this process in a select number of health regions.

Recent changes to the EUB's emergency preparedness requirements will improve the involvement of RHAs and other local government agencies in the preapplication process for sour gas developments. Oil and gas operators will be required to consult with and disclose projects to all local government stakeholders, including health authorities. This change to the public consultation and disclosure requirements will provide for earlier consultation with local government bodies and will facilitate earlier identification and resolution of issues specific to emergency response plans.

Preliminary discussions have been held with the Alberta Association for Municipal Districts and Counties with respect to establishing a process to improve the involvement of local governments in EUB policy-making and applications. The first meeting with local government representatives is expected to occur during the next quarter.

## **Recommendations 38 and 41-44: EUB Hearings and Decisions**

### ***Lead Agency/Branch - EUB Applications***

The five recommendations focus on improving how the EUB hearing process for sour gas projects deals with issues of public interest, particularly public health and safety concerns.

In response to the recommendations, the following actions continue to be taken:

- Hearings are scheduled or rescheduled to provide sufficient preparation time.
- The EUB holds information sessions as needed that educate and support public participants and that provide information about available resources.
- The Board uses prehearing meetings, where appropriate, to outline issues and explain the benefits of an interrogatory process to all parties. (An interrogatory process provides structure on the exchange of information on technical and complex issues.)
- EUB staff actively identify issues to determine what type of expertise is required and available for a hearing.
- EUB decision reports provide an evaluation of the pertinent evidence and the reasons for the Board's decisions.

## **Recommendations 39 and 40: Rewrite *Guide 29: Hearing Process* and Make Hearings User Friendly**

### ***Lead Agency/Branch - EUB Law***

Revised draft *Guide 29: Energy and Utility Development Applications and the Hearing Process* has been approved by the Board and will be finalized in January 2003. It will be rolled out to stakeholders through public meetings and open houses. The EUB is also preparing a video accompaniment to *Guide 29* to enhance the public's introduction to the hearing process.

## Sour Gas Operations

### **Recommendation 21: Review Requirements for Older Sour Gas Pipelines, Ensure That There Is Adequate Attention to Corrosion Failures**

#### *Lead Agency/Branch - EUB Compliance and Operations*

Review and evaluation of *Guide 66: Pipeline Inspection Manual*, which includes requirements for pipeline corrosion monitoring programs is ongoing; revisions to the guide are anticipated to be completed in early 2003.

The project team continues to work with the Canadian Standards Association (CSA) technical committee and anticipates that the EUB will develop requirements supplemental to CSA standards for sour service pipelines. Completion of this work is expected by the end of 2003.

### **Recommendation 22: Review Adequacy of Third-Party Damage Prevention for Sour Pipelines**

#### *Lead Agency/Branch – EUB Compliance and Operations*

The EUB is continuing to draft amendments to the Pipeline Regulations to address a number of issues, including prevention of third-party damage to pipelines. Early in 2003 the project team will involve external stakeholders in a review of the proposed amendments. Revisions will be made based on stakeholder feedback and the amendments forwarded to legislative council for processing. It is anticipated that the revised pipeline amendments will be proclaimed in June 2003.

### **Recommendation 24: Publicize Requirements to Convert Existing Pipelines to Sour Service**

#### *Lead Agency/Branch – EUB Compliance and Operations*

The EUB project team has developed a draft interim directive (ID) that describes and clarifies all requirements for reclassification of pipelines to sour service. An internal review of the ID has been completed, and broader external stakeholder engagement with CAPP, SEPAC, and individual companies is scheduled to take place in spring 2003. The new requirements are expected to be implemented through the ID by the end of 2003. A communications plan to publicize the requirements at that time is being developed.

### **Recommendation 30: Accelerated Enforcement Where Noncompliance Threatens Health and Safety**

#### *Lead Agency/Branch – EUB Compliance and Operations*

The second draft of the updated information letter (IL) on the EUB enforcement process and generic enforcement ladder was presented at internal and external stakeholder workshops in November and December 2002 for feedback.

After incorporating feedback, the project team will review the IL with the Advisory Committee to ensure that it meets the committee's expectations. It is anticipated that the finalized IL will be published in March 2003, resulting in improved enforcement ladders for public health and safety noncompliance matters.

