

Final Minutes



Ambient Monitoring Strategic Planning Team Meeting #33

Date: Wednesday February 6, 2008
Time: 10:00am – 3:30pm
Place: ConocoPhillips, Calgary

In attendance:

Name	Stakeholder group
Brian Free	CASA
Bob Myrick	Alberta Environment
Ken Omotani	TransAlta
Ian Peace	Residents for Appropriate Power Industry Development
Roxanne Pettipas	ConocoPhillips
Kim Sanderson	CASA
Chris Severson-Baker	Pembina Institute
David Spink	Prairie Acid Rain Coalition
Kevin Warren (after 2pm)	Parkland Airshed Management Zone

With regrets:

Name	Stakeholder group
Michael Bisaga	Lakeland Industry and Community Assoc.
David McCoy	Husky
Findlay MacDermid	RAPID
Bettina Mueller	Alberta Environment
Keith Murray	Alberta Forest Products
James Vaughan	ERCB
Brian Wiens	Environment Canada
Mike Zemanek	Alberta Health and Wellness

Roxanne convened the meeting at 10:25 a.m.

Action Items:

Action items	Who	Due Date
9.2: Brian Free to load team information to the CASA website and provide the working group with access information.	Brian Free	Ongoing
29.5: Revise steps used to calculate costs to include the extra costs of sampling in remote locations for the passive network.	Bob Myrick	By next meeting
31.2: Contact Carolyn Kolebaba to ensure an AAMD&C representative can attend the workshop	Brian Free	In progress
31.10 Send out invitations to the workshop.	Brian Free	Feb. 29

Action items	Who	Due Date
33.1: Bob Myrick to revise wording for recommendation for an emissions inventory, which will then be fit into the appropriate topic summary.	Bob, Brian, Kim	Feb. 15
33.2: Bob will draft text on the acid deposition monitoring, along with a recommendation, and circulate to the team.	Bob Myrick	By next meeting.
33.3: Bob will talk to Environment Canada about ways to measure visibility.	Bob Myrick	By next meeting.
33.4: Bob and AENV staff will revise the human health monitoring section in light of the Cape recommendations and the team's direction.	Bob Myrick	By next meeting.
33.5: Bob, David and Ian will talk to Dr. Cape in the next week to get clarity on transboundary monitoring, then AENV will determine approximate costs.	Bob, David and Ian	Feb. 15
33.6: Bob will draft text on mobile monitoring and emergency response monitoring for the report and for the appropriate topic summary.	Bob Myrick	By next meeting.
33.7: Bob and David will revise the network topic summary after Bob revises the main section on the network and after they talk to Dr. Cape to get further clarification.	Bob and David	By next meeting.
33.8: Bob will discuss with Peter Watson arranging a meeting with the new environment minister to discuss funding the AMSP.	Bob	Feb 29
33.9: The co-chairs and other team members as appropriate will seek a meeting with the new environment minister in April.	Co-chairs	March 14
33.10: Bob will test with AENV whether principle #5 should be deleted.	Bob	By next meeting.
33.11: Brian will set up another teleconference, tentatively for Feb. 14 at 2:00, for the small group working on the funding formula (Mike, David, Ken, Kevin, Ian, and Bob).	Brian	Feb. 12
33.12: Bob will talk to the Government of Alberta representatives on the CFO team to get clarity on the draft recommendation.	Bob	By next meeting.
33.13: Brian will poll for the next meeting date, considering Feb 21, 22 and 25 in Edmonton.	Brian	Feb. 8

1) Administration

a. Approve agenda and meeting purpose

Roxanne reviewed the agenda. The team added a discussion of Neil Cape's recommendations to the agenda as Item #2. The agenda was approved.

b. Approve minutes from Meeting #31 and 32.

