

Appendix B Evaluations of Public Information Sessions

Following is a breakdown by location of the evaluation forms received from attendees, as well as comments from the evaluation forms on both content and process.

Rocky Mountain House – 22 forms received

| Statement | Partially or Fully Disagree | Neutral | Partially or Fully Agree |
|--|-----------------------------|---------|--------------------------|
| I found the greeters helpful | | 7 | 15 (68%) |
| I found the information handouts helpful in my understanding of NGC development in Alberta | 3 | 8 | 9 (43%) |
| I found the information stations and staff to be useful and educational | 2 | 7 | 12 (57%) |
| I found the posters and maps useful and informative | 1 | 7 | 14 (64%) |
| I found the facility easy to access and an appropriate venue for this evening's session | 1 | 3 | 18 (82%) |
| The short session presentations were presented in an understandable and useful manner | 2 | 7 | 13(59%) |
| The pace of the evening was appropriate for the topic material | 2 | 3 | 17 (77%) |
| I found the facilitated question and answer portion to be a valuable tool in sharing information | 2 | 4 | 16 (73%) |
| I found the speakers to be knowledgeable about their specific area | 2 | 10 | 8 (40%) |
| I had sufficient opportunity to ask questions and provide input | 1 | 1 | 20 (91%) |
| The moderator was effective and was able to adhere to the schedule | 1 | 1 | 20 (91%) |

Written Comments:

- ◆ Appreciate the opportunity to learn about CBM/NGC. Alberta development must be better than Wyoming and Colorado.
- ◆ A little startled to find out how many NGC wells had been drilled to date – where was the heads up on this earlier?
- ◆ It almost seemed that some of the advisory group members were better able to answer questions.
- ◆ The EUB needs a better understanding of the daily workings of public consultation and personal consultation process.
- ◆ Even though it was the first in a series of meetings, it was well delivered. Format was simple and to the point. One concern is land tenure and public lands relates to traditional aboriginal ownership. Has much debate been devoted to this issue and is your group prepared to deal with these types of matters?
- ◆ Some confusion regarding well densities. Not clear on surface impacts. Group is starting with premise that we need NGC development. This is not a given. Government should be looking at alternative energy sources. It seems like the objective of the Department of Energy is to get as much royalties as quick as they can. This philosophy negates or minimizes other concerns.
- ◆ One of the most important issues is water production and the speaker was not capable of presenting the information in an understandable manner. Speaker needs to be better prepared. People answering questions are not familiar enough with the regulations.
- ◆ I do not see adequate representation on MAC to deal with my concerns related to recreational activities on Crown land. Information on NGC impacts is scarce – focus is on the well site, with little mention on the road/pipeline. Concerned about the impacts on forest resources. In my work in the forest industry I spend time dealing with access issues and attempting to minimize oil and gas footprint, including decommissioning roads. With the advent of NGC, I would question why we should be worried about minimizing impact.

Wetaskiwin – 8 forms received

| Statement | Partially or Fully Disagree | Neutral | Partially or Fully Agree |
|--|-----------------------------|---------|--------------------------|
| I found the greeters helpful | | 1 | 7 |
| I found the information handouts helpful in my understanding of NGC development in Alberta | | 2 | 6 |
| I found the information stations and staff to be useful and educational | | 3 | 5 |
| I found the posters and maps useful and informative | | 2 | 6 |
| I found the facility easy to access and an appropriate venue for this evening's session | | 1 | 7 |
| The short session presentations were presented in an understandable and useful manner | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| The pace of the evening was appropriate for the topic material | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| I found the facilitated question and answer portion to be a valuable tool in sharing information | | 1 | 7 |
| I found the speakers to be knowledgeable about their specific area | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| I had sufficient opportunity to ask questions and provide input | 1 | | 7 |
| The moderator was effective and was able to adhere to the schedule | | | 8 |

Written Comments:

- ◆ Very good presentation.
- ◆ Excellent program – keep up the good work.
- ◆ Please add more of these meetings to your schedule.
- ◆ I would have appreciated copies of the posters on the wall.
- ◆ The speaker on the *Water Act* was very poor and did not appear to be very knowledgeable. We cannot drink gas. The environmental representative lady was very good at NOT answering a question, which is typical.

Stettler – 45 forms received

| Statement | Partially or Fully Disagree | Neutral | Partially or Fully Agree |
|--|-----------------------------|---------|--------------------------|
| I found the greeters helpful | | 12 | 33 (73%) |
| I found the information handouts helpful in my understanding of NGC development in Alberta | 2 | 15 | 23 (58%) |
| I found the information stations and staff to be useful and educational | 2 | 14 | 28 (64%) |
| I found the posters and maps useful and informative | 2 | 8 | 32 (76%) |
| I found the facility easy to access and an appropriate venue for this evening's session | | 3 | 42 (93%) |
| The short session presentations were presented in an understandable and useful manner | 4 | 13 | 27 (61%) |
| The pace of the evening was appropriate for the topic material | 1 | 8 | 35 (80%) |
| I found the facilitated question and answer portion to be a valuable tool in sharing information | 2 | 8 | 35 (77%) |
| I found the speakers to be knowledgeable about their specific area | 5 | 12 | 28 (62%) |
| I had sufficient opportunity to ask questions and provide input | 2 | 9 | 34 (76%) |
| The moderator was effective and was able to adhere to the schedule | | 6 | 38 (86%) |

Written Comments:

- ◆ Is this study going to be like others – lots of time and taxpayers' money spent, but not much action? I feel the bottom line will be how much money the government can get from revenue. These sessions are held to make the public feel good.
- ◆ Sessions not well advertised. Heard about it on CBC – I could have missed it. I'm concerned that three jurisdictions involved will result in giving the landowner the run-around.
- ◆ One of the speakers was hard to understand.
- ◆ Glad to have the opportunity to attend, but still uneasy about coalbed issues.
- ◆ You need to work harder on all aspects of oil industry – they do what they want. Should be a moratorium on drilling until you can fully answer questions. I found this session informative but incomplete.
- ◆ Meeting should have been held earlier in the winter before calving season.
- ◆ Why not use waste materials to produce methane first (e.g., garbage pits) – didn't answer question about public safety and methane.
- ◆ Slow down.

Barrhead – 11 forms received

| Statement | Partially or Fully Disagree | Neutral | Partially or Fully Agree |
|--|-----------------------------|---------|--------------------------|
| I found the greeters helpful | | | 11 (100%) |
| I found the information handouts helpful in my understanding of NGC development in Alberta | | 2 | 9 (82%) |
| I found the information stations and staff to be useful and educational | | 2 | 9 (82%) |
| I found the posters and maps useful and informative | | 2 | 9 (82%) |
| I found the facility easy to access and an appropriate venue for this evening's session | | 1 | 10 (91%) |
| The short session presentations were presented in an understandable and useful manner | | 2 | 8 (80%) |
| The pace of the evening was appropriate for the topic material | | 1 | 10 (91%) |
| I found the facilitated question and answer portion to be a valuable tool in sharing information | | | 11 (100%) |
| I found the speakers to be knowledgeable about their specific area | | | 11 (100%) |
| I had sufficient opportunity to ask questions and provide input | | | 11 (100%) |
| The moderator was effective and was able to adhere to the schedule | | 1 | 10 (91%) |

Written Comments:

- ◆ Glad I came – was negative coming, positive leaving.
- ◆ Good – would like industry to tag along and provide their overall intent to some of these projects.
- ◆ The meeting was very important.
- ◆ Very good presentation – well handled.
- ◆ The information package does not contain contacts or instruction on how or to whom to address written input. Some of the presenters were hard to understand.

Strathmore – 27 forms received

| Statement | Partially or Fully Disagree | Neutral | Partially or Fully Agree |
|--|-----------------------------|---------|--------------------------|
| I found the greeters helpful | | 8 | 19 (70%) |
| I found the information handouts helpful in my understanding of NGC development in Alberta | | 12 | 15 (56%) |
| I found the information stations and staff to be useful and educational | 1 | 7 | 17 (68%) |
| I found the posters and maps useful and informative | 1 | 3 | 23 (85%) |
| I found the facility easy to access and an appropriate venue for this evening's session | 1 | 2 | 24 (89%) |
| The short session presentations were presented in an understandable and useful manner | 3 | 10 | 14 (52%) |
| The pace of the evening was appropriate for the topic material | 3 | 8 | 15 (58%) |
| I found the facilitated question and answer portion to be a valuable tool in sharing information | 1 | 4 | 22 (81%) |
| I found the speakers to be knowledgeable about their specific area | 3 | 4 | 20 (74%) |
| I had sufficient opportunity to ask questions and provide input | 3 | 2 | 21 (81%) |
| The moderator was effective and was able to adhere to the schedule | 3 | 7 | 17 (63%) |

Written Comments:

- ◆ Disappointed – was hoping to find out more specific information on how the wells are drilled, what actions the companies need to take in order to drill, and what happens when things go wrong. How am I supposed to ask questions if I don't understand what exactly they are doing on my land? The answers supplied during the Q and A were disappointing. There was a lot of dodging – and passing it along. As for water, I don't care about the difference between saline and non-saline, I want to know the distance a well has to be from my domestic well. Do the companies have to test my well and what happens if they contaminate my well? Most of the speakers seemed to be 'text book smart' – not 'hands on experience' smart.
- ◆ Obvious by its absence was Surface Rights Board representation. Was that on purpose? The issue of compensation for leases and easements is a major issue at meetings related to oil and gas surface rights. In my view, this meeting lost credibility as a result of what could be perceived as an evasive tactic.
- ◆ The comments made were very valid. Water today is very important and as was said: "When the well goes dry, who fills it again?" Will it be too late?
- ◆ Are the maps available on a web site?
- ◆ Presentations need better time management. Better facilitation needed to curb comments not related to NGC.
- ◆ Respect landowners/farmers' rights/time.
- ◆ Adverse effect compensation seems low compared to potential property devaluation, spreading of weeds, etc.
- ◆ Although many issues discussed and topic of NGC not adhered to – a very valuable and informative session. Thanks.

Drayton Valley – 4 forms received

| Statement | Partially or Fully Disagree | Neutral | Partially or Fully Agree |
|--|-----------------------------|---------|--------------------------|
| I found the greeters helpful | | | 4 |
| I found the information handouts helpful in my understanding of NGC development in Alberta | | 2 | 2 |
| I found the information stations and staff to be useful and educational | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| I found the posters and maps useful and informative | | 2 | 2 |
| I found the facility easy to access and an appropriate venue for this evening's session | | | 4 |
| The short session presentations were presented in an understandable and useful manner | | 1 | 3 |
| The pace of the evening was appropriate for the topic material | | 1 | 3 |
| I found the facilitated question and answer portion to be a valuable tool in sharing information | | 1 | 3 |
| I found the speakers to be knowledgeable about their specific area | | | 4 |
| I had sufficient opportunity to ask questions and provide input | | 1 | 3 |
| The moderator was effective and was able to adhere to the schedule | | | 4 |

Written Comments:

- ◆ No written comments.

Pincher Creek – 8 forms received

| Statement | Partially or Fully Disagree | Neutral | Partially or Fully Agree |
|--|-----------------------------|---------|--------------------------|
| I found the greeters helpful | 1 | 4 | 3 |
| I found the information handouts helpful in my understanding of NGC development in Alberta | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| I found the information stations and staff to be useful and educational | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| I found the posters and maps useful and informative | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| I found the facility easy to access and an appropriate venue for this evening's session | | 2 | 6 |
| The short session presentations were presented in an understandable and useful manner | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| The pace of the evening was appropriate for the topic material | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| I found the facilitated question and answer portion to be a valuable tool in sharing information | | 1 | 7 |
| I found the speakers to be knowledgeable about their specific area | | 5 | 3 |
| I had sufficient opportunity to ask questions and provide input | | 1 | 7 |
| The moderator was effective and was able to adhere to the schedule | 1 | 2 | 5 |

Written Comments:

- ◆ Questions professionally not answered.
- ◆ Do not condemn our headwaters to this kind of devastating pollution. Water is far more important than NGC will ever be. Listen to the public. The eastern slopes should be kept pristine forever.
- ◆ No development on the eastern slopes. It is far too dangerous to the water supply for millions of people downstream. I believe the government has already made up its mind in favor of industry. All of us use oil and gas, but much more care needs to be put into its recovery. The government people are very good at beating around the bush and giving no clear answers to very clear questions. The natural beauty of our mountain ranges should not be tampered with for any short-term gain.
- ◆ Need to see aquifers mapped. Tunnel vision. Stay out of our headwaters. Instead of deciding how to produce methane gas, you should be asking if you should do it all. We need a study on underground aquifers – it is not understood now. We need a plan for the whole area and we have to look at cumulative effects. We need a moratorium until these issues have been addressed. Please put water before cash.
- ◆ No questions were answered. Extremely poor communication. Why was there no public notice of these meetings, e.g., newspaper ads, radio? Will any of the information you received at this meeting count for anything?
- ◆ Answer questions – don't slide over them. Seriously listen to experts in the audience. Did you hear what one of the attendees was explaining to you? Realize you can't study a problem after it is full blown, so that you can set standards to prevent it from occurring. Cumulative effects and footprints are the result of poor or no pre-planning.
- ◆ The 'flak catchers' were very effective. However, the overall atmosphere was negative – the audience wasn't buying the official version. General feeling is that this experience will have minimal effect on the final outcome, which has probably been already determined.

Grande Prairie

No evaluation forms were received.