## Emergency Preparedness

### Recommendation 15: Follow-up on Major Releases of Sour Gas

#### *Lead Agency/Branch – EUB Compliance and Operations*

An exercise of the draft *Alberta Emergency Support Plan: Upstream Petroleum Incidents*, which includes the EUB's *Incident Response and Reporting Protocol*, took place in October 2002. An assessment of the exercise results is currently under way to determine if revisions to the document are required. The support plan is expected to be finalized in April 2003.

### Recommendations 55 and 56: Audit Process for Operator ERPs

#### *Lead Agency/Branch – EUB Compliance and Operations*

The project team has completed the first phase in development of an ERP database and has compiled a comprehensive inventory of licensed sour facilities.

A first draft of an ERP review protocol and an ERP audit/inspection protocol are currently under development.

A pilot project to test the audit/inspection process is anticipated to begin in February 2003 and is expected to continue for about three months.

### Recommendations 57, 63, and 64: *Emergency Management Guide* and Requirements to Coordinate Responder Roles

#### *Lead Agency/Branch – EUB Compliance and Operations*

Feedback from stakeholders has been incorporated into a final draft of *EUB Guide 71: Emergency Preparedness and Response Requirements for the Upstream Petroleum Industry*.

The project team plans to issue the approved guide in March 2003, which will complete Phase 1 of the project.

As part of Phase 2, a stakeholder workshop is being planned for March 2003 to continue to review requirements for conducting ERP exercises and testing a company's capability to respond to an emergency.

### Recommendations 58 and 62: Review Process for Defining EPZs, and Require ERPs to Show H<sub>2</sub>S/SO<sub>2</sub> Evacuation Zones

#### *Lead Agency/Branch - EUB Compliance and Operations*

#### **NEW START**

Recommendations 58 and 62 have been started ahead of schedule during this quarter with internal EUB discussions taking place on the strategy to address these recommendations.

These recommendations are closely related to Recommendations 17, 18, and 19 to develop a protocol for calculating EPZs. The plan is to include the requirements of

Recommendation 62 within the protocol, then implement the protocol as part of Recommendation 58.

Future revisions to *Guide 71* planned for publication in early 2003 will be made to reflect the changes resulting from this work.

### **Recommendation 65: Capability to Monitor Significant Release Events**

#### ***Lead Agency/Branch – EUB Field Surveillance***

The project team has completed an inventory of the type, sensitivity, reliability, and location of available air monitoring equipment in the province that will be used to assess whether adequate capability exists to monitor events involving significant sour gas releases.

Draft guidelines have been developed to be used by EUB staff in the event of an emergency to ensure a consistent approach to collecting, analyzing, and disseminating air monitoring results.

The project team has also completed its review of the Lodgepole Blowout Inquiry Report to determine whether any shortfalls, additional requirements, or other strategies could be employed in developing an air monitoring protocol or assessing the current capabilities. It expects to have the final report completed by the end of February 2003.

### **Recommendation 66: Clarify and Coordinate Monitoring Roles and Responsibilities**

#### ***Lead Agency/Branch – Alberta Environment***

Air quality monitoring roles and responsibilities are reflected in the draft *Alberta Emergency Support Plan: Upstream Petroleum Incidents*. An exercise of the support plan took place in October 2002 involving teams from the EUB, local and provincial governments, and industry. An assessment of the exercise is currently under way to determine if revisions to the document are required. The support plan is expected to be finalized in April 2003.

### **Recommendation 87: Infrastructure and Resources for Aboriginal Community ERP**

#### ***Lead Agency/Branch – EUB Compliance and Operations***

#### **COMPLETED**

The EUB team, in conjunction with Emergency Management Alberta (EMA, formerly Alberta Disaster Services), Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC), and Health Canada, has reviewed the programs in place for First Nations and Metis for planning and development of disaster services capability. The following summarizes the roles, responsibilities, and programs as they currently exist.

- EMA—The Alberta Disaster Services Act requires all 312 Alberta municipalities, which includes eight Metis settlements, to have a municipal emergency plan (MEP) and to appoint a director of Disaster Services to be responsible for the plan. EMA also coordinates a grant program to ensure that individual training in emergency

management is available to all key responders identified in the MEP and that there is collective training for municipalities to exercise their MEPs regularly.

- INAC—Alberta has 46 First Nations communities that are federally regulated and not bound by the Alberta Disaster Services Act. However, under a memorandum of understanding between INAC and EMA, emergency preparedness for these communities is funded by INAC and administered by EMA. The role of EMA includes emergency preparedness, response assistance in the form of advice and coordination, and recovery support, also in the form of advice and direction. EMA has two First Nations officers responsible for delivering the disaster services programs to First Nations communities in the same manner as for non-First Nations communities.

INAC works with First Nations communities and remains fully responsible for the provision of resources and infrastructure so that the communities can maintain a sufficient level of emergency response preparedness.

The EUB, INAC, and EMA are satisfied that adequate programs exist for the delivery and coordination of emergency preparedness for First Nations communities and Metis settlements. The parties are also satisfied that the resource and infrastructure needs of First Nations communities are being and will continue to be managed through INAC.

## Information, Communication, and Consultation

### Recommendation 3: EUB/IOGC/INAC/First Nations Jurisdictional Issues

#### *Lead Agency/Branch – EUB Law*

#### **NEW START**

In September 2002 the EUB Law Branch began drafting a working paper to clarify the roles and jurisdictions of the named agencies to provide the EUB, other agencies, and the public at large with a better understanding of the various bodies that regulate oil and gas activity on reserve lands in Alberta.

Addressing this recommendation will assist in the completion of other recommendations, such as 1, 14, and 69.

The key deliverables for this project may include

- a working paper to be vetted with internal and external stakeholders;
- a document that explains the roles and interplays of the named agencies; and
- a process for ongoing internal/external review of roles and interplays.

The projected completion date of Recommendation 3 is September 2003.

### Recommendation 16: Review, Organize, and Enhance Access to EUB Data

#### *Lead Agency/Branch – EUB Resources*

EUB testing of the newly developed geographic information system (GIS) Web site is under way. All key existing sour gas data will reside in a new database, making it more accessible to queries.

The GIS Web site will be demonstrated at open houses to create public awareness of the availability of the site and to provide opportunity for feedback. Modifications to the Web site will be made based on feedback received. The project team will determine what changes, if any, are required to the sour gas data submission to ensure accuracy and completeness of databases and implement required changes. Once necessary modifications have been made, the Web site will be made available to stakeholders.

This project will involve ongoing maintenance, data quality improvements, and enhancements that will likely take a number of years to implement.

### Recommendation 31: Increase Availability of Information on Enforcement Actions

#### *Lead Agency/Branch – EUB Compliance and Operations*

The EUB team completed the design of the in-house process to gather, maintain, and post information on enforcement actions. The EUB's Corporate Compliance and Operations Branch is now testing the process. Subject to obtaining Board approval, it is still expected that level-3 and -4 enforcement information will be published by spring 2003.

## **Recommendations 45, 46, 47, and 48: Perception of EUB's Neutrality**

### ***Lead Agency/Branch – EUB Communications***

In November 2002, the EUB struck a committee to bring forward options regarding neutrality training for EUB staff. A statement of principles is being developed. Following its completion, neutrality training templates will be developed for EUB staff.

The EUB continues to develop a proactive communications plan to emphasize the role of the regulator in protecting the public interest. The three-year plan includes more proactive work with the media, open houses, youth initiatives, high-quality internal communications, and speaking engagements for senior staff.

The plan will focus on ensuring that Albertans understand the role of the EUB and the clear distinction between the relevant Alberta Government departments, including the Department of Energy and the EUB.

The EUB is currently working with the Alberta Department of Energy on the industry/government funding model for the EUB.

## **Recommendations 69, 70, 71, and 74: Establish EUB Public Consultation Staff Resource Team**

### ***Lead Agency/Branch – EUB Corporate Support***

In November 2002, a workshop was held with a representative group of EUB and industry stakeholders to discuss the proposed expanded and clarified requirements and expectations for participant involvement. This document has gone through a subsequent revision and will undergo final stakeholder review in spring 2003, as an integral part of the revised *Guide 56: Energy Development Applications*.

Following this, the EUB will develop training programs in participant involvement and technical communication. Joint rollout sessions with the EUB Law Branch of documents relating to participant involvement and the hearing process are being planned for spring 2003 in various locales around the province. These sessions will be open to the public, industry, and EUB field staff.

As well, the new participant involvement requirements will be implemented through the revised *Guide 56* scheduled for release in spring 2003.

