

Draft Minutes



**Airshed Zones Board Committee (AZBC)
Meeting #3 Teleconference
October 15, 2009**

Action Items:

Action items	Who	Due Date
1.1 Gustavo will send the meeting #2 minutes to Bill Clapperton (copy to Krista Phillips) for possible comments.	Gustavo Hernandez	October 16
3.1: provide the member definition by CASA bylaws.	Gustavo Hernandez	Before the next meeting
3.2 draft the final report	Gustavo Hernandez	End of October

1 Administration

Jillian Flett chaired the meeting, which convened at 9:10 a.m.

- a. Introductions were made.

It was noticed that because of the absence of NGO representatives, the meeting didn't reach quorum, and consensus decisions could not be taken.

In attendance:

Name	Membership
Krista Phillips (till 10:30)	Industry (Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers)
Jillian Flett	Government (Alberta Environment)
Kristina Friesen	Alberta Airshed Council (AAC)
Kerra Chomlak	CASA
Gustavo Hernandez	CASA

- b. Meeting objectives were reviewed.
- c. Agenda items were approved by consensus.
- d. Review action items for meeting #2.

Action items	Who	Result
2.1: Kerra will ask the CASA business planning committee for a short window of time on their	Kerra Chomlak	Business Planning Committee will meet next

Action items	Who	Result
October workshop agenda to discuss the link with the AZBC and zones.		week. In CASA update section, Kerra will talk about AZBC.
2.2: Gustavo will draft three key questions to be considered by the committee; these questions represent the more important concerns of this committee and they will serve as background for the September 22 AAC meeting.	Gustavo Hernandez	Done
3.1: The AAC will report back about who is the member and who is the alternate.	Michael Bisaga and Kristina Friesen	Done. Kristina Friesen as member, alternate vacant.
3.2: Kerra will ask the CASA board representatives from AUMA and AAMDC, Linda Osinchuk and Tom Burton, whether municipalities would like to be on the CASA board.	Kerra Chomlak	There is no answer yet from AUMA and AAMDC. Carried forward.
4.1: Linda will facilitate the AAC meeting on September 22 in collaboration with the AAC co-chairs.	Linda Jabs	Done
4.2: Jillian will give a brief introduction of the committee's discussion at the AAC meeting on September 22.	Jillian Flett	Done
4.3: CASA members will meet with AAC co-chairs to draft the relevant agenda items for the AAC meeting on September 22.	Michael Bisaga, Kristina Friesen, Kerra Chomlak, Linda Jabs and Gustavo Hernandez	Done

Action 1.1: Gustavo will send the meeting #2 minutes to Bill Clapperton (copy to Krista Phillips) for possible comments.

- e. An updated overview of CASA projects was exposed.

2 Review Q&A from AAC meeting on September 22

- a. **Review AAC minutes:** the section of the AAC minutes related to the "AZBC update" were not shared; they still were not approved by the Alberta Airshed Council (AAC). It was agreed to hear a summary of the AAC meeting from people who attended the meeting; the main points were:
 - The AZBC had previously developed questions to be answered during the AAC meeting on September 22. In this meeting on September 22, the council did not go through the questions specifically, but through discussion and brainstorming, they answered all of the questions.
 - The AAC reflected on Airshed Zones (AZs) general concerns:
 - o the terms of how AZs solve their rules;
 - o what it is important for the AZs;

- what AZs are looking for;
- how AZs see the CASA board membership; and
- how to meet the requirements of a CASA board seat.
- The AAC members identified two key areas of consensus:
 - AAC should have a seat at CASA board; and
 - each Airshed Zone (AZ) is unique, with own challenges and opportunities.
- A high level discussion on what it is an AZ and the roles of AZs were conducted:
 - AZ definition;
 - education role;
 - monitoring vs. management roles;
 - review of scientific data;
 - metering (on the ground vs. in altitude); and
 - future AZ roles.
- Discussions on AZ and ACC, and they relationship with CASA were conducted:
 - the evolution in the relationship between CASA and AZ;
 - the CASA endorsement once a monitoring plan, business plan and funding is in place;
 - the relationship between the need for endorsement and AZ definition;
 - what AAC wants to be involved in CASA board;
 - if the attendance of AZ in CASA projects teams is enough AZs involvement at CASA;
 - how CASA board decisions could affect the AZs;
 - the possible double member representation at the CASA board because of the multi-stakeholder AZ entity; which sector each AZ represents. It was clarified that:
 - each AZ is a multi-stakeholder entity that operates with a consensus process; and
 - The AAC organization itself is not a multi-stakeholder entity. AAC is an entity where the executive directors of each AZ participate. The executive directors administrate the AZs. The AAC does operate in a consensus base, but for a common interest.
 - This last point begged the question if AAC members are aligned with the role of defining policy direction, policy decisions, etc. that CASA board requires. It was clarified that:
 - the administrative concept means that AZ executive directors are representing an organization;
 - the AZ executive director is responsible for strategic direction of the their organizations including: setting direction, business planning development, looking for funding, developing budgets, etc.; and
 - any executive director does not represent any other organization other than the AZ.
 - the common interest of the AAC members is not currently being represented at the CASA Board table, and some misunderstandings can not be clarified with only observer status at CASA meetings

b. Discuss Q&A from AAC meeting

The answers for the AZBC questions addressed to the AAC were discussed based on the previous summary reaching consensus in the answer process.