Minutes from these two meetings were approved.

c. Review action items from Meeting #31 and 32

Action items	Status
9.2: Brian Free to load team information to the CASA website and provide the working group with access information.	Ongoing
29.3: Brian to post a copy of Kirk Andries presentation on CASA website. (Get permission to post on web.)	Done
29.5: David Spink to revise steps used to calculate costs to include the extra costs of sampling in remote locations for the passive network.	By next meeting
31.1: David Spink to draft a recommendation for an emissions inventory	Done. New action: Bob will provide revised wording, and the recommendation will be added to a topic summary.
31.2: Brian to contact Carolyn Kolebaba to ensure an AAMD&C representative can attend the workshop	In progress
31.3 Kerra and Brian to revise the wording of the funding principle about diffuse anthropogenic emissions.	Done
31.4 Brian to revise the Funding topic sheet based on discussion. Send to the team.	Done
31.5 Send <i>editorial</i> comments on all of the topic sheets to Brian.	Done.
31.6 Ken Omotani, Bob Myrick, Ian Peace, and airshed representative to form a sub-group to determine options for a cost apportionment funding formula for a provincial air monitoring network.	Done. Discussed later in the meeting. (Agenda item 3)
31.7 Bob to send the numbers and locations of monitors to the funding formula sub-group.	Done
31.8 Team members to send Bob Myrick any other questions/comments for Dr. Cape.	Done
31.9 Bob to talk to Dr. Cape about his availability and cost to attend the workshop.	Done. Dr. Cape could participate by phone or video. He will be in Calgary in early May and the team may want to arrange a meeting with him at that time.
31.10 Brian to send invitations and book a venue for the workshop.	Partly done. Booked the Coast Terrace Inn as the venue. Invitations not gone out yet.
31.11 Brian to review and revise the emissions inventory recommendation based on the team's discussion and distribute it to the team.	By Feb 8
32.1 Team members to send review comments regarding the topic summaries to Brian Free	Done
32.2 David Spink to send highlights from the Jan. 21 telephone call with Neil Cape to Brian to distribute to the Team	Done.
32.3 Roxanne, Ian, and Brian to hold teleconference wrt the March workshop	Done

2. Discussion of Neil Cape's Recommendations

Copies of the initial recommendations from Dr. Cape were distributed. Bob reviewed the recommendations, which were then discussed.

Environmental protection (This relates to the Ecosystem-based monitoring sub-program.)

- **Wet deposition.** Dr. Cape is of the view that Alberta's current network is inadequate to determine the certainty of wet deposition across Alberta. He recommends 7 more stations spread across the province, which would double the size of the network. He also recommends a 3-5 year study to get a better understanding of north-south and east-west gradients. This would be a much more substantial expansion. He made specific comments about location of these sites.

Discussion

- These recommendations are consistent with what he recommended for WBEA.
 - The intent is to do short-term intensive monitoring; This will provide a scientific basis as to what level of monitoring is appropriate.
 - Need to set a clear time limit on the short-term study. A 3-year time-frame was proposed.
 - Alberta is producing more pollution and will have to pay more for monitoring.
 - These recommendations are at a provincial scale; airsheds may do more intensive monitoring depending on their issues.
 - If this recommendation is implemented, it will require capital equipment for 16-20 precipitation monitors, which are \$3,000-\$4,000 each, plus analytical costs.
 - WBEA is going to proceed to implement this monitoring for their area.
-
- **Dry deposition.** Dr. Cape recommends dry deposition to be co-located at all wet deposition sites, but it is not clear if they are recommended at the 16-20 temporary sites.

Discussion

- Dry deposition monitoring is much more expensive than wet deposition monitoring.
- It's likely that at some wet deposition stations, transboundary and background monitoring could also be done.
- It will be necessary to scientifically rationalize and balance the use of "denuder" instruments with passive monitors, since the denuders are much more costly. Ideally, denuders would be installed at the permanent sites, and where they don't go in, passives would be used. Further analysis is needed, but it appears that what Dr. Cape is proposing is cheaper than what the team was initially considering.
- The program must be implementable with affordable costs, but Alberta needs to step up and address this issue.
- The intent is to adequately understand acid deposition in Alberta, but this should not be regarded as another research program. It is a worthwhile, relatively low cost way to gather good information, and it needs to be packaged a little differently. Co-location is an important aspect and should be part of the program from the beginning.

Action 33.2: Bob will draft text on the acid deposition monitoring, along with a recommendation, and circulate to the team.

Human Health Monitoring (This relates to the Population-based monitoring sub-program.)

Dr. Cape is not recommending installation of new permanent monitors in cities at the present time.
Discussion

- AENV also provided some feedback on the team's thinking and does not feel there is a scientific rationale for five monitoring stations each in Edmonton and Calgary.
- A combination of a passive network and portable monitoring does make sense and if issues or hotspots emerge, permanent monitoring stations might then be considered.
- AENV needs to do more work to look at all the substances in the human health part of the plan.
- It was noted that visibility monitoring is not addressed by Dr. Cape. Yet for Calgarians, for example, a view of the mountains is very important. It was suggested that visibility monitoring should be considered and possibly added to the AMSP.

