

Go Forward Action Required

Prepare and deliver communication materials	Jason Veness, Stakeholder and Tribal Relations
Develop a Security Plan	Michael Nagina, Security
Provide a Map of the Work Force Camps in South Dakota	James Odom, Project Manager
Integrate planning with PGI	Lou Thompson, Manager Tribal Relations

Meeting De-Brief

Debrief participants included - Shawn Howard, James Odom, Steve Marr, Gary Duggan, Don Greenwood, Bud Andersen, Rick Perkins, Beth Jensen, Drew Duncan, Jason Veness, Lou Thompson

1. The meeting was held in Faith, SD – owing to some pressure for hosting in it in the school at Takini.
 - a. Instead of exacerbate the issue we decided to move the meeting to Faith, SD
 - b. A prayer was offered by tribal elders to set the tone of the meeting
2. About 40 people attended the meeting to get information on the work force camps
 - a. Questions ranged from clarifications on work force camps to issues associated with the project in general
3. Opponents of the project soon began venting their concerns and it became clear that their intent was to try and raise fear in the people and intimidate TransCanada
4. Out of respect for the elders, leadership and people who were there to listen to the information on work force camps we decided to withdraw and leave the meeting instead of giving the opposition a venue to continue grandstanding.

Opportunities and Lessons learned

1. James Odom – We partially clarified issues and answered questions on workforce camps however owing to the vocal oppositions being present that message was neutralized. As well any neutrals in the crowd may have walked away from the meeting leaning towards the opposition because we gave them an opportunity to be vocal. On a related note there was no control of the room from a messaging perspective – no one to moderate the questions. A suggestion would be to have a moderated event if we chose to engage in the future.
2. James Odom/Steve Marr?– If we host an event like this in the future we would want to have overt security visible in the crowd.
3. Don Greenwood – As far as security was concerned, keeping a low profile was the best choice and we would not recommend overt security presence (previous meeting with the tribes Don mentioned that all police officers were searched and that tribal representatives tried to arrest them for bringing weapons on reservation)
4. Travis Kelley – Not sure if the information shared on workforce camps was beneficial in any measurable way. Would not endorse another meeting of this type in the future. Would recommend more structured facilitation of a meeting or town hall style event. Would have liked to have had someone watching in the crowd who could monitor the situation and pull the plug earlier.

5. Drew Duncan – This meeting was not conducive to reducing the risk of opposition in the state. In fact meetings like this raised the fear of local in the non-tribal communities and gave them reason to be non-supportive in the future. Meetings like this are not beneficial as they raise tension in the communities. We need to focus our efforts on the supporters of the project and stay away from engaging the local, vocal opponents in the community.
6. Lou Thompson – It is the TR groups responsibility for ensuring violent opposition to the project and in the community is addressed. Although the meeting was generally viewed internally as being of little benefit there are tremendous benefits from the meeting that are not immediately recognizable but still valid (listed below). The fact is TransCanada has an obligation and responsibility to tribal people to provide information to those that want it and need it. The TR team will continue to find ways to meaningfully engage tribal people in SD. Committed to including other business partners on TR planning in the future.

Benefits of the meeting – Lou and Jason

1. Identified violent opposition and their tactics
2. Clarified and corrected some of the misinformation regarding workforce camps
3. Provided factual information to the public on work force camps
4. Demonstrated that TransCanada was more than willing to increase and build upon a relationship with Tribal communities
5. Demonstrated that TransCanada would not be intimidated by an increasingly marginalized section of the tribal community in opposition to the project
6. Successfully reached out to people within the tribal community who want information on the work force camp and the project in general.
7. Opposition demonstrated they are increasingly losing ground in their community by disrespecting their own elders and leadership.

Go forward plans

1. Based on input from the Tribal Relations and Stakeholder Relations teams, the following strategy and tactical actions will continue to take place
 - a. Continue to look at opportunities to influence the leadership of these communities in SD
 - b. Empower PGI consulting team by supporting them with factual documentation of the project which they can communicate with tribes internally
 - c. Look at opportunities to host a tour of a work force camp for tribal leadership and elders.
 - d. Continue strategy of meaningful engagement and incremental success.
 - e. Define opportunities for tribal participation in benefits of the project
 - f. Funnel more information on TR related activities to broader internal groups
 - g. Follow up with the town of Faith, SD on changes to proposed work force camps.