

# Final Minutes



## Ambient Monitoring Strategic Planning Team Meeting #42

Thursday and Friday, November 20 and 21, 2008  
 Alberta Environment Offices, Red Deer

### In attendance:

Name	Stakeholder group
Michael Bisaga	LICA and PASZA
Kerra Chomlak	CASA
Linda Jabs	CASA
Findlay MacDermid	Residents for Accountability in Power Industry Development (day 2)
Kim McLeod	CASA (observer)
Bob Myrick	Alberta Environment
Ken Omotani	TransAlta Corporation
Ian Peace	Residents for Accountability in Power Industry Development
Roxanne Pettipas	ConocoPhillips/ CAPP
Krista Phillips	CAPP
Kim Sanderson	CASA
Chris Severson-Baker	Pembina Institute
Kevin Warren	Parkland Airshed Management Zone

### With regrets:

Name	Stakeholder group
Keith Murray	Alberta Forest Products Association (corresponding)
David Spink	Prairie Acid Rain Coalition
Brian Wiens	Environment Canada
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	Before March 2009
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. 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.	Merry Turtiak, Mike Zemanek	ongoing
40.3: Team members are to test Scenario 3(b) with their particular stakeholder groups and report back their findings to the next AMSP meeting.	Team members	Dec 15

<b>Action items</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>Due Date</b>
41.10: Bob will arrange for someone in AENV to put together an updated map with all the monitoring stations in Alberta.	Bob Myrick	Dec 15
42.1: Kerra will draft key messages related to the release of the Cape report and circulate to the team by Nov 25. Members will respond by Nov 28.	Kerra Chomlak, Team members	Nov 25 Nov 28
42.2: Bob Myrick will confirm if the Cape report will be posted on the AENV website and advise Kerra. If it is, the CASA website will provide a link to the report. If not, CASA will post the report. Kerra will advise the team when the report is posted.	Bob Myrick Kerra Chomlak	Dec 15
42.3: Linda or Kerra will talk to Jennifer Allan, the CAS project manager, to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) request the removal of the unbolded text associated with item 4c in the Knowledge and Information section, and</li> <li>b) suggest that the AMSP team do a presentation to the CAS team to share the AMSP team's work and discuss if there is anything the CAS can do support funding for the AMSP implementation.</li> </ul>	Kerra Chomlak or Linda Jabs	Dec 1
42.4: The CASA secretariat will prepare an estimate of costs for the team to finish up its work, review with the co-chairs and present a revised budget for the next meeting.	CASA secretariat	Dec 12
42.5: Team members will provide comments on the AMSP monitoring terms document including Monitoring Types, Monitoring Subprograms and Monitoring Stations.	Team members	Dec 9
42.6: Team members will review all the items labelled #4 in the workshop response table, and this will be the starting point for discussion at the December meeting.	Team members	Dec 15
42.7: Bob will get information from AENV's climate change staff on the criteria for applying for funding from the Ecotrust fund.	Bob Myrick	Dec 15
42.8: Mike will make changes to the Gantt chart to reflect the extended bars for the agreed-upon time frame.	Mike Bisaga	Dec 5
42.9: Bob will ask if his shop wants a presentation from the team to go over the proposed recommendations before the presentation to the board, and advise Linda.	Bob Myrick	Dec 9
42.10: CASA and Kim will prepare a short briefing note for the team that summarizes the funding recommendations, rationale, and arguments for why sectors should support them.	CASA secretariat and Kim Sanderson	Nov 25
42.11: Kerra will find out when the industry caucus is meeting and advise the co-chairs. If this date is unsuitable for the co-chairs, the industry caucus will be sent the briefing note and Kerra will poll for another date.	Kerra Chomlak	Dec 1
42.12: Kim will revise the report, address gaps, and work with Bob to identify material that may be better suited to an appendix.	Kim Sanderson, Bob Myrick	Dec. 8
42.13: Kim will extract the recommendations from the main report and include them in a separate document to be sent to the team with the briefing note.	Kim Sanderson	Nov. 25

# 1 Welcome

Roxanne convened the meeting at 10:00 and reviewed the meeting purpose and objectives.

