



Fundy Ocean Research Center for Energy

Community Liaison Committee (CLC) Meeting

FORCE Visitor Centre
1156 West Bay Road, Black Rock
Monday, September 25th, 2017

Minutes

1. Welcome & Introductions

The meeting was called to order by Co-Chair Tom MacLaren at 11:37 a.m. The Agenda and copies of the Minutes of the last meeting were circulated; both documents having been circulated previously in electronic format. Present at the meeting were: Gerard Cormier (GC), Tom MacLaren (TM), John Brownlie (JB), Lois Smith (LS), Cindy Tupper (CT), Norman Rafuse (NR), Melissa Nevin (MN), Robert Yorke (RY), Don Fletcher (DF), Carys Burgess (CB), and Mary McPhee (MM). Also attending were guests Stacey Pineau (SP) and Christian Richard (CR) from Emera, and Melissa Oldrieve (MO), Kira Krumhansl (KK) and Sandra Currie (SC) from FORCE. Those gathered gave introductions around the table. A note that Stacey Pineau and Sandra Currie were a few minutes late joining the meeting at 11:42 a.m.

2. Minutes of Last Meeting

TM asked the membership if they had all reviewed the minutes of the last meeting. Hearing from the membership that they had reviewed the minutes, the Co-chair asked for any errors or omissions. No errors or omissions were reported. TM asked for a motion to approve the minutes; LS motioned approval, seconded by NR. The minutes were approved as circulated.

3. Old Business

a. FAQ review

MM told the membership that FORCE had combined FAQ suggestions from students, CLC members, the general public, and staff experiences and would share the FAQ digitally with the membership for feedback. Members discussed the prevalence of questions regarding turbine technology, and it was reiterated by CB that any questions regarding turbine technology could be forwarded to developers. GC indicated that after reviewing the FAQ questions provided, and being provided with the digital copy, it would be helpful to establish a timeline for feedback; MM advised a timeline would be set upon sharing of the digital version. CT reflected that it was a priority of the FAQ to help define the role of FORCE and what FORCE does in regards to hosting, and facilitating. MM will circulate the FAQ via email in the body text, as well as a document attachment and indicated a timeline for feedback.

b. CLC presentation to FORCE Board and follow up

GC and TM informed the membership of the details of the June 8 trip by Gerard, Tom and Mary to join the FORCE Board of Directors meeting, and make a short presentation regarding the CLC and FORCE site. MM described the outline of the presentation, indicating a casual presentation, which saw Mary provide information on the background, formation and role of CLC, as well as the membership and



Terms of Reference, followed by Gerard who addressed the history of the CLC as well as relationships within the community and amid FORCE and turbine technology developers, with Tom providing details regarding the evolution of the CLC, the gaps in communication, the FORCE brand perception, and the opportunities for strengthening ties to the community. GC indicated to the membership that the Board members had been very receptive to the visit. TM told the membership that the Board's response to the presentation was very positive, indicating support for developing a potential retail gift shop, as well as the action and follow up which had seen the Board host its regular meeting at the FORCE site on September 14, followed by a social hosted on site for the Board and CLC members, as well as FORCE staff to meet, have a BBQ and have discussions. GC indicated that many of the CLC members had attended the September 14 event.

c. Membership Update

MM informed the membership that following discussion, TM had invited Arnold Wood to join the CLC and Arnold had indicated his acceptance to the invitation. Several members asked if Arnold was expected to join the meeting, TM and MM indicated that they had not had a response from Arnold regarding the meeting. MM informed the membership that upon checking the CLC Terms of Reference, no further membership invitations had been followed through (e.g. Dave Rafuse), as the CLC was at the current capacity recommended by the TOR. MM indicated that because the issue was an important one, the Agenda had been designed with further discussion regarding membership under "New Business." Members discussed the importance of representation, and capacity of the CLC. TM indicated that the discussion would revisit membership under New Business.

d. Visitor Centre Update

MM indicated that Sandra Currie would provide a brief update regarding summer season, visitor numbers, students and activities. SC described a demanding season with respect to operational supports, such that tracking of visitors had been affected, due to demands on staff. SC told the members that 3500 visitors had been tracked to date on paper, but staff expected up to 1,200 visitors had been missed and that tracking had been reduced to non-existent during periods of operations, particularly in May and June, related to turbine recovery operations. SC informed the members that in addition to returning student Kristen Yorke, there was an 8-week student position fulfilled by Connor Fullerton who hailed from Belmont, NS. SC indicated that other interns working on the project were also often present on site, and provided a positive presence. SC and MM indicated that Kristen Yorke had been a valuable asset to the team with previous experience in operations support and public programs. SC indicated that her position had included working on outreach and engagement, as well as the visitor services. SC told the members that a lot of visitors wanted more information and additional resources beyond what the Visitor Centre offered and added that the staff made great efforts to provide resources, including online information, and endeavoured to adapt presentations to the needs of groups, students and the general public. SC indicated that a number of scholarly and student tours were part of the 2017 season. Members discussed the ability of the Visitor Centre to function fully as a public site and operations base, and the compromise that was presented by delivering to both demands, as well as the priority to deliver visitor services and provide information to the public, engage with the community. Members discussed the enlistment of radio operators in supporting marine operations, as well as the potential for volunteers to be involved in delivering public programs. Members discussed safety, recompense, confidentiality, scheduling challenges, the experiences of volunteers with other organizations.