## **Recommendation 72: Landowner Questions**

### ***Lead Agency/Branch – EUB Corporate Support***

The landowner questions document *Understanding Energy Development* is being developed as an EUB brochure and will be supported by a number of related EnerFAQs. EnerFAQs is a series of short, public-focused question-and-answer documents, each on a different topic. Currently there are seven EnerFAQs available on the EUB Web site [www.eub.gov.ab.ca/BBS/public/EnerFAQs/default.htm](http://www.eub.gov.ab.ca/BBS/public/EnerFAQs/default.htm), and four more are being developed.

After many months of consultation with stakeholders, the EUB is confident that these products will satisfy the intent of the recommendation. As a reflection of its importance to landowners, *Understanding Energy Development* will replace the current EUB public

information package required in *Guide 56*. Its release, therefore, is tied to the release of the revised *Guide 56* in spring 2003. *Understanding Energy Development* and each EnerFAQs in the series will also be available as stand-alone documents from the EUB.

### **Recommendation 73: Establish EUB Information Office**

#### ***Lead Agency/Branch – EUB Corporate Support***

The EUB continues to analyze results from the public consultation study that was completed last quarter and is considering a number of options in the creation of an information office. The Communications Group has added two full-time staff members to develop more publicly oriented materials about various topics that will be made available in a number of ways, including on the EUB Web site. A database of public frequently asked questions is also being developed. Further research is under way to determine the best way of presenting technical information to a public audience.

### **Recommendation 79: Determine Local Benefits from Sour Gas Development**

#### ***Lead Agency/Branch – EUB Resources, Economics***

The project steering committee met with members of the Advisory Committee to discuss its request that the Recommendation 79 study include a discussion of setbacks. It was agreed that the steering committee would continue on its current course of action and that setbacks would be dealt with qualitatively in the report, rather than quantitatively. It was also suggested that Recommendation 53, a review of the implications of setbacks on the ability to develop property, may be more suited to dealing with the setbacks issue that was raised by the Advisory Committee.

In the meantime, the steering committee continued with data collection on land values. Delays have been experienced with data collection; however, most of the data have been collected and the study has moved into the analysis and report preparation stage.

In the next quarter, the steering committee will interview stakeholders in selected communities throughout Alberta and engage Aboriginal communities.

The analysis of data is expected to be complete by the end of February 2003, following which a draft report will be written.

### **Recommendation 81: Public Consultation Materials—Role of EUB**

#### ***Lead Agency/Branch – EUB Corporate Support***

Work continues on a brochure for the public that focuses on the role of the EUB and provides contact names and phone numbers. It would be given out when industry conducts public consultation.

Development of a comprehensive video on the role of the EUB has begun. It is expected to air on Access TV in April 2003.

An assessment of the needs regarding public consultation materials in three pilot First Nations communities is under way. Additionally, the EUB is planning an educational program aimed at Aboriginal youth to raise awareness of the EUB's role.

## **Recommendation 86: Timely and Meaningful Public Consultation for First Nations and Metis**

### *Lead Agency/Branch – EUB Corporate Support*

#### **COMPLETED**

Early in the PS&SG initiative, the Staff Resource Team (Recommendation 69) did a thorough analysis of existing requirements and expectations for public consultation in general and for consultation with Aboriginal individuals and communities in particular. This analysis revealed gaps in EUB requirements and expectations that have now been rectified, as far as possible, in the new participant involvement requirements to be released in spring 2003.

There are several new references in the new participant involvement requirements to consultation with Aboriginal communities that help to clarify what is expected of industry. All EUB requirements and expectations for participant involvement have applied and continue to apply to both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal individuals and communities. The EUB makes no differentiation in this regard.

While the EUB does not feel that any new requirements specific to Aboriginal consultation are necessary, it has done a number of things to raise awareness of requirements and expectations and to assist industry in their consultation efforts. A significant number of EUB field and office staff have undergone Aboriginal awareness training to better understand Aboriginal issues and to deal with them in an appropriate and sensitive manner.

The EUB Field Surveillance Branch, with the EUB Aboriginal affairs consultant and IOGC, has completed dozens of visits with both First Nations and Metis communities. The purpose of these visits was to introduce the two organizations to the communities and to better understand the concerns that the communities may have. Field Surveillance has also hired two new Aboriginal inspectors to assist in the communication among all stakeholders with respect to Aboriginal issues.

All enforcement actions with regard to noncompliance with participant involvement requirements apply regardless of where that noncompliance occurs.