

Final Minutes



Ambient Monitoring Strategic Planning Team Meeting #39

Date: Thursday, August 14, 2008

Time: 10:00 am to 3:30 pm

Place: CASA Offices, Edmonton

In attendance:

Name	Stakeholder group
Michael Bisaga	Alberta Airsheds (for Kevin Warren)
Kerra Chomlak	CASA
Linda Jabs	CASA
Bob Myrick	Alberta Environment
Ian Peace	Residents for Accountability in Power Industry Development (by phone)
Krista Phillips	CAPP
Kim Sanderson	CASA
Chris Severson-Baker	Pembina Institute
David Spink	Prairie Acid Rain Coalition
Brian Wiens	Environment Canada

With regrets:

Name	Stakeholder group
Keith Murray	Alberta Forest Products Association
Ken Omotani/ Angela Ball	TransAlta Corporation
Roxanne Pettipas	ConocoPhillips/ CAPP
Kevin Warren	Parkland Airshed Management Zone
Mike Zemanek	Alberta Health and Wellness

Action Items:

Action items	Who	Due Date
33.9: Team representatives will brief the new Deputy Minister about informing the minister about the AMSP and funding.	TBA	November
38.1: Bob will report back to this team on what the proposed CFO monitoring network might look like and any potential implications for the AMSP team.	Bob Myrick	September
38.2: Merry and Mike will champion with the CAS team the idea of ambient monitoring being an important part of the CAS, and that the CAS is an opportunity to secure support for long-term funding for monitoring. The intent is to raise the profile of ambient monitoring within the CAS, as it is relevant to all four contemplated strategic directions. If the CAS indicates the need for a comprehensive air monitoring network, the AMSP will be in place to respond.	Merry Turtiak, Mike Zemanek	ongoing
38.3: Kerra will confirm if Mike Pawlicki is still an alternate on the	Kerra Chomlak	September

Action items	Who	Due Date
team.		
38.4: Kerra will check with urban and rural municipal board members about how they want to participate with this team.	Kerra Chomlak	September
38.5: Bob will provide additional details behind the numbers in the pie chart, and better define the stations that are included in each section.	Bob Myrick	September
38.6: The team will develop clear language for the key definitions of the types of monitoring e.g., fenceline.	Costs Subgroup	September
38.7: Bob will forward the GOA's policy development process to the team.	Bob Myrick	September
38.8: The Costs Subgroup will work up the costs and descriptions for the various scenarios	Costs Subgroup	September
38.10: Bob will put the Cape report through the AENV release process by Sept 30, and advise Kerra when it has been officially released so it can be posted on CASA website. It will clearly be marked "draft."	Bob Myrick	October 15
38.11: Bob will go through the November draft of the report and make all the revisions he feels are needed to update the document based on recent discussions.	Bob Myrick	August 26
39.1: Krista will draft some new text to add to the minutes of meeting 38 and circulate to the team.	Krista Phillips	August 25
39.2: All AMSP team members should talk to their sectors to encourage them to support air monitoring as part of the new Clean Air Strategy. (See also action 38.2)	Team members	Sept. 11
39.3: Kerra will distribute a list of CAS team members to the AMSP team.	Kerra Chomlak	August 18
39.4: CASA will draft some key messages related to release of the Cape report for discussion at the next meeting.	CASA Secretariat	Sept. 11
39.5: Brian Wiens will do a first draft of an implementation plan by August 15, and email to Bob Myrick, Chris Severson-Baker, and either Kevin Warren or Michael Bisaga to review and comment by Aug. 22, then prepare a second draft by Sept. 4.	Brian Wiens, Bob Myrick, Chris Severson-Baker, Kevin Warren or Michael Bisaga	
39.6: Bob Myrick will test the proposed recommendations with AENV.	Bob Myrick	
39.7: Bob Myrick will finish the changes to the draft AMSP report and forward to Kim to edit.	Bob Myrick	August 26
39.8: Kerra will check the files to see if the final workshop report and a cover note were sent out to participants.	Kerra Chomlak	August 22
39.9: Kerra will organize a teleconference for the Workshop Feedback Subgroup.	Kerra Chomlak	August 18

Bob convened the meeting at 10:25 am.

Kerra introduced Linda Jabs, who will be starting with CASA in September and will become the project manager for this team. Those present introduced themselves.

