

Response to OPR Discussion Questions

Apeiron was able to meet with communities and held conversations over the last few months. While the discussion was focused on the majority of the questions asked by the OPR discussion paper, some other questions were seen by members as above their knowledge or ability to answer. To date, Apeiron has worked with these communities through TLU studies, workshops, and regulatory support. Throughout these processes common themes have emerged and are captured below. Even though each impacted community is in a different geographically, they share many common concerns as Métis people of Alberta.

Answers from communities:

1. Local 845 community members shared that many times when reading documents or emails from the CER, or proponent that they are very formal. Their energy is spent on trying to interpret the technical/formal language rather than the message or content. An overall call for simplified and clear language would be good.
2. Recognizing that the community has knowledge about the area, and that this can have value. Communication with the community and seek inputs. When the community is involved, sharing their knowledge about the land and everyone working together then the community feels valued.
3. Local 845 community members expressed that the impacts to their community and land are beyond the Row during construction and operations/maintenance. Any activity on the RoW will be of concern. One of the concerns raised, was all the access roads built during construction, and how these roads create higher activity along the RoW, as it opens up the area to non-locals.
4. Many in the community expressed concern for “seed-mixing”, and how communities or elders need to be engaged in the development of the seed mix. Many people in the area could share their knowledge of plants and contribute to the conversation. Include the community in the development of the seed-mix just not CER or proponent SMEs.
5. The key is to “integrate” indigenous knowledge, not use “consideration of indigenous knowledge”. Local 845 felt that there isn’t enough in-person communication, emails are not communication. The community expressed the need for more follow-up conversations. In-person meetings should be held in the community being impacted. On-line meetings are only accessible to people with access to technology, not many elders would participate.
6. Our elders know about the land, utilize their knowledge. Understand that when community members participate and share their knowledge, that they are taking time

out of their day to participate. These individuals are not salaried people, so some sort of compensation should be available.

7. Open up the dialogue and come into community more often, with seminars and more meeting with the general community. The keynote is more communications with the communities. The meetings need to be less formal, more about having a conversation. Taking the time to get to know the people, the leaders, and the elders.
8. More engagement with the community. In-person, smaller meetings. Connect with the community.
9. Again, coming into community often, talking about the opportunities for people to be involved and how to find work as well.

10.-12. No comment.

13. Keep in mind that not all communities have the same level of accessibility to technology or devices. The interactive pipeline map is a great idea to share information about the project, but if the community has unstable internet, then how can they access the online tool.

14-19: No comment.

20. One thing that has not been explicit to the community is how many/percentage of the contractors should be Indigenous. It appears to be up to the contractors themselves as well to hire an unknown percentage of Indigenous people. The vagueness of these numbers should be addressed to support the local communities.

21-29: No comment.