

ALBERTA  
ENVIRONMENTAL APPEALS BOARD

Discontinuance of Proceedings

---

Date of Discontinuance of Proceedings – August 2, 2007

**IN THE MATTER OF** sections 91, 92 and 95 of the  
*Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act*, R.S.A. 2000, c.  
E-12;

**-and-**

**IN THE MATTER OF** an appeal filed by Talisman Energy Inc.  
with respect to *Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act*  
Approval No. 10106-02-00 issued to Talisman Energy Inc. by the  
Director, Northern Region, Regional Services, Alberta  
Environment.

Cite as: *Talisman Energy Inc. v. Director, Northern Region, Regional Services, Alberta Environment* (02 August 2007), Appeal No. 06-080-DOP (A.E.A.B.).

## **I. BACKGROUND**

[1] On November 30, 2006, the Director, Northern Region, Regional Services, Alberta Environment (the “Director”), issued Approval No. 10106-02-00 (the “Approval”) under the *Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act*, R.S.A. 2000, c.E-12, to Talisman Energy Inc., authorizing the construction, operation and reclamation of the Sundance sour gas processing plant for the processing of natural gas, near Edson, Alberta.

[2] On December 22, 2006, the Environmental Appeals Board (the “Board”) received a Notice of Appeal from Talisman Energy Inc. (the “Appellant”), appealing the Approval.

[3] On December 28, 2006, the Board wrote to the Appellant and the Director (collectively the “Participants”) acknowledging receipt of the Notice of Appeal and notifying the Director of the appeal. The Board also requested the Director provide the Board with a copy of the records (the “Record”) relating to this appeal and that the Participants provide the Board with their available dates for a mediation meeting, preliminary meeting or hearing.

[4] According to standard practice, the Board wrote to the Natural Resources Conservation Board and the Alberta Energy and Utilities Board asking whether this matter had been the subject of a hearing or review under their respective legislation. Both boards responded in the negative.

[5] On January 9, 2007, the Board received a letter from the Director, requesting that the appeal be held in abeyance until April 9, 2007 to allow the Participants an opportunity to discuss the issues raised by the Appellant. The Board granted the request for an abeyance until February 9, 2007 and requested that a status report be provided to the Board at that time.

[6] On February 9, 2007, the Board received a status report from the Director, advising that a meeting was planned between the Director and the Appellant for February 15, 2007. The Director proposed to provide the Board with a further status report on March 15, 2007. The Board acknowledged the Director’s letter on February 12, 2007, and asked that a status report be provided to the Board by March 15, 2007.

[7] On March 14, 2007, the Board received a letter from the Appellant advising that the February 15, 2007 meeting was productive and that the Participants continue to work towards reaching a resolution. The Appellant also requested a further abeyance until April 30, 2007, with status reports due at that time. The Board granted the request.

[8] On April 27, 2007, the Board received a letter from the Director advising that the Participants were continuing work towards a potential resolution of the appeal. The Director suggested the appeal be held in abeyance until May 30, 2007. The Board acknowledged the Director's letter on April 30, 2007, advising that because the Participants were continuing to work towards a resolution, it was granting their request for a further abeyance.

[9] On May 30, 2007, the Board received a letter from the Appellant advising that they had received a proposal from the Director and that the Participants were requesting an abeyance until July 31, 2007, to review and respond to the proposal. The Appellant also advised that they hoped this would be their final request for an extension, prior to the resolution of the appeal. The Board granted the request.

[10] On July 31, 2007, the Board received a letter from the Appellant advising the Participants had resolved the issues in the appeal. The Appellant also advised that they wished to withdraw their appeal.

## **II. DECISION**

[11] Pursuant to section 95(7) of the *Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act*, and based on the withdrawal of the appeal by the Appellant, the Board hereby discontinues its proceedings in Appeal No. 06-080 and closes its file.

Dated on August 2, 2007, at Edmonton, Alberta.

---

Dr. Steve E. Hrudehy, FRSC, PEng  
Chair