1 Administration

a. Approve agenda and meeting purpose

Bob reviewed the agenda and meeting purpose; several adjustments were made to the agenda. A discussion of the Cape report will be deferred until the September meeting. The team agreed to talk about the roles and responsibilities document sent out from Alberta Environment under Other Business. The revised agenda and meeting purpose were approved.

b. Approve minutes from Meeting #38 (June 18)

One member felt more detail was needed in the minutes about what AENV considers to be doable with respect to funding, and how to deal with long term funding mechanisms for small and diffuse emitters. Other members noted that the team needs to wrap up its work and not devote time to developing funding mechanisms. Ideally, we want to get the minister on board to provide funds in the short term while mechanisms are being developed for the longer term.

Action 39.1: Krista will draft some new text to add to the minutes of meeting 38 and circulate to the team.

The minutes from meeting 38 will be approved at the next meeting.

c. Review action items from Meeting #38

Action items	Status
33.9: Team representatives will brief the new Deputy Minister about informing the minister about the AMSP and funding.	This will be done near the end of November. If the team cannot reach consensus, a meeting with ADM and/or DM in AENV could be requested to get further guidance.
37.9: Kerra will email the current budget to the team.	Done
38.1: Bob will report back to this team on what the proposed CFO monitoring network might look like and any potential implications for the AMSP team.	Carry forward. Bob will provide the CFO monitoring plan to this team when it is done, likely around the end of September.
38.2: Merry and Mike will champion with the CAS team the idea of ambient monitoring being an important part of the CAS, and that the CAS is an opportunity to secure support for long-term funding for monitoring.	Carry forward. The CAS team is not yet at that level of discussion. (See action 39.2) The intent is to raise the profile of ambient monitoring within the CAS, as it is relevant to all four contemplated strategic directions. If the CAS indicates the need for a comprehensive air monitoring network, the AMSP will be in place to respond.
38.3: Kerra will confirm if Mike Pawlicki is still an alternate on the team.	Carry forward
38.4: Kerra will check with urban and rural municipal board members about how they want to participate with this team.	Carry forward
38.5: Bob will provide additional details behind the numbers in the pie chart, and better define the stations that are included in each section.	Carry forward.

Action items	Status
38.6: The team will develop clear language for the key definitions of the types of monitoring e.g., fenceline.	Carry forward, assigned to Costs subgroup. Definitions need to address purpose of monitoring program, what it tries to accomplish, and who pays.
38.7: Bob will forward the GOA's policy development process to the team.	Carry forward.
38.8: The Costs Subgroup will work up the costs and descriptions for the various scenarios	Partially done. On agenda for today.
38.9: Team members will review the Cape report to test if anything has changed since the last draft. Comments will be provided to Kerra and Bob by email and any outstanding issues will be discussed at the next meeting.	No comments were received.
38.10: Bob will put the Cape report through the AENV release process by Sept 30, and advise Kerra when it has been officially released so it can be posted on CASA website by October 15.	Carry forward. CASA can develop some key messages so AMSP co-chairs can respond when the report is made public (action 39.4). This team is still trying to reach consensus and not all of Cape's recommendations may be incorporated. This is just one of the inputs to our work. Any stakeholder concerns will be discussed at the September meeting.
38.11: Bob will go through the November draft of the report and make all the revisions he feels are needed to update the document based on recent discussions.	Carry forward. Bob is working through the document based on evolution in the team's thinking since the March workshop.
38.12: Kerra will poll for: a) a meeting date for the Cost Subgroup, b) a team meeting date in July and August, and c) a date for a September retreat.	Done. Sept. 11 is the meeting date and the team needs to decide if it wants to make this a two day meeting.

Action 39.2: All AMSP team members should talk to their sectors to encourage them to support air monitoring as part of the new Clean Air Strategy. (See also action 38.2)

Action 39.3: Kerra will distribute a list of CAS team members to the AMSP team.

Action 39.4: CASA will draft some key messages related to release of the Cape report for discussion at the next meeting.

2 Costs and Funding of Monitoring Network

The Costs Subgroup developed four scenarios (including 3a and 3b), but did not do any calculations for scenario 4 since good emissions data are lacking for that scenario. They presented the others (1, 2, 3a and 3b) to the team for feedback.

Scenario 1: The provincial network looks at the province as a whole; it is trying to get a sense of what the general air quality is and what's coming in and out of Alberta. The provincial network is used to understand air quality in population centres, smog formation, acid deposition, background air quality, transboundary and spatial issues (in accordance with the proposed

subprograms). The provincial network for Scenario 1 excludes compliance monitoring and most airshed monitoring (because it is done largely to respond to local or regional issues). (Note: the subgroup recognized that some airshed monitoring has been included as part of the provincial network and that some compliance monitoring could possibly be considered part of the network but that no compliance monitoring had been included to date.)

Scenario 2: For Scenario 2, population centres would be removed, and the province and/or airsheds would be responsible for this monitoring. The provincial network for Scenario 2 excludes compliance monitoring, most airshed monitoring, and all population centre monitoring (that is, Scenario 1 minus population centre monitoring).

Scenario 3a: The provincial network for Scenario 3a includes all air monitoring in Alberta (that is, scenario 1 plus 100% of compliance monitoring and airshed monitoring).

Scenario 3b: The provincial network for Scenario 3b is the same as Scenario 3a, but with only 10% of compliance monitoring included, rather than 100%. The rationale for 3b is that 100% of compliance monitoring is only for approvals, not for public use. A 10% usage of compliance monitoring for the provincial network is an educated guess, and it could change. Prior to addressing Scenarios 3a and 3b, the present cost of monitoring in Alberta must be calculated. The subgroup has not thoroughly assessed the numbers and does not yet have a proposed scenario to recommend to the team.

The team discussed the scenarios.

- Fenceline (compliance) monitoring is included to give a full picture of the complete provincial network. Part of the issue is fairness. Industry is already funding fenceline monitoring and most of the airsheds, which means they are paying a larger share than they should if the polluter pay principle were being applied fairly. One scenario is that 10% of compliance stations could be upgraded and made more useful to the public, and would then become part of the provincial network. One member thought it was important to clarify if we are talking about rolling compliance monitoring into the airsheds, because if that happens, it is no longer compliance monitoring and we want to be sure we are not double counting. We need to understand the implications of including 100% or 10% or none of compliance monitoring in the provincial network. The team would not include onsite monitoring in the provincial network and compliance monitoring is really no different. It was suggested that scenario 3a be discarded.
- One way to look at fenceline monitoring is as part of a plant's operating costs. Also this monitoring helps to characterize air quality as air leaves a plant and thus helps downwind communities know what's happening. However, the public has not had much access to fenceline data. In reality, most sites, including fenceline sites, serve more than one purpose and don't easily fit into just one of the proposed subprograms. We need a defensible number if we want to look at a site's value to several programs.

Principles and Criteria

Krista reviewed the proposed principles and criteria discussed by the Costs Subgroup. Principles that could be used to assess the scenarios are:

- Fairness – The sources of the emissions that drive the monitoring should fund/pay for the monitoring.
- Data used to build the scenario must be available and credible.
- The scenario must be administratively feasible in terms of collecting funds and calculating the allocation.
- The scenario must be saleable.
- The scenario must have long-term durability.

Funding Responsibility Matrix

Krista reviewed the proposed funding responsibility matrix, which is being considered as an objective way of determining fairness. The intent is to show the monitoring programs and who is responsible for paying; for example, for fenceline monitoring, 90% is operating cost to address the issue of fugitive emissions, and 10% is to look at background or some other characterization of emissions in the area. The subgroup intends to go through each program and see who is responsible for funding it. Then they will look at the CAC inventory and funding formula to determine how much each responsible entity would pay and decide which scenario most closely matches the numbers. At the next meeting, the subgroup will confirm if the table can meet the team's needs. The subgroup focused first on the current situation, and will then look at what the future should be to determine what is fair. The intent is to keep this tool simple, knowing that each monitoring program is designed to address an issue. If it becomes too complex, it will need to be revisited.

The team discussed the proposed funding responsibility matrix, noting that each of the responsible entities must be defined. Also, the team needs to decide if mobile emergency response monitoring is part of the provincial network or not.

It was agreed that the subgroup will recommend a scenario by the September 11 team meeting, but can't commit to having solid numbers by then. The subgroup will present scenario and principles and how they mesh, but will then go back to look at costs in more detail.

3 Team Report

The team identified and agreed on the following components and gaps that need to be filled in order to complete the final report:

1. A monitoring plan. The plan is 90% done. The team needs to review the recommendations with the goal of getting it 99% done at the next meeting.
2. A funding scenario. The Costs Subgroup is working on this.
3. A funding mechanism to ensure that funding is in place on a sustainable basis.
4. An implementation schedule.

Members noted that it could take two years to get a funding mechanism in place to ensure secure funding for the current network and additions, and it could easily be five years from the time the AMSP is accepted until it is fully implemented. Others commented that five years will be seen by some stakeholders as too long to wait, and that better air monitoring is needed to keep pace with emissions growth. The team recognized that factors such as labour and the availability of enough skilled people will be a barrier to rapid implementation. It is expected that much of the

capital expenditure will occur in the first couple of years of implementation. The team should develop milestones for the AMSP, laying out expectations for a phased implementation approach. A subsequent team or committee could then monitor implementation progress.

The team agreed to develop an implementation plan, showing the existing monitoring programs, proposed changes and a timeline for implementation.

Action 39.5: Brian Wiens will do a first draft of an implementation plan by August 15, and email to Bob Myrick, Chris Severson-Baker, and either Kevin Warren or Michael Bisaga to review and comment by Aug. 22, then prepare a second draft by Sept. 4.

The team recognized that AENV cannot commit to annual funding for the provincial network but that some interim method is needed until a long-term funding mechanism can be identified.

The team agreed to recommend that AENV should commit to proposing funds for implementation in its annual budget request and to seeking funds from other provincial government departments and from the federal government.

The federal government sets standards for emissions for mobile sources so has some responsibilities. It was agreed to not mention municipalities as a source of potential funding. The team acknowledged that municipalities make decisions about land use, which can affect emissions from transportation. However, Calgary and Edmonton, as well as other smaller cities, are part of a zone and will be captured in that way. Rural municipalities have fewer transportation alternatives. As well, there is an action item to get municipalities to this table. It could take several years to develop and implement a long-term sustainable funding mechanism that is not vulnerable to economic cycles.

The team agreed to make the following recommendations:

After two years, Alberta Environment should develop a sustainable long-term funding mechanism, particularly with respect to small and diffuse sources.

Alberta Environment should implement the new funding mechanism within two years after it is developed.

Within two years after accepting the AMSP, Alberta Environment should commit to ensuring that funding for the additional network needed to address emissions from regulated industry is funded by those emitters.

Action 39.6: Bob Myrick will test the proposed recommendations with AENV.

The team agreed that it needs to thoroughly review its draft report and revisit the recommendations to ensure they are still relevant. Bob has been working to incorporate changes to the draft report to reflect the evolution in the team's thinking since the current draft was done late last year.

Action 39.7: Bob Myrick will finish the changes to the draft AMSP report and forward to Kim to edit.

4 Team Work Plan and Budget

The team agreed that comments from the spring 2008 workshop need to be addressed. A subgroup was formed to review and sort those comments, consider how to respond to them and come back to the team with a recommendation about any adjustments that may be needed to the draft report. Proposed subgroup members are Ian Peace, Roxanne Pettipas and Mike Zemanek or Merry Turtiak. It was also suggested that if an email had not been sent to workshop participants thanking them for their input and indicating that their comments are helping to shape the report, that needs to be done.

Action 39.8: Kerra will check the files to see if the final workshop report and a cover note were sent out to participants.

Action 39.9: Kerra will organize a teleconference for the Workshop Feedback Subgroup.

The Costs Subgroup meets on August 29 and will aim to have a recommendation to the team by September 4. Ian Peace asked to join the Costs Subgroup.

The Implementation Subgroup will meet by teleconference. The subgroup will have a second draft implementation plan by September 4.

5 Next Meeting

The team agreed to hold only a one day meeting on September 11 in Calgary. Potential agenda items include:

- Cape report and key messages
- Cost subgroup report on activities and recommendations
- Implementation plan and timelines
- Workshop feedback and response
- Framing research questions that each of the monitoring subprograms would answer. (Note: Need to be cautious about the scope of this.)
- Roles and responsibilities document and responses

Environment Canada is completing a report on trends analysis in air quality, and it may be useful to the team.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 pm.