Action 33.3: Bob will talk to Environment Canada about ways to measure visibility.

Action 33.4: Bob and AENV staff will revise the Population-based monitoring section in light of the Cape recommendations and the team's direction.

Transboundary

The team was thinking initially of 5 stations each on the west and east borders, and monitoring continuously for a number of pollutants. Dr. Cape recommends six stations on the eastern border with directional monitoring to determine concentrations from both directions to get a better idea of the source.

Discussion

- Six on Alberta's western border may be too many. The mountain passes may be the best locations.
- Capital costs are not high, but with stations in remote areas, costs to collect samples are significant.
- Dr. Cape needs to clarify this area.

Action 33.5: Bob, David and Ian will talk to Dr. Cape in the next week to get clarity on transboundary monitoring, then AENV will determine approximate costs.

3. Review of the Workshop Topic Summaries

The team reviewed the vision and the funding topic summaries in detail, and changes were noted directly in those documents.

Noted that mobile monitoring and emergency response monitoring should be included as part of the strategic plan.

Action 33.6: Bob will draft text on mobile monitoring and emergency response plans for the report and for the appropriate topic summary.

Action 33.7: Bob and David will revise the network topic summary after Bob revises the main section on the network and after they talk to Dr. Cape to get further clarification.

Funding the Monitoring Network

The team reviewed the relevant portions of the discussion from meeting 32. Option 4 described in those minutes is the favoured option: *Costs are apportioned according to emissions of all Criteria Air Contaminants: NO_x, SO_x, fine particulates, carbon monoxide, ammonia, and VOCs.*

It was noted that the team initially said the new system should be in place within five years after the report was approved. The team needs to think through what this means in terms of timing for each year, and what the ramifications might be for the airsheds. The team should come up with a recommendation for how to set up the administrative aspects as well.

The following points were also raised:

- Whether the options the team considered should be included in the topic summary and the report, with an explanation as to why most were rejected.
- We need to be clear in principles 3 and 4 what the role of the provincial government would be.
- The principles should also apply to airsheds.
- Airsheds will have some monitoring that is consistent with the rest of the province, but many will also likely have enhanced monitoring to meet their specific needs.
- Large industrial emitters that are not in a zone and that emit substances that are of provincial concern (e.g., mercury) should contribute to a provincial fund to monitor for that substance.
- There could be minimum monitoring standards across the province, and if an area wants better monitoring, the onus would be on them to form an airshed.
- To ensure fairness, AENV can ask facilities that require approvals to pay and if they don't, the requirement is added to their approval. The government will need to figure out how to get facilities that don't require an approval to pay. The required payment should include basic cost for monitoring CACs plus a portion to cover some administrative costs.
- The previous AMSP failed because it was too costly, so we need to ensure this one is reasonable and that the government supports it. It was suggested that the co-chairs and other team members as appropriate should meet with the new minister before the AMSP goes to the CASA board to explain the funding costs and implications.

Action 33.8: Bob will discuss with Peter Watson arranging a meeting with the new environment minister to discuss funding the AMSP.

Action 33.9: The co-chairs and other team members as appropriate will seek a meeting with the new environment minister in April.

Action 33.10: Bob will test with AENV whether principle #5 should be deleted.

The table in the funding topic summary needs more work. The team has not yet decided how the funding formula should be structured. The small group has discussed several approaches, but simplicity is key. It was noted that if funding is tied directly to monitoring specific emissions, airsheds would never be able to do issues response monitoring. This formula refers mainly to the provincial system, but it does need to be connected regionally.

Action 33.11: Brian will set up another teleconference, tentatively for Feb. 14 at 2:00, for the small group working on the funding formula (Mike, David, Ken, Kevin, Ian, and Bob).

Members were reminded to review and provide any comments on other topic summaries ASAP.

4. CFO Team's Recommendation

The CFO team revised its monitoring recommendation at its last meeting; copies were circulated.

Action 33.12: Bob will talk to the Government of Alberta representatives on the CFO team to get clarity on the draft recommendation.

5. Next Meeting

Action 33.13: Brian will poll for the next meeting date, considering Feb 21, 22 and 25 in Edmonton.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm.