

# **Six Nations Community Engagement Report**

## **SunEdison**

Prepared by: Amy Lickers – Six Nations Community Planner

November 27, 2014

DRAFT

## **Executive Summary**

Six Nations Consultation and Accommodation Process (CAP) team began meeting with AxioPower/SunEdison in September 2010. During this time SunEdison believed that they had fulfilled their duty to consult and accommodate by notifying Six Nations of the projects. When the CAP team found out that Norfolk Bloomsburg was being sold, they notified the potential owner that SunEdison had not fulfilled their duty to consult with Six Nations, and SunEdison returned to discussions with the CAP team.

The two projects up for discussion were: Welland Ridge (City of Welland) and Norfolk Bloomsburg (Norfolk County) Solar Projects.

A Term Sheet for the project was presented to the Consultation Team, which includes an accommodation offer for two solar projects.

The Community Benefits include a one-time Royalty Payment of \$432,392.73 based on the net present value of \$2000/MW over 20 years using a 7.14% discount rate.

The participation level for the SunEdison Projects engagement process was very low. 13 participants attended the single meeting and no written comments were submitted.

The approach that we took for the SunEdison Welland Ridge and Bloomsburg Norfolk projects community engagement, was more properly defined as a community information process. Both projects had been completed and sold to another company prior to the community engagement process, so there was very little opportunity to negotiate on other community benefits and implement community requests.

One community meeting was held on October 23, 2014 at the Six Nations Community Hall, and advertisements were run in the Turtle Island News and Two Row Times papers for four weeks.

## **Community Engagement Team**

### *Six Nations CAP Team:*

Matt Jamieson – Director Economic Development

Lonny Bomberry – Director Lands and Resources

Phil Monture – Land Rights Consultant

Paul General – Eco- Centre Manager

Joanne Thomas – Consultation Supervisor

Caron Smith – Land Use Officer

Dawn LaForme – Secretary/Receptionist

Nicole Kohoko – External Projects Coordinator

Amy Lickers – Community Planner-Engagement Lead

## **Impact on Rights**

Both projects are located within the 1701 Fort Albany (NANFAN) Treaty Lands. The 1701 Fort Albany (NANFAN) Treaty are constitutionally protected (*Section 35(1) of Canada's Constitution Act, 1982*) treaty rights between the Imperial Crown and The Five Nations, which would become Six Nations, upon acceptance of the Tuscarora nation into the confederacy. The Treaty was to ensure the right for Six Nations to freely pursue their economic livelihood utilizing the natural resources within lands that extend throughout central and southwestern Ontario.

Six Nations maintains that rights extend beyond hunting, fishing and gathering for subsistence, as these activities were traditionally a means of economic livelihood as well as community subsistence.

These projects utilize land and natural resources that Six Nations has a treaty entitlement to therefore the economic impact should be shared with the rights holders of the Six Nations of the Grand River Territory.

## **Methodology**

### Comment Cards

The comment cards provided a brief summary of each of the projects, the potential community benefits for Six Nations community, a listing of the community engagement sessions, and contact information. The comment cards were created to assist the project team, Six Nations Elected Council and community advocates in creating awareness of engagement process and providing opportunity to capture comments.

There were no comment cards provided back.

### Website – [www.snfuture.com](http://www.snfuture.com)

The website was designed to provide all members of Six Nations the opportunity to become educated about the project and involved in the decision making process. The website contained the project information, meeting dates, a link to the projects webpage with the project studies, contact information for the engagement lead and a comment section.

There were no comments provided back

### Meetings

The community meeting was in the traditional “Town Hall” style, with an opening presentation and questions/comments to follow.

#### ***Thursday October 23, 2014 6pm***

Six Nations Community Hall – Dinner was provided

Attendance: 13

General Attitude: Generally the attitude toward the project was receptive. Community members were interested in knowing about the project and being updated on past projects.

## **Conclusion and Next Steps**

The community engagement session and meetings were poorly attended. Although this is the eight major community engagement process held, people are still becoming acquainted with the process and what the individual impact is on them.

Over the past few projects, we have noticed that participation continues to dwindle. There are assumptions that could be made as to why participation is low. People are generally in agreement which is why they do not participate;

- This theory can be supported by the fact that the one engagement process that had an increased turnout was related to a project that did not have community support.
- Community members still don't know about the project or the process.
- People are busy living their lives and trust the Six Nations Elected Council to make the right decision.

Regardless of the assumption, is it clear that actions need to be taken to determine at what level and how often community members would like to be involved in the decision making process.

While the participation was low, we do know from previous projects, that solar energy projects are generally supported by the community.

Feedback given through this process will assist in negotiating the best possible agreement for Six Nations in the future.

**Appendix A – Newspaper Ad**

**Appendix B – Powerpoint presentation**