

Final Minutes



Ambient Monitoring Strategic Planning Team Meeting #20

Date: November 2, 2006

Time: 9:30 – 3:30

Place: CASA Offices

10035 108 ST NW FLR 10
EDMONTON AB T5J 3E1
CANADA

Ph (780) 427-9793
Fax (780) 422-3127
Email casa@casahome.org
Web www.casahome.org

In attendance:

Name	Organization
Rob Bioletti	Alberta Environment
Dan Mackle (for Ian Peace)	Residents for Accountability in Power Industry Development
Bettina Mueller	CASA
Roxanne Pettipas	ConocoPhillips Canada / Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers
Kim Sanderson	CASA
Chris Severson-Baker	Pembina Institute
James Vaughan	Alberta Energy and Utilities Board
B.J. Vickery	Lafarge Canada Inc / Alberta Chamber of Resources
Kevin Warren	PAMZ, PASZA

Regrets:

Name	Organization
Karina Bodo	Alberta Health
Matthew Dance	CASA
Findlay MacDermid	Residents for Accountability in Power Industry Development
David McCoy	Husky Oil / Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers
Myra Moore	Fort Air Partnership
Keith Murray	Alberta Forest Products Association
Bob Myrick	Alberta Environment
Ken Omotani	TransAlta Utilities
Mike Pawlicki	Lafarge Canada Inc.
George Pfaff	Petro-Canada Edmonton Refinery / Canadian Petroleum Products Institute
Brad Watson	Lafarge North America
Brian Wiens	Environment Canada

Action Items:

Task	Who	When
9.2: Load the data to the CASA data warehouse and provide the working group with access information.	Matthew	ASAP
14.1: Forward the parameters that are included in the SO ₂ and NO _x forecasts to Matthew and the team.	Matthew	Ongoing
18.8: Compile a short document that cross-references workshop questions to sections of the report where these questions are addressed, or to other documents as appropriate.	Matthew	December 2006
19.2: Invite the DC9 to join the team	Matthew	ASAP
20.1: Roxanne will confirm with Ian Peace that the team agreed not to have an ENGO co-chair.	Roxanne	Nov. 13
20.2: Bettina will talk to Bob Myrick to determine who he has	Bettina	Nov. 6

Final Minutes

Task	Who	When
talked to about addressing the regulatory requirements of a new system.		
20.3: BJ will meet with Bob to complete their work on system management.	BJ and Bob	Nov. 16
20.4: Bettina will talk to Brian Wiens to see if Environment Canada is familiar with the EPA work and, if so, whether EC could do a presentation at the next meeting.	Bettina	Nov. 10
20.5: Rob will discuss with Bob the task of developing a spreadsheet that shows the current monitoring costs and who is paying, and what the anticipated costs amount to.	Rob, Bob	Nov. 10
20.6: The Implementation and Funding group will write out the assumptions and rationale for each of the proposals or recommendations.	I&F group	Nov. 16
20.7: Bettina will email the three subgroup champions, noting the timelines and expectations for the champions.	Bettina	Nov. 6
20.8: Bettina will email the team with the date and time for the teleconference.	Bettina	Nov. 7
20.9: Matthew will follow up on communications within the health sector.	Matthew	Nov. 17

Roxanne Pettipas convened the meeting at 9:45 am.

1. Administration

a. Introductions

Introductions were made around the table.

b. Approve agenda and meeting purpose

Roxanne reviewed the agenda and meeting purpose. The team agreed it also wanted to review the tasks from the June workshop. The agenda was approved. Roxanne advised the team that Myra Moore was recently diagnosed with brain cancer; many members had seen the email from Kevin Warren about supporting Myra through CKUA (www.ckua.ca)

c. Approve minutes

Several changes were noted to the September 19 minutes:

- Page 3, last sentence in the first paragraph under the second bulleted list is incomplete (“If industry were charged....”)
- Page 3, first sentence of the next paragraph, insert “a” before “map.”
- Page 5, under Discussion, second sentence should say “blend” rather than “bled.”
- In the same paragraph, the third sentence should say “fund raising” not “funding raising.”
- David McCoy was added to the Implementation and Funding Group.
- The Data and Information Management group provided an update but this was not part of the minutes.
- The team had discussed whether to have an ENGO co-chair.

Action 20.1: Roxanne will confirm with Ian Peace that the team agreed not to have an ENGO co-chair.

Final Minutes

Members did not formally approve the minutes as these items remained outstanding.

d. Review action items

Task	Status
9.2: Matthew to load the data to the CASA data warehouse and provide the working group with access information.	Carry forward
14.1: Matthew to forward the parameters that are included in the SO ₂ and NO _x forecasts to the team.	Carry forward
18.8: Matthew to compile a short document that cross-references workshop questions to sections of the report where these questions are addressed, or to other documents as appropriate.	Carry forward
19.1: Matthew to invite Kevin Warren and Myra Moore to join the Implementation and Funding sub-group.	Done
19.2: Matthew to invite the DC9 to join the team	Carry forward
19.3: Matthew to forward Bob's map to the team.	Done

Roxanne advised that Ken Omotani is unable to take on the task of industry co-chair and it was thought to be inappropriate to have two industry co-chairs in any event.

2. Sub-group Updates

The team reviewed the timelines in the July minutes, and that they will miss the deadline proposed at the June workshop (December 31) to finish the plan. Members expressed concerns about the slippage and the desire to get the plan done as soon as possible.

- a) **Systems Management** – BJ provided an update for this subgroup, noting there have been a couple of conference calls and Bob made a short presentation at the last meeting on the group's thinking on the current system. The group has not met since the September 19 team meeting.

The team noted the following points in discussing system management issues:

- It is essential that this work and the implementation and funding work are consistent and coordinated. Issues with the current system had less to do with ineffectiveness of the structure and more with funding. The original expectation was that industry would fund the backbone system but there was no fallback plan if that did not occur. The new system needs to be simple and have a backstop; we need to know how much it's going to cost and have a way to fund it. (See also the discussion under Implementation and Funding.)
- There needs to be a driver for why the system would be funded. If industry is expected to fund it, the team needs to make a compelling case to them.
- System management depends on how it is funded. If stakeholders commit to funding, then we have a multi-stakeholder management approach, and we need a way to deal with non-consensus matters. If AENV funds the system, then maybe we don't need a multi-stakeholder approach.
- Further work is needed on the costs of the current system, opportunities for efficiencies and reallocation of funds.

Final Minutes

- What about other industries and sectors stepping up to the plate, such as transportation and municipalities? Is it assumed that oil and gas will always be the primary funder? This has been a barrier to airshed formation in areas where there is not a lot of industry.
- AENV has traditionally paid for the transportation part of monitoring costs in urban areas, and this should be pointed out in the strategic plan. The team should look at emissions from other sectors and consider how they will be addressed.
- The government should at the very least maintain its current commitment and fill gaps, or find new efficiencies.

It was proposed that this group briefly review the history, look at problems with the current system, describe the main options and the pros and cons of each, based on who is providing the funding. This will also include a description of the decision making process for a multi-stakeholder approach. When describing the options, they should address the consequences of choosing one option over another. The group should also have a good understanding of the regulatory needs that the system needs to meet.

Action 20.2: Bettina will talk to Bob Myrick to determine who he has talked to about addressing the regulatory requirements of a new system.

Action 20.3: BJ will meet with Bob to complete their work on system management.

b) Implementation and Funding

Rob walked the committee through the handout previously distributed, “A New Air Monitoring Network.” He noted it was a description of the ideal monitoring system based on science, irrespective of funding. The costs were subsequently added but further work needs to be done in this area. The team raised a few questions, and the following points were noted:

- The population numbers are more or less consistent with the original strategic plan and were derived based on human health monitoring. Adjustments in light of other factors can still be done.
- The distance of 50 km from a city in reference to ozone, is the area where maximum ozone build up could be expected, based on wind speed and modeling.
- In locations where the emissions profile warrants (e.g., air toxics such as formaldehyde), the strategic plan should note the need to ensure these emissions are monitored, and consider how and by whom this would be done, and whether or not regulatory requirements stay in place in the new system.
- The plan should stay at a high level and set out the parameters that explain and justify the numbers and locations of stations (e.g., the emissions profiles, population and other factors that are the basis for determining how many stations a particular community will have).
- The team will do an implementation plan in which the rationale for the network will be presented. However, for the first version of the strategic plan, the team may want to provide more detail. The strategy and the detail should be in the same working document to ensure that all the “bases are covered” before the team prepares the implementation plan. This will respond to the request from the June workshop for more detail on

Final Minutes

implementation. However, two separate documents will eventually be produced. The intent will be to update the implementation plan fairly regularly, but the strategic plan is not expected to change often. The first product will be the strategic plan, and the next workshop can explain how the plan is intended to be applied. Then the implementation plan will lay out the details and workshop participants can provide input.

Example of the structure of a working document to take to the workshop:

Strategic Plan Element	What this element means
Edmonton and Calgary get four stations	Explain why four are needed and adequate
>50,000 population = generally 2 stations, with other considerations, such as emissions sources	Lethbridge only gets one, for these reasons Grande Prairie gets two, for these reasons
Ozone stations 50 km from a city	Explain significance of modeling, wind speed, ozone formation, etc.

Bettina noted that air quality monitoring has evolved in recent years in terms of network design and the type of information used to represent air quality for a large area. The goal of these systems is to get as complete a picture as possible, as cost effectively as possible, and get a sense of the uncertainty associated with the data. Policy makers need to know what this uncertainty level is and how spatially representative the data are. The spatial approach is relatively new, but a number of agencies, including the US EPA, are working on it, and it could be valuable to incorporate into the strategic plan.

This approach takes a range of data and information, including population, emissions, and models and enables a larger area to be covered with higher certainty. There are still hot spot issues, but this iterative, complex approach makes efficient use of modeling and information integration to assess the certainty of results. If there is uncertainty, another station may be installed in the area. If there is consistency between the models and the observed data, the level of certainty increases, and the station can be moved to a different location. The less variation there is in emissions and sources, the larger the area that can be represented with one station.

Several questions need to be considered for any monitoring system:

1. How good does the information need to be?
2. What information is needed?
3. How much does it cost to collect?

Each decision should be a deliberate, conscious one; e.g., if there is a denser population, a high level of certainty is needed about air quality. In areas with more dispersed population, fewer emissions, etc. it may be possible to accept less certainty.

The team was not familiar with this approach but was interested in learning more about it. It requires specialized expertise and the team may want to recommend that this approach be assessed for application in Alberta and that it be considered in developing the network.

Final Minutes

It is an interdisciplinary approach that draws on modelers, pollution experts, and others. Environment Canada may be familiar with the US work.

Action 20.4: Bettina will talk to Brian Wiens to see if Environment Canada is familiar with the EPA work and, if so, whether EC could do a presentation at the next meeting.

Various other points were noted during subsequent discussion of the strategic plan:

- More monitoring is currently being done in Fort McMurray than in other parts of Alberta. It would be undesirable to have a provincial standard that is lower than what is being done in Ft. McMurray.
- There is now an implicit assumption that monitoring is done to confirm there isn't a problem, and this needs elaboration. The assumption should be stated clearly in the strategic plan; e.g., in areas of low population and little industry, temporary monitoring should confirm that air quality is relatively good. As long as that assumption holds, a station can keep moving around, but if you find a problem, you need a plan to figure out what the source or issue is. In other words, there needs to be another process to follow if you have a problem.
- Some zones that manage as well as monitor (e.g., PAMZ) have a process that describes the action to be taken if a problem is identified. If the portable monitor finds a problem, notification occurs and the trailer goes back in six months to check again to see if the problem has been addressed. Most zones do monitor in urban areas, but not all have a management approach. The issue is likely to be determining how to monitor in towns between 10,000 and 20,000 that lie outside airshed zones.
- AENV is making two portable trailers available for 3-6 months of use by zones, subject to zones applying and AENV determining priority.
- The team needs a clear budget that shows current and proposed costs.
- Each proposal or recommendation needs a rationale and what the recommendation means, as described in the sample table earlier in these minutes.

Action 20.5: Rob will discuss with Bob the task of developing a spreadsheet that shows the current monitoring costs and who is paying, and what the anticipated costs amount to.

Action 20.6: The group will write out the assumptions and rationale for each of the proposals or recommendations.

c) Data and Information Management

This group provided an update at the last meeting, but it doesn't appear in the minutes. There was nothing further to report since then.

Final Minutes

3. Work Plan Review

The team reviewed its earlier timelines and made some adjustments. Members agreed to the following schedule:

- Nov. 17: Drafts from group champions to full team
- Nov. 22: Comments from team back to each champion to revise
- Nov. 27: Champions send revised text to Kim
- Nov. 27: Teleconference from 2:00-4:00
- Late Dec: Kim distributes revised draft plan to team
- Jan. 8: Next team meeting to discuss revised draft plan

Action 20.7: Bettina will email the three subgroup champions, noting the timelines and expectations for the champions.

Action 20.8: Bettina will email the team with the date and time for the teleconference.

4. OSC Self Assessment

Bettina reported that the OSC reviewed its terms of reference at its last meeting. Members thought they had done well in some areas but not in others. In light of the new AMSP being developed, the OSC agreed it made sense to wait for the AMSP team's recommendations, and then assess what role the OSC could have, and possibly also look at the things that prevented them from doing the work they set out to do. The OSC will look at the draft strategic plan and bring a recommendation back to the AMSP team about what they think their role, if any, might be. The next OSC meeting is January 9 and they would like to have a draft AMSP to discuss at that meeting.

5. Other Business

Members wondered what the situation was in terms of health representation on the team. Alberta Health and Wellness has not attended the last three meetings, and health sector engagement was a key issue at the June workshop. Communications among health agencies regarding the AMSP have not been good, and the Calgary Health Region is keen to join the team.

Action 20.9: Matthew will follow up on communications within the health sector.

6. Next Meeting

The next team meeting will be Monday, January 8, 2007. The location will be confirmed, pending a presentation from Environment Canada.

The team thanked Bettina for her input to the discussion.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30.