e. CLC Communications Materials

Members discussed need for supporting materials in providing accurate information. Members felt that the discussion of the FAQ and the community mail out and action items would be sufficient progress on communications materials supporting CLC activities.

f. Community Mail-out

MM indicated that FORCE had not followed up on the community mail out, noting that members would have seen the Cape Sharp Tidal Venture Newsletter. Members indicated that following development of the FAQ and sufficient feedback, FORCE and CLC could develop mail out outline and priorities. Members discussed the gaps existing with Visitor Centre reach, and the website. MN indicated that the website was difficult to navigate and confusing for those looking for direct answers. Members discussed the difficulty of finding information on the FORCE website. MN suggested an additional community site within the FORCE webpage, which could host the FAQ and other resources. Members discussed and shared support for improving the webpage. MO indicated FORCE recognized the website was in need of improvement, and told the members that FORCE have been focusing efforts on social media. MM and MO indicated that FORCE would discuss the development process for a community page within the FORCE webpage.

g. Supply Chain Database

MM indicated that FORCE had received many questions about the concept of supply chain database, and the sessions which Marine Renewables Canada had facilitated. Members indicated that the supply chain process for tidal needed definition of roles, and there was emphasis that a local focus supply chain activity was desirable, as the overall process was more broadly focused. Members suggested the supply chain process required a needs assessment/summary from turbine technology developers. NR indicated that the supply chain work could be supported via the Cumberland Energy Authority, and other Cumberland County entities, but this would require some dedicated sessions with such entities. MM indicated that FORCE staff including SC could engage local groups in workshops. MO indicated that she would follow up with Marine Renewables Canada to ensure no overlap and to assess any interest in partnering.

h. Marine Advisory Distribution List

MM described the process of updates which are provided as to marine operations and activities to groups such as fishers and indicated that FORCE was interested to gauge whether or not CLC members would like to be included in such updates. Members inquired as to the frequency of the updates. MO indicated that the updates are circulated via email, and usually are re-circulated or updated every month or so, or at least when any new vessels are involved in operations or any new operations are upcoming. Members indicated interest in being added to the list for the marine advisory distribution. MO indicated that CLC members would be added to the list, and that each time an advisory went out, there were instructions regarding how to “opt out” of the list for advisory distribution.

4. New Business

a. Cape Sharp Tidal Venture Update

MM indicated that Christian Richard and Stacey Pineau were present to share information regarding the Cape Sharp Tidal project. CR provided a detailed update to the members, beginning with the background of the component issues discovered in the OpenHydro turbines in France, and the process



of upgrading components for the turbines built in Pictou, NS. CR reviewed the information provided to the CLC at the May meeting regarding entanglement of the turbine which was installed at the FORCE site the previous fall, and shared that successful retrieval which occurred on June 15th, the first recovery attempt following freeing the entangled line from the turbine. CR indicated the work happening in Saint John on the turbines, including upgrades to the TCC, as well as the discovery of the sacrificial anodes being gone from the turbine when it was recovered from FORCE site in June. CR indicated that there were many questions about deployment timelines, and shared that the team was taking full advantage of the time in port, conducting thorough assessments and covering every angle, especially considering the high costs of deployment and recovery operations. CR further indicated that the project timeline for deployment of next turbine at FORCE site was currently sitting at late 2017 or early 2018. GC asked if the other Cape Sharp Tidal turbine would be deployed in 2018. CR replied that the turbine which was recovered in June from FORCE site would be re-installed in 2018, and clarified the next deployment would actually be the turbine which had not been at FORCE site yet. JB asked why both turbines were not ready for deployment at same time. CR replied that facility availability, vessel assets, availability of components, and time allocation for thorough analyses were all factors in the timeline, as well as weather and safety. CT asked if there were plans for producing more turbines in Nova Scotia. CR replied that OpenHydro was commissioning a facility in northern France for production and indicated that in the case of the Bay of Fundy, if there are further phases of development, there is potential for a Nova Scotia production facility. SP shared updated with the members, including that Jeremy Poste, who had been country manager for OpenHydro Canada had moved on to another opportunity and Alisdair McLean had joined the team in the late spring. SP informed the members that the recent Cape Sharp Tidal update newsletter had been mailed out around the local area, a total 16,000 copies. SP also indicated that CSTV's monitoring reports to regulators (Q3) were upcoming.

b. Membership and Terms of Reference

Members discussed the membership of the CLC, including technology developer representatives. MM indicated that CLC members and members of the general public had provided feedback on CLC membership, reach of the CLC, role of the CLC. MM informed the members that current Terms of Reference dictated that no new members could be added at this time. Members discussed the issues surrounding CLC membership, including inactivity of some members, fisher members, councillor members, technology developer membership. MN reminded that CLC itself including membership makeup was part of FORCE project EA approval. Members discussed whether or not technology developers were required as voting members, and the potential for CLC to invite all developers to provide a representative to report to CLC. GC motioned that the existing developer representative (Carys Burgess, EMERA) seat be removed as a voting member, rather all technology developers would be invited to have a representative for CLC. RY seconded. All were agreed. Members discussed the absence of fisher members from meetings, and the TOR meeting attendance guidelines. It was decided that the Co-chairs would review the issue of fishers member attendance and write a letter to the members asking for their response or attendance to next meeting.

c. EEMP Update

MO introduced Kira Krumhansl to the group as Environmental Programs Director, indicating that KK would be taking on director of the EEMP moving forward. MO informed the members that FORCE had submitted quarterly reports to regulators, in addition to CSTV's quarterly reporting, indicating that all



the study topics were covered in reporting. MO detailed the ongoing fish survey work, as well as CPOD mammal data collection, indicating that the newest lobster EEMP survey work would commence in the coming weeks. MO summarized the Q3 report details. MO indicated the progress of the FAST platform work, including the FAST 3 deployment schedule which was supporting further data collection on fish, as well as upgrades in progress to FAST 2 with testing and intended deployments scheduled for the coming months. MN asked if EMAC had been out to the FORCE site as a group. MM indicated that only individual members of EMAC had visited the site occasionally over the years. MO replied that EMAC had never held a meeting at the FORCE site or visited as a group and indicated this was a good idea for FORCE to consider. TM asked if the results of the surveys and study had produced any surprises. MO replied that there were no surprises with the data recorded, and further indicated the data quality was good and proving useful for analysis. TM asked if there were any losses of equipment. MO replied that some of the CPODs from spring deployment had surfaced early, and indicated that fishers recovered two of the units. JB asked what the sonar on the CSTV turbine show. MO deferred to CB to speak to the results of the turbine mounted sonar. CB replied that the Gemini sonar worked well within the settings, adding that the device could be used to look at a larger area up to 60m from the turbine. JB asked what the sonar showed. CB replied that the sonar show water column, sea floor section, and included a lot of false positive data hits, which was helping to inform the software, adding that the next deployment would be an opportunity to improve use of the sonar. MO continued with EEMP updates, indicating the successful continuation of seabird monitoring study, as well referring to the shoreline monitoring mobile surveys and observation. JB asked how that acoustic work was helping to collect data regarding harbour porpoise. MO replied that acoustic data was delivering good results, and indicated presence of harbour porpoise for a percentage of the time which was equivalent to approximately 10 minutes of a 24 hour day, adding that more data collected over time would help to further inform the presence of harbour porpoise. JB asked how long data has been collected over various EEMP studies at FORCE. MO replied that the latest program of continuous study work had commenced in 2016 and was ongoing, indicating that the first studies related to the FORCE site were completed in 2007-2008.

d. Shoreline Monitoring and Beach Clean Up schedule

MM described to the members the Shoreline Survey component of the marine mammals EEMP, as well as ongoing beach cleanup efforts. MM indicated that after several stages of shoreline monitoring, FORCE had reviewed safety and logistics and was excited to welcome additional public participation to the program. Members discussed the responsibilities of volunteers, including observations, garbage clean up events, and the typical observations of shoreline survey participants. MM indicated that she would update the CLC members to dates of shoreline surveys, as well as beach cleanup events. MM further detailed that FORCE hoped to have a shoreline cleanup event under the umbrella of the Great Canadian Shoreline Cleanup before the winter.

e. Meeting Schedule

Members discussed the importance of additional meetings, recognizing the length of typical CLC meeting Agendas, and prevalent long meetings. Members discussed quarterly meetings. TM indicated that he would host an additional meeting, suggesting December, and further suggesting the meeting discussion (Agenda) be limited to an hour, which would be followed by a Christmas social time. There was consensus around the table regarding the interest in such a meeting and TM indicated the Co-chairs would follow up with MM to organize.

5. Action Items

a. Homework assignment: Suggestions for FORCE

MM welcomed the members to submit suggestions for FORCE as to potential events, activities, and opportunities, and further encouraged members to provide feedback to FORCE at any time. There was consensus among the membership that the follow up actions from CLC meetings were sufficient feedback at this time and that in the case of additional feedback, all were comfortable to reach out to FORCE as needed.

b. FAQ follow up

MM to circulate the FAQ document/text for review by CLC members.

c. Harbour Commission – Parrsboro wharf

NR informed the members that the Parrsboro Harbour Commission were pursuing upgrades to the Parrsboro wharf facility, specifically pursuing funding for a new wharf, and was welcoming and encouraging letters of support toward the Provincial Government, as the Federal funding which was on the table was contingent on the Provincial support. NR indicated that any letters of support would be appreciated.

6. Adjournment

All agreed that the Co-Chairs and MM would follow up regarding next meeting before Christmas Holidays. Meeting adjourned at 13:46.