Question 1: It would be beneficial to clarify the interests and needs that would be represented at CASA by the Airshed Zones. Examples of questions are:

1.1. Which of the Airshed Zones' interests would be fulfilled by a seat at the CASA Board?

Answer: to have the availability of having input into the issues that affect the AZs because a lot of CASA recommendations impact the AZs.
The availability to be present and participate in discussions trying to reinforce a more correct and consistent message about what the AZs are and what they do.
Interest in bringing forward topics that are relevant to everybody in air quality issues;
Provide the form to AZs to participate in high-level discussion, future roles and challenges including funding considerations.
The AAC member at CASA board would be a voice identifying AZs concerns.

1.2. Which Airshed Zones interests could not be fulfilled by a seat at the CASA Board?

Answer: autonomy recognition.
There are issues in the relationship between CASA and AAC that they may not be reached by the board; examples of that are the value of CASA endorsement to AZ and Airshed Zones Guidelines update.

1.3. Which of CASA's businesses and/or projects are of interest to Airshed Zones?

Answer: Clean Air Strategy
Ambient Monitoring Strategic Plan
Particulate Matter and Ozone Management Framework
The business plan
Sharing and dissemination of other information

Question 2: Airshed Zones have told us their expectation is that becoming a CASA Board member will confirm their involvement in policy development, framework approvals, and other CASA business. Examples of questions are:

2.1. What may be some of the other expectations of Airshed Zones?

Answer: Alignment with Land Use Framework (LUF) development, and other planning processes,
Understanding and having input on key issues in management systems and in overall Air Quality management

2.2. *What impact, if any, could an Airshed Zones seat at CASA Board have on both business plans?*

Answer: to have a more integrated business plan between both AAC and CASA.

Bring perspectives on issues that they could affect AZs and CASA.

Question 3: There is an evolution in the Airshed Zones concept, and we need to be prepared for this evolution (new frameworks, policies, roles, management vs monitoring, etc). Examples of questions are:

3.1. *Which assumptions and roles do we assume about the Airshed Zones in the present and the future?*

Answer: AZs roles are evolving, LUF, Ambient Monitoring Strategic Plan, Air Quality Management introduce new challenges and roles to AZs. AZs should have more participation in those processes.

WPACs are represented on the Water Council, and consideration should be given to consistency with AWC.

3.2. *What conflict of interest, if any, may arise at CASA based on these roles?*

Answer: AZs are multi-stakeholder entities. AAC it is not a multi-stakeholder entity. AAC is an entity where participate the executive directors of AZs, and both operate in a consensus base.

The possible review of the endorsement process and Airshed Guidelines review could mean a conflict of interest having AAC a seat at CASA board.

AZs would be held to the same standards as any other board member in that they should self identify any potential conflicts and abstain from relevant decisions.

3 Wrap up

a. **Discussions:**

(i) What is the interest the Airshed zones would be representing?

NGO sector or Government sector

Some issues need more discussion and clarification because the AAC roles are between these two sectors.

Some stakeholders could see the Government sector as more related with AAC roles and expectations. NGO is the represented sector by AZs at CASA projects and by WPACs on the AWC.

Action 3.1: provide the member definition by CASA bylaws.

(ii) Who would be represented at the table?

The common interests of the AZs, represented by the AAC. The individual would be expected to represent the AAC organization, not the individual zones or any personal interest.

(iii) What are the benefits to CASA?

CASA would then have the benefit of involvement of all stakeholders with an interest, as per the consensus process. The AAC would provide perspective that may not be adequately provided at the current time.

Respect the CASA value of inclusiveness, in that all people that are directly affected by the project recommendations are represented at the board, Provide input to different CASA reports.

(iv) What are benefits to Airsheds?

The ability to provide a different perspective on recommendations where there are potentially more deliverable and implications associated with a more integrated point of view.

To bring forward perspectives on issues that the AZs are thinking, evaluating and contemplating.

Credibility associated to being at CASA board.

b. **Wrap up subjects:**

The final report to be addressed to the board will include the discussed Q&A, and it should be tested in advance with all of the different sectors in CASA.

The report should include the recommendations on reviewing the Airshed Zones Guidelines, clarifications, endorsement process, and support to AZs.

The Terms of Reference require that we answer specific questions, elaborate with recommendations, and actions and processes to follow pursuing a better understanding of the relationship between AZs and CASA.

Action 3.2: Gustavo will draft the final report.

4 Other business, if any

There is not other business.

5 Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:50 a.m.