

**EXAMINATION OF THE
ALBERTA ENERGY AND UTILITIES BOARD
SECURITY MEASURES RELATED TO THE
ALTA LINK 500 KV HEARING**

CONDUCTED BY JUSTICE D.W. PERRAS (RETIRED)

SEPTEMBER 7, 2007

**IN THE MATTER OF THE EXAMINATION OF THE ALBERTA ENERGY AND
UTILITIES BOARD OF SECURITY MEASURES RELATED TO THE ALTA LINK
500 KV HEARING CONDUCTED BY JUSTICE D.W. PERRAS (RETIRED)**

THE ASSIGNMENT

The general mandate called for an examination of the security arrangements for the Alta Link 500 KV hearings and whether the arrangements were appropriate and prudent having regard to apparent risks; and whether any one exceeded or abused the security arrangements directed by the Board; and whether there was any inappropriate information given directly or indirectly to the hearing panel from Board security staff or any security personnel engaged by the Board; and lastly, to offer any recommendations for consideration by the Board or government that would bear on the provisions of security matters, in a quasi-judicial context for the future.

As well the assignment directed that three specific areas be canvassed:

1. What steps and processes and alternatives did the Board undertake before determining the security arrangements to include the use of plain clothes or private security personnel;
2. What instructions or directions were given to private security personnel, and were those instructions or directions exceeded, or superseded and, if so on whose authority;
3. For what purpose was the information gathered by the Board's security staff or private personnel and what information was conveyed and to whom.

PROCESS

The examination proceeded on the footing that a cross section of various people involved and interested in the proceedings would be requested to provide a recorded statement. Some invitees declined on the footing as the matter was before the Court. The engagement began on July 10, 2007, and was to be completed by September 5, 2007.

Some 60 people were interviewed and gave statements. As well various reports, notes and e-mails were gathered relating to the security provisions arranged by the Energy and Utilities Board (E.U.B.) for panel hearings particularly for the Rimby hearings.

It was not possible logistically within the time constraints to interview every one.

BACKGROUND OR CONTEXT

As I understand it the Independent System Operator (I.S.O.) has responsibility for overseeing the provinces electrical system and applied to E.U.B. through its operating arm the Alberta Electrical Systems Operator (A.E.S.O.) to decide if a 500 kilovolt line was needed. The E.U.B. then set up a hearing and generally notified consumers by advertising in local papers and invited a known list of consumers. The panel of E.U.B. decided a 500 kilovolt line was needed. Subsequent to the decision A.E.S.O. (the operating arm of I.S.O.) selected Alta Link to construct the line; and Alta Link then applied for a permit to the E.U.B. to do so. In the fall of 2006, hearings proceeded and continued sporadically until ending on June 28, 2007.

Almost from the beginning land owners and their legal counsel were concerned about the proposed transmission line. Various arguments were advanced from time to time before the hearing panel. Concerns were raised about adequate and proper notice, in particular about the “need” for the transmission line. In the past the need for the line

had been coupled with the “review and variance” hearing, hence the concern by the land owners for not having had an opportunity to have a say in the original “need” application. Rulings on various motions were made from time to time and the hearing proceeded in Red Deer in March 2007.

An application to have the “need” revisited was allowed by the panel. Subsequently the panel, as I understand it, relied on the “Needs Identification Document” and affirmed the need for the transmission line.

This ruling taken on March of 2007 has attracted an application to the Court of Appeal where leave was granted as of June 2007. A previous decision of the panel on December 6, 2006 was appealed and leave granted by the Court of Appeal as well. Both appeals raise issues of statutory interpretation of the various relevant provisions of the legislation relating to the provision of an electrical system for the province. Other issues such as notification and bias on the part of the Board are at issue as well.

The various pieces of legislation and how they are intertwined and the panel’s ruling from time to time on the Alta Link application have contributed to confusion, frustration, discontent and anger particularly among the land owners.

The Alta Link hearings, after the pre-hearing meetings, started March 12, 2007. After several adjournments the matter resumed but patience on the part of the land owners and people interested in the transmission line flagged and frustration with the panel and hearings accumulated.