# 2 Administration

## a. Approve agenda

Roxanne reviewed the proposed agenda. Weather pending, the team will visit the PAMZ Red Deer ambient monitoring station on the second day, so start time will be 9:00. Monitoring definitions will be included under item 4. Bob will provide an update on AENV’s perspective regarding the team’s future, as item 2d. The revised agenda was adopted.

## b. Approve minutes from October 9, 2008 teleconference

The minutes were approved by consensus.

## c. Review action items from October 9 Meeting

Action items	Status
33.9: Team representatives will brief the new Deputy Minister about informing the minister about the AMSP and funding.	To be done before March 2009
38.6: The Costs Subgroup will develop clear language for the key definitions of the types of monitoring e.g., fenceline.	Done. On today’s agenda
38.10: Bob will advise Kerra when the Cape report has been officially released so it can be posted on the CASA website. It will clearly be marked “draft.”	Done. Jim Ellis has signed off on the Cape report so it can be released, and does not need to be labelled “draft.” There will be no media release, but key messages will be developed. <b>See action 42.1.</b> The report will be posted on either the AENV website or the CASA website. <b>See action 42.2.</b>
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. 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.	Carry forward. The AMSP team has not discussed action 4a proposed in the draft CAS under Knowledge and Information. The bolded text is acceptable, but the rest of the description may not be appropriate. <b>See action 42.3.</b>
39.3: Kerra will distribute a list of CAS team members to the AMSP team, along with some of the draft text on monitoring for the CAS.	Done.
39.6: Bob Myrick will test the proposed recommendations with AENV.	Done. Bob distributed alternate wording to be discussed on today’s agenda.
40.1: Workshop subgroup to achieve consensus on key messages from workshop report and draft a cover letter/memo to be sent to workshop participants along with a copy of the workshop report.	Addressed under new action 42.1.

<b>Action items</b>	<b>Status</b>
40.3: Team members are to test Scenario 3(b) with their particular stakeholder groups and report back their findings to the next AMSP meeting.	Carry forward, assuming team agrees on scenario 3b at this meeting.
40.4: The Costs Subgroup is to take Scenario 3(b) and flesh it out to establish what the current costs are, what the future costs will be and come up with a delta that will address the transition.	Done.
40.5: Bob to check on the political saleability of a clean air fund.	This has been discussed up to the ADM level in AENV and with the DM of Energy, who advised linking this to the CAS. See action 42.3.
41.1: Linda will distribute the proposed CFO monitoring plan to the team.	Done.
41.2: Linda will distribute additional details provided by Bob on numbers in the pie chart and definitions that are included in each section.	Done.
41.3: Kerra will distribute key messages developed at the September 11 <sup>th</sup> meeting to the meeting and propose process for team to sign off on key messages before Cape report is released by AENV.	Addressed under new action 42.1.
41.4: Krista and Roxanne will advise Kerra regarding an industry member for the Implementation subgroup.	Done
41.5: Linda will send the most current draft report to the team well ahead of the retreat.	Done
41.6: Bob will see whether AENV could provide meeting space in Red Deer once retreat dates are known.	Done
41.7: Linda will poll for dates for the retreat for the week of November 17.	Done
41.8: Kerra will draft a status report for the board book and circulate to the team to review.	Done
41.9: Kerra will follow up with ENGO members to ensure they are okay with not going to the board in December.	Drop. Kerra did not formally do this. See agenda item 1d.
41.10: Bob will arrange for someone in AENV to put together an updated map with all the monitoring stations in Alberta.	In progress. Should be available for next meeting.

**Action 42.1: Kerra will draft key messages related to the release of the Cape report and circulate to the team by Nov 25. Members will respond by Nov 28.**

**Action 42.2: Bob Myrick will confirm if the Cape report will be posted on the AENV website and advise Kerra. If it is, the CASA website will provide a link to the report. If not, CASA will post the report. Kerra will advise the team when the report is posted.**

**Action 42.3: Linda or Kerra will talk to Jennifer Allan, the CAS project manager, to:**

- a) **request the removal of the unbolded text associated with item 4c in the Knowledge and Information section, and**

- b) suggest that the AMSP team do a presentation to the CAS team to share the AMSP team's work and discuss if there is anything the CAS can do support funding for the AMSP implementation.**

**d) Feedback from AENV on their position and direction to the team**

Bob advised that AENV would like the team to report to the CASA board in March 2009. If the team does not have consensus on everything, they should present what they have and indicate the level of consensus so that implementation can begin. There may be non-consensus on some items, but the team should seek agreement on as much as possible and present options to the board as required. Even with non-consensus, the team can provide direction so implementation can proceed, at least in some areas.

To present to the board in March, the team will need to sign off on the report by mid February at the latest. By January, it should be clear where there is consensus and where there is not. But the team could still make a consensus recommendation on a non-consensus issue and could also identify areas where more work is needed. Obviously, full consensus is better because all parts of the report and recommendations will be linked.

### **3 Budget and Work Plan**

Kerra reviewed the budget, noting that after including expenses for this two-day workshop, the team will have about \$1500 left in its budget. The team needs an estimate of how much more work is required to complete its tasks so that additional fundraising can be done if needed. A work plan for the rest of the project will emerge based on discussion at this meeting.

**Action 42.4: The CASA secretariat will prepare an estimate of costs for the team to finish up its work, review with the co-chairs and present a revised budget for the next meeting.**

### **4 Costs of Monitoring Network**

Krista and Bob presented a summary of the work of the Cost subgroup, reviewing the funding assumptions and principles as previously agreed to by the team (See sections 3.2 and 7.1 of the current draft report).

**Action 42.5: Team members will provide comments on the AMSP monitoring terms document including Monitoring Types, Monitoring Subprograms and Monitoring Stations.**

The following comments emerged in discussion of scenario 3b and costs of the monitoring network:

- The provincial network will be funded on the polluter pay principle.
- If costs are to be apportioned by emissions (polluter pay), industry should not be paying for transboundary stations.
- Fenceline monitoring will not be "polluter pay"; the facility will pay 100% of this monitoring if it is not rolled into the provincial network.
- A decision on what becomes part of the provincial system will be a task for the Multi-stakeholder Implementation Committee (MIC), which will look at stations in specific

communities to see if efficiencies can be gained. If an industry station is already there, the MIC would consider if it could become a provincial monitoring station. If so, the station could be upgraded, with the addition of parameters appropriate for an urban station. In other situations, it would not be appropriate to convert fenceline monitors to be part of the provincial network and these would continue to be paid for by industry.

- The costs to government would rise because of airshed monitoring that is now funded by industry, but should be funded by government (diffuse sources).
- Capital cost is based on full implementation of the AMSP. The capital costs would not occur all at once, and operating costs would also not be incurred all at once. There is likely to be ramp-up of maybe \$200,000 per year. Government costs will be doubled, and some industry sector costs will go down while others go up.
- The forestry sector advised by email that it does not support paying for monitoring. A number of forestry companies gave their equipment to airsheds and considers that contribution to still be valid.
- It's very hard to calculate the change in cost for specific industries, although some could do it themselves, based on knowledge about which companies are in zones and which are not.
- The team needs to meet with certain industry sectors (e.g., forestry, PPA buyers, cement) to explain the plan and get their feedback.

## 5 Funding the Monitoring Network

The team discussed the implications for funding if airsheds wanted to do new monitoring and what the effect would be on the overall provincial network, noting the following comments.

- This is an area of potential confusion, as the team is designing a network that it considers necessary, while zones may be doing other monitoring that is not essential but could be important to help address local or regional issues. How are those costs covered?
- Scenario 3b says those costs would be part of the provincial network, which means costs would be shared across the whole system. This could a) encourage zones to do more, b) result in the system encouraging zone to keep costs down, or c) identify a provincial need for new components to the overall system.
- A regional emissions formula might show that monitoring costs are \$10/tonne in WBEA where they do a lot of monitoring, vs \$1/tonne in PAS. In WBEA, we know a lot of emissions will occur in the future so they are trying to understand the situation in advance, which is partly why they do so much monitoring. Should some of those additional expenses be hived off?
- Some things have already been excluded (e.g., TEEM in WBEA). Perhaps this should be more explicit in the write up.
- In other cases, such as mercury monitoring in WCAS, the industries that emit mercury cover those costs directly.

The implications of the funding scenario need to be made clear for stakeholders, noting:

- What monitoring is included and what is not
- The intent is not to exclude airsheds from pursuing regional solutions, but not to burden others.
- Monitors are there to serve a provincial purpose.

- The funding formula now includes the things that airsheds do on a regional basis to address their local air quality issues.

The funding formula needs to be simple, objective, open, transparent, and understandable, and have a consistent charge per tonne of emissions. The existing system still stands for the compliance monitoring box shown in the summary of scenario 3b. In new areas where there is no zone, new proponents would pay their own capital and operating costs. If the new development is in an area where there is an airshed, the usual approach would be followed (the facility does compliance monitoring for a period of time, complaints are assessed, etc.), then a decision would be made on whether the new facility will be brought into the airshed monitoring program. At present, that decision is made by AENV. Should the MIC consider if stakeholders can have input on whether a facility can change from compliance to airshed monitoring and what the criteria would be?

Some questions were raised about what gets monitored by transboundary stations and who pays for those stations, which are currently included in the funding formula. The team affirmed its commitment to have a transboundary/background monitoring subprogram. The plan includes ten stations for this subprogram, five on the west and five on the east, but the intent is that the MIC will assess and decide what number is adequate. In most cases, these stations will serve at least two subprograms (transboundary and background) and in some cases the ecosystem subprogram too.

*The team tentatively agreed that the provincial funding formula will apply to all monitors in the provincial system. The provincial system is defined as the seven subprograms being recommended. The MIC will have authority to change some of the monitors in the plan. When the MIC applies the funding formula, it should compare provincial average emissions/tonne to regions, especially in emission growth areas, and should then address any differences.*

An outstanding question is what does this mean in real dollars for each sector over the next five years?

Airsheds are multi-stakeholder organizations and every stakeholder knows the role they play in the zones. AENV is on all airshed boards and is expected to be responsible for flagging any anomalies or inconsistencies (e.g., \$10,000 cost vs \$1,000 cost for same thing in two different zones).

## **6 Workshop Feedback and Response**

The team did not have time to review the workshop report and the table developed by the subgroup.

**Action 42.6: Team members will review all the items labelled #4 in the workshop response table, and this will be the starting point for discussion at the December meeting.**

*In response to a workshop suggestion that a meteorological subprogram be developed, the team agreed that this is outside the scope of its report, and that by implementing the AMSP, more and better met data will be gathered.*

*In response to a workshop suggestion that a transboundary station be established in Saskatchewan to monitor emissions from Alberta, the team agreed to consider:*

- *A recommendation about looking for opportunities to share data with adjacent provinces to east and west to the benefit of both jurisdictions. The final report may have a section on future work, which is where such a recommendation could go.*
- *Another potential recommendation for future work is the need to devote more resources to air quality management training to increase capacity in Alberta.*

## **7 Implementation Timelines**

Mike Bisaga presented a short report from the Implementation subgroup, including a Gantt chart showing the proposed implementation schedule. It will be important to have the right people involved in making decisions about the funding and implementation plans to ensure timely implementation. The subgroup developed principles to guide the process of prioritizing the various projects and deciding which stations to put in first. These principles were later ranked to give the MIC guidance; the rankings and associated discussion appear below.

The subgroup concluded the cost would be about \$20-million to implement over six years, with a significant funding commitment required from AENV. The team recognized it would be hard for AENV to commit the required funding each year. AENV would need to get funds from somewhere other than the standard monitoring budget, as that annual budget won't be increased. Possible options include the federally-sponsored Ecotrust fund, to which airsheds may have to apply (deadline is mid-July). These funds have been transferred to the province already, and must be spent on climate change or clean air initiatives.

### **Action 42.7: Bob will get information from AENV's climate change staff on the criteria for applying for funding from the Ecotrust fund.**

Team members made the following comments while discussing implementation and associated funding:

- Funding roles and responsibilities must be clear. AENV is agreeing to fund its share for diffuse emissions, and the GoA needs flexibility to do this. If the team can get consensus, it will help the GoA, but they have to figure out how to do it.
- The GoA has not agreed to the funding formula, timing for implementation, or interim funding, and it is uncertain when a decision will be made. Bob is hoping for feedback within the next month. AENV will implement what they can with the money they have, which may amount to \$250,000 per year, or about 25% of what the full implementation plan requires. AENV can request the funds from Treasury every year, but there is no certainty they will be allocated. AENV needs to discuss these issues internally and it may be helpful for the team chairs to meet with AENV executive after that discussion.
- Team members need to be able to explain to their stakeholders why they should support the plan. Since the biggest change in cost would accrue to the GoA under the new plan, it



is critical for senior people in AENV to understand the issues and be able to participate in a thorough discussion at the CASA board level.

### Ranking of Implementation Principles

The team agreed to include the implementation principles in the final report as guidance to the MIC, and to provide context at the beginning of the implementation sector of the report. The MIC should undertake implementation systematically and in order, considering the funding situation. This guidance will help them do an annual work plan for implementation. It will also be important in the report to note that all the recommendations are linked and they must be considered in the context of the entire report.

Two principles were considered most important:

1. Commitment to implementing external commitments to this process, specifically the PM and ozone management plans.
2. Filling in the biggest gaps where monitoring is lacking, according to the seven subprograms. For example, three of the five transboundary stations could be in the WCAS and the MIC could then prioritize these three sites. It will be important to ensure that the decision to do something at one site is aligned with all the implementation principles.
  - Biggest gaps are where there are the biggest uncertainties. The task is to figure out where to put stations so you can be certain that when you collect data, the data are representative of the entire province. The gap in data quality needs to be filled to ensure that monitoring data are obtained that meet the objectives of the subprogram.

The remaining principles are things to keep in mind while doing an annual work plan:

- Gaining efficiencies in existing monitoring by combining efforts and reducing duplication. This is aimed at existing monitoring; e.g., adding or upgrading facility-specific compliance monitoring and rolling it into the provincial system rather than setting up a new station
- Balanced workload over time to ensure it is manageable economically
- Reasonable implementation timeframe for the monitoring itself (not necessarily over the short term)
- Based on available emissions forecasts, areas with increasing emissions should have monitoring priority
- Create efficiencies by implementing monitoring that will address more than one program and/or objective. This principle is more focused on new monitoring; if a station will address more than one objective, it should be a higher priority.
- Practicality in implementation – implement those things in the short term that are relatively quick and inexpensive to implement

The Implementation subgroup assumed that implementation would start following CASA board approval and could be done in four years. The four-year implementation plan is estimated to be \$4-million in capital cost, with operating costs of \$7-million, so after four years total cost is estimated to be \$11-million. If the funds can be secured, how long will it take to implement the plan? The following points were noted in discussing the time frame:

- Is the time frame realistic? For example, are there enough people with the right skills in Alberta to implement in four years? For sites with an existing trailer, it

takes three months to get the equipment in. Without a trailer, it would take six months to get the infrastructure and integrate into the system.

- Airsheds need a year to start planning for new stations, as they have to work within their budget cycle and in consideration of contractor requirements.
- It