RED DEER – APRIL 16, 2007

On April 16, 2007, in an upstairs meeting room at the Westerner Park in Red Deer the attempt to conduct the hearings was nigh on to impossible. The narrow venue was

crowded with people very close to the panel members and supporting staff. Speakers commanded the floor interrupting to raise objections to the procedure adopted on April 4, 2007, requiring motions be in written form. Efforts to control the process were hollered down with jeers and cheers depending on who was speaking. Complaints from the floor raised issues of fairness, notification, timing and an opportunity for land owners to make their point. At some point a group of older women congregated before the panel and sang several songs. Some of the language used by the group reflected negatively on participant members.

At some point a scuffle, captured by a TV camera, occurred with a gentleman shoving a staff member of the E.U.B. Constant interruption punctuated the efforts of the panel to conduct the hearing. After adjourning until the next day matters continued in the same vein. Legal counsel speaking to the panel characterized the proceeding as “dysfunctional” and “exceptional not for the right reasons”. Others characterized the hearings as having descended into “chaos” with a lack of respect for the process.

Swearing and pejorative epithets were cast at the panel members and ultimately the panel adjourned on April 18, 2007.

REASONS FOR ADJOURNMENT

There were a constellation of reasons that converged to bring about the adjournment and without going into detail, these reasons were as follows:

1. The complicated legislation (at least four pieces) and regulations governing the electrical hearings are confusing and difficult to rationalize.

2. Little information by I.S.O. prior to recent times has been placed before the public about the long term plans or needs for transmission lines, therefore the public has little understanding of the problems and proposed solutions.
3. The initial application to determine needs was not spelled out and lead to confusion, subsequently.
4. Insufficient and inadequate notice of the “needs” application and the Alta Link’s application lead to frustration and anger by land owners whose lands would be affected by the transmission lines.
5. Having regard to fact that the proposed 500 KV line stretched from Edmonton to Calgary some 300 kilometers, involving many land owners little planning appears to have been carried out in terms of how to handle an obviously large and very interested affected population.
6. The bifurcated applications i.e. “needs” and subsequently the “review and variance” application lead to numerous procedural issues relating to how and when presentation before the panel should be made and what would be examined.
7. The panel in its efforts to accommodate land owners varied its procedural rulings adding to the frustration of the interested and involved parties.
8. Over and above extemporaneous outbursts there were organized efforts to disrupt the hearing, for example the “singing grannies” while on its face, entertaining and harmless were nevertheless very disrespectful and disruptive to a quasi-judicial hearing. As well there were a number of strident speakers commanding the floor while clearly not following the directives about how and when presentations were to be made. In fact some speakers were not even registered as

involved parties. While a scuffle broke out and an assault occurred on a Board staff member, the quick intervention by a Sheriff prevented further prolonged confrontation. In my view the confrontation and assault was not an organized item. However, other people including staff were jostled and bumped including some counsel in the confined hearing room.

9. The panel members and staff had never dealt with such a fractious and persistently raucous crowd and did not have an adequate venue nor sufficient identifiable security present to control the proceedings. The panel and staff, particularly women, were feeling quite uncomfortable, fearful and intimidated by the unprecedented proceedings.

CONSIDERATION TO CONTINUE

After the adjournment the panel considered their position on how to carry on business as a quasi-judicial panel in face of an unprecedented angry disruptive audience. The panel considered it a necessity to have a secure venue, and security for the panel, staff and general public that would permit the panel to run the hearing as close to normal as possible. To this end the panel sought advice from the security staff and legal counsel.

SECURITY

At this point the security unit had no formal policy in writing partially because security had never been an issue at previous panel hearings no matter the application. However, the security unit did have five recognized threat assessment categories that were referred to in practice. The threat assessment categories range through no threat,

low threat, medium threat, high threat, and imminent threat. For security purposes details for assessing the level of threat are not set out. After the panel's adjournment in April of 2007 the security unit rated risk assessment as a level four risk for the continuing of the hearing. The reasons for the category four risk level emanated from the April 16-17, 2007 hearing in Red Deer. While the scuffles and violence were a factor, the unprecedented disruptive tactics and constant booing, jeering, heckling and shouted obscenities weighed in. In addition, some staff voiced fear and reluctance to continue under the circumstances.

CONSIDERATIONS OF SECURITY

The security unit having assessed a high level of risk for any continuation of the 500 KV hearing then turned to find a suitable venue and to beef up security personnel. In terms of venue various locations were canvassed but suitable venues were not available; hence the Court House at Rimby was selected. Unfortunately, it was too small to accommodate the many land owners, legal counsel, interested parties and general public; therefore, arrangements were made to provide a live feed of the in court room proceedings to a near by community recreation center so interested parties could follow the proceedings. Various E.U.B. staff and communications for the live feed were located in the Community Center.

In so far as security was concerned the security unit took into consideration the safety of the panel members, the E.U.B staff, various legal counsel, land owners and interested public. To this end security contacted the Solicitor General Security Services, who had previously agreed to provide security under an (MOA) for service personnel requested by E.U.B., subject to operational requirements. In this

case the Solicitor General Security Services was able to provide three sheriffs on a rotation basis from the nearest venue for a period of time.

An approach to the Rimby R.C.M.P. (a four member detachment) secured agreement to provide some security by having a presence at the location from time to time and to provide police service if any illegality was reported. The E.U.B. internal security service as of April 16, 2007, had only two people, one who had started work on April 16, 2007; hence the search for a private contractor security service. In this respect the head of E.U.B. security canvassed seven or so agencies, including commissionaires, seeking trained security personnel for the purposes of meeting the Occupational Health and Safety Act but most agencies either had no one available or no trained personnel available; hence E.U.B. security turned to an agency called Schepp Johnman for security.

Security for the Rimby hearing continuation was arranged by the head of E.U.B. security. The contact was verbal and the contract was for three personnel to attend the Community Center at Rimby and to observe with a view to secure the Board, staff and hearing and to report anyone causing damage to property or reverting to violence. According to the management of Schepp Johnman there was no contract to collect information from private conversations and definitely no eavesdropping or use of electronic measures.

Three people were deployed by Schepp Johnman. One attended on May 14 and 15, May 18 to 31 and June 7 and 8. Another attended on May 16 and 17 only, while the third attended on May 22 to 25, May 28 to 30 and June 4 to 6. The directions or instructions were to be an observer and only report as to the number of people who, from

time to time, attended the hearing at the Community Recreation Center and to keep alert for any signs of violence or organized disruptive actions.

None of the three deployed on the Rimby contract tried to read any of the computers deployed around the Community Center by the parties. The head of security from the E.U.B. outlined the security arrangements made for Rimby in a memo circulated on May 9, 2007. In that memo he used the term "covert security presence" to describe his arrangements for additional security personnel. In my view it would have been more palatable to identify security personnel openly and to so identify them as security. Under the circumstances with adequate back up to control anyone who was obstreperous or violent that would have been adequate to secure the hearing room and the recreational center where a number of staff were housed and where the general public including legal counsel attended to follow the proceedings.

In the future, E.U.B. might want to approach the Solicitor General Security Services to supplement the current M.O.A. to provide for security personnel when the risks assessment warrants such additional trained security. Had the Schepp Johnman personnel been introduced at the commencement of the hearing as additional security for the hearing and for the recreation venue in all likelihood it would have obviated the current problems. I grant that there appeared to be a concerted effort to derail the hearing by organized disruptive and disrespectful tactics but identifiable security service in sufficient numbers would in my view have been sufficient to protect and control the activity and protect staff, counsel appearing, interested and registered parties as well as the general public.

ALLEGATIONS OF VIOLATION OF SOLICITOR CLIENT PRIVILEGE

The allegations of spying and listening to solicitor-client conversations are troubling and problematic and if established are serious matters. This examination is not broad enough nor does it have the time to delve into the allegations of solicitor-client transgressions in depth. It is true one of the contracted private security personnel who ingratiated himself with some land owners was invited to connect to a conference call by land owners who provided him with the phone numbers and code number. I believe he only connected to one call. It is also true that E.U.B.'s head of security said go ahead for the purpose of trying to ascertain if any further violence or disruptive protests were being planned.

It is also true that the E.U.B. security head received verbal reports from time to time from the contract security personnel. The sworn statement from the head of E.U.B security is that any information he gleaned was used only for assessing possible disruptive actions or possible violence. His sworn statement is that none of the information he received from private investigators was passed on to anyone other than his immediate supervisor.

Board members who comprised the Alta Link hearing panel all swear no information was supplied to them relating to the hearing issues, other than security arrangements.

The managers of Schepp Johnman also swear they received no information as a result of the contract.

It is very unfortunate that the head of E.U.B security approved one of the contract employees connecting to a conference call organized by land owners and their

advisors. It would have been much better to continue with the original plan to observe the community center and attend to security for the technical equipment, security for the staff and for the general public attending.

Since issues of solicitor-client transgressions have been raised as an issue in an application before the Court of Queen's Bench, I leave that issue to be canvassed in the Court where I am sure it will be thoroughly aired.

OTHER USES OF SCHEPP JOHNMAN

E.U.B. subsequently used Schepp Johnman for another separate panel hearing at Redwater in May of 2007. The risk assessment was "low" but because some of the Redwater "councilors" were uneasy about the hearing in the Redwater multiplex the panel requested security and such was provided as general security for panel members to and from the hearing and for break out periods and for security for E.U.B. staff. The security personnel who attended the hearing room were not uniformed and were directed to only intervene if there was disruptive behavior, physical violence or threat of violence in the hearing room. The mandate in Redwater was more narrow and less intense.

The subsequent use of private security in Redwater is mentioned simply because the same agency was used as in Rimby.

ALLEGATIONS OF SPYING

Allegations of spying by the E.U.B. have been raised and received prominent media coverage. The use of the word "Spy" as it appears in the allegations is used opprobriously. In this matter there was no intent to capture information from a hostile

party for the purpose of advancing the interest of an opposing hostile party. The E.U.B. was not an opposing party in these proceedings. The E.U.B. was a neutral party operating a quasi-judicial panel whose role was to determine the issues raised by the application before the panel. There was no need for the Board to collect information on its own initiative as each member of the Alta Link hearing panel emphasized, on examination, that all the relevant information on the various issues is fully expected to be placed before the Board by the parties, and therefore there is no need for the Board to attempt to ferret out information.

It was a mistake on the part of security to give a green light to the one contract security to connect to a conference call even when invited to do so by several of the organizers. The conference calls, as I understand it, were to occur on Mondays but some were cancelled from time to time and only one conference call was connected into by the private investigator and very little of interest was noted by him. In any event nothing was passed to the panel hearing the 500 KV application.

OTHER USES OF SECURITY

A.E.S.O. also employed two security guards who accompanied executives when they were giving evidence at the hearing in Rimby. Both gave statements under oath to the effect that they drove the witnesses to the hearing and one accompanied the witnesses in the court room at Rimby while the other waited in an ante room. Neither ever attended the community center and when the witnesses completed their testimony they left the hearing.

Alta Link also used private security but not investigators only for the purpose of escorting Alta Link's people to and from the hearings in safety. Tans Alta who are

not part of the application to the Board but have an interest advise they have not had any security personnel in attendance at the 500 KV hearings.

Epcor's Genesse plant is the proposed connecting links to the proposed Alta Link line if built and therefore have an interest. However, Epcor is not taking on an active role in the hearing but is monitoring activity through perusing transcripts. Epcor, through counsel, advises that they have had no security presence at the 500 KV hearings.

QUESTIONS RAISED IN ASSIGNMENT

1. What steps and processes and alternatives did the Board undertake before determining the security arrangements to include the use of plain clothes or private security personnel?

The Board through the security unit under took a risk assessment relating to continuing the 500 KV hearing and rated the risk at level 4, a high risk level for further disruption and violent activity. The security unit then assessed possible venues for continuation with a view to security for panel members, staff, legal counsel, witnesses and the general public. The best venue available was the Court House at Rimby as Red Deer court rooms were not available, nor were other facilities in Red Deer that were suitable for a continuation.

The security unit canvassed the Solicitor General Security Service for assistance and were able to secure three sheriffs to assist. As well the R.C.M.P. were canvassed and agreed to assist by providing a presence from time to time and to attend upon a report of any illegal activity.

The security unit next canvassed a number of private agencies to secure further security personnel. In the end result the Schepp Johnman agency contracted to supply

three plain clothes security personnel to rotate and to assist in securing the community recreation center, where the E.U.B. staff were housed along with equipment and the general public.

2. What instructions or directions were given to private security personnel and were those instructions or directions exceeded or superseded and if so on whose authority?

The directions and instruction given to the private security personnel are best conveyed by quoting from the transcript of the examination of the resident manager of the Schepp Johnman Calgary office who arranged the contract with E.U.B. to deploy three people for security work.

Q.P.4 (Line 18)

“What directions or instructions did Ray give to you with respect to how to deploy the people that you were going to assign to this particular security detail?”

ANSWER

“They – Ray was very concerned of the threats, the risks, damage at the community hall in Rimby. He wanted a ----- one of my personnel to sit in that community center and strictly observe the goings on. If there were any threats or if anyone caused damage to the community center he gave me the phone number of the community center managers. He said if there was any sort of damage, to contact them. If it was a heightened level, to directly contact the R.C.M.P. in the area and then that - - my person would –my investigator would report to Ray on a daily basis as the ----- you know if there was any of those”

QUESTION

What instructions did you give to each of these people with respect to this particular

ANSWER

“for the most part, just follow the directions from Ray”

By and large the only amplification of the initial instructions occurs where one investigator reported about an invitation by land owners to sit in on conference calls to the head of security. The head of security for E.U.B. gave the green light to participate in the conference call held on May 28, 2007, but not to tape or record the call. No other private contractor or investigator sat in on any conference calls.

Under examination when asked what he reported about the conference call he, the private investigator said about the meeting: “I just basically told him that, you know, it wasn’t anything of real consequence. My impression was that they were disappointed that a lot of the regular participants were not there because in fact there had been a hearing”.

The issue here is the fact of connecting to and listening to the participants of the conference call on May 28, 2007. Such activity on the part of E.U.B. security should not have been authorized, even though the concern was to gather information about possible violent or disruptive actions. A well trained visible security force would have served the purpose and obviated the need for connecting to conference calls.

3. For what purpose was the information gathered by the Board’s security staff or private personnel and what information was conveyed and to whom?

The purpose for gathering the information was to allow the Board’s security unit to anticipate and counter any plans for violence, property destruction or actions that

would frustrate and disrupt the hearings relating to 500 KV hearings, or threaten the safety of the panel or E.U.B staff or general public. The information gathered by investigators was conveyed to the head of the E.U.B. security unit.

Information such as the planned global warming action camp for protest in early June as advertised in pamphlets and pamphlets relating to action for a public inquiry letters were gathered, as well as paper cartoons left on panel Board car windshields and were provided to the head of security who declined to send anyone to the camp. In addition, verbal reports were forwarded to the head of security for E.U.B., who in turn relayed information about action camps to the R.C.M.P., otherwise the head of security only advised the Board if a proposed activity would or could be of a disruptive nature to the hearing or a safety issue. No other agency was given information that was gathered unless it was relating to a possible disruption of the hearing. In general terms the reports from the various private security personnel passed on to E.U.B security focused on any information that would indicate disturbances, violence etc., that might be planned.

In short, very little of commotion or disruptive activity was witnessed or observed from May 14, 2007 until the hearing finished on June 28, 2007 other than some sporadic gatherings and signs outside the Rimby Court House and Community Center.

SUMMARY

In summary, the security arrangements for the most part were appropriate and prudent given the risk, except for the approval of connecting to a conference call organized by land owners and organizers, and while little was gleaned from this process the idea of an approved E.U.B. security personnel listening in to land owners phone conferences is repulsive and more so because it is not needed to carry out the security

mandate of the security unit of the E.U.B.

In terms of the security mandate being abused or exceeded it is my view that the security arrangements, given all the circumstances and available options, were prudent and not abused save and except the May 28, 2007 okay to connect to the conference call.

Lastly, I can find no indication that any inappropriate communication directly or indirectly was communicated directly or indirectly to the Board panel hearing the 500 KV hearings by E.U.B. security staff or private security personnel.

RECOMMENDATIONS

During the course of the examination a wide range of interested parties were canvassed and as a result a number of suggestions come to mind – not all related to security issues:

1. It is my suggestion that government give consideration to consolidating the various pieces of legislation that govern the provision of an electrical system for Alberta.
2. That I.S.O. undertake and devise a public education programme to enlighten the general public having regard to the various issues relating to the provision of a safe and reliable electrical system.
3. That I.S.O., in conjunction with the appropriate parties, in terms of future transmission lines of substance give consideration to carefully planning the process and steps involved to adequately notify, in a timely manner, land owners and interested parties.
4. That any agent selected to construct substantive transmission lines be sensitive to land owners concerns and bend every effort, that is reasonable, to convenience land owners concerns.
5. That E.U.B. develop a written policy relating to the provision of security services.
6. That E.U.B. canvass the Solicitor General Security Services to expand the current M.O.A. to provide adequately trained personnel to draw upon for security services needed for Board hearings for the future particularly when large numbers of the public are involved.

7. That the E.U.B. give consideration to developing an educational programme for the Board having regard to their quasi-judicial function paying some attention to the powers available to call upon when audiences are fractious or individuals are disruptive. Educational programmes can be used to refresh from time to time the Board and staff.

8. That E.U.B. make every effort to retain, for large hearings, venues that are adequate to serve the hearing aspect as well as the security aspect.

9. That E.U.B. make every effort to have security personnel easily identified as such at all hearings.

10. That E.U.B. refrain from using a covert security service.

11. That E.U.B., under its supervision, consider the feasibility of mediation, or arbitration service aimed at settling individual land owners and transmission builder disputes relating to location or compensation relating to land that is affected.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED BY JUSTICE D.W. PERRAS (RETIRED)

SEPTEMBER 7, 2007

APPENDIX

- 1. Terms of reference**
- 2. Pamphlets collected by security**

**Examination of the Establishment and Implementation by the Alberta
Energy and Utilities Board of Security Measures Related to the
AltaLink 500 kV Hearing**

Terms of Reference

A. General Mandate of the Examination:

1. Whether the security arrangements established by the Board prior to June 9, 2007 (“security arrangements”) related to the AltaLink 500kV Hearing were appropriate and prudent given the security risks apparent at the time.
2. Whether any party or parties exceeded or abused the security mandate and the security arrangements put in place by the Board.
3. Whether there was any inappropriate communication directly or indirectly to the Board panel from the Board’s security staff or private security personnel.
4. Any recommendations to the Board or the government with respect to how security matters should be handled in future in a quasi-judicial setting.

B. Some Specific Issues or Questions to be Addressed by the Examination include:

Without restricting the generality of the mandate of the Examination, issues or questions to be addressed by the Examiner are to include:

1. What steps or processes did the Board undertake before determining the security arrangements, including hiring private or plainclothes security personnel, was the best option? What alternatives were considered?

2. What was the mandate of the private security personnel? If the original mandate was exceeded, on whose authority was that done and was the private security personnel paid for that work?
3. What information was collected by the Board's security staff or by private security personnel and what was the purpose of collecting that information?

C. Process for the Examination:

1. The Examiner shall determine the process that will best facilitate the obtaining of information for the purposes of carrying out the mandate of the Examination.
2. The Examiner may request that statements made to the Examiner be made under oath.
3. Individuals who may wish to make statements or submissions to the Examiner that contain personal information about that individual should be advised in advance that such information may be disclosed during the Examination process for the purposes of supporting the transparency of that process or disclosed for the purposes of the Examiner's report.

D. Report:

The Examiner shall prepare a report for the Minister of Energy. The Examiner's report will be made available to the public by the Minister.



A Call to Action To Protect Alberta!
**Global Warming Action
Camp**

June 3rd - June 8th 2007

**Alberta Needs Change, Not Climate Change
Invest in Clean Energy NOW!**

Alberta faces historic and unprecedented destruction from corporate fossil fuel exploitation of the province to feed America's insatiable energy appetite. A group of experienced and committed organizers are planning a campaign and actions training to support ongoing campaigns against the destruction of Alberta by the fossil fuel industry, reverse global warming and call for new directions toward renewable energy and energy efficiency.

Five day Actions Training - Beginning Sunday June 3rd with 8pm welcome, and ending with Friday evening June 8th 2007.

Sessions will include, non violence training, media and communications skills, legal/regulatory strategies, direct action skills, campaign strategies and tactics, grass roots organizing, planning and logistics. Generations of organizers will be attending this camp and sharing campaign/action experiences, victories, stories and share our collective visions for an energy future we can live with!

The basic camp schedule is:

- Sunday June 3rd will be an arrival day and a welcoming to this camp.
- Monday June 4th will largely deal with non-violence training. This will cover history, practical legal issues, and practical how-to skills in de-escalation and negotiation techniques.
- Tuesday June 5th will cover Campaign Planning, Media 1 and Climbing 1
- Wednesday June 6th will cover Media 2, Climbing 2, Action/Event Scouting, making Slogans and Banners, and an evening presentation of creating messages in the media through pictures.
- Thursday June 7th will cover Grassroots Organizing, Climbing 3, and Blockades.
- Friday June 8th will be Campaign/Action Planning 2, Campaign/Action Role play, Community Dinner and Party.

Where will camp be? Edmonton, Alberta Area

The camp will be an outdoor camping setting on secluded acres located on a ridge along the beautiful and mighty North Saskatchewan River. The training will be free of charge to those attending. Camp will also provide a field kitchen & staff who have extensive experience with keeping campers on needed diet and well nourished to meet full days of work at the training.

Organizers/Trainers of Camp

- ~ Mike Roselle (founder of Earth First!, and The Ruckus Society)
- ~ JR Roof (co-founder The Ruckus Society and former Director of Greenpeace International Ships and Direct Action Division)
- ~ Ingrid Gordon (Lead climb Trainer, Founder and Director of Gear For Good, Member of Greenpeace USA Direct Action Team 1988- 2004)
- ~ Dr. Jim Butler (University of Alberta) History and Context of Non-violent Movements
- ~ Randy Hayes - Founder of Rainforest Action Network (RAN)
- ~ Celia Alario - Seasoned media trainer. Seattle WTO in 1999
- ~ Meredith James - Canadian Youth Climate Coalition
- ~ Mike Hudema - Global Exchange
- ~ Lindsay Tefler - Grassroots Organizing
- ~ Lloyd Greenspoon - Ontario based Environmental lawyer and activist
- ~ Mike Harold - Former International and British Greenpeace Actions Director

Anyone interested in attending or more information should contact:
jmsroof@yahoo.com



SAVE ALBERTA - STOP GLOBAL WARMING!

ACTION PLAN FOR PUBLIC INQUIRY LETTER

PREPARE LETTER FOR SIGNATURE, INSERT CORRECT NAME AND ORGANIZATION AFFILIATION, IF THERE IS ONE.

PRINT OUT AND MAIL INTO THE PREMIER AND THE CHAIR OF THE EUB. SEND COPIES TO WHOMEVER YOU HAVE ON THE CC LIST. YOU WILL NEED AT LEAST 7 COPIES. IF YOU EMAIL OUT THE LETTER, THEN NO COPIES ARE REQUIRED. IN THIS CASE, PRINT IS FAR BETTER.

EMAIL COPY OF LETTER TO: info@powerexport.ca

SEND COPY TO LOCAL MEDIA AND MORE IF YOU CAN. COORDINATE WITH PROVINCIAL MEDIA RELEASE WHICH WILL GO OUT BY MAY 12, 2007.

CALL THE PREMIERS OFFICE AND REQUEST A RESPONSE.

FINALLY, HAVE YOUR NEIGHBORS AND FRIENDS, OTHER ORGANIZATIONS SEND IN A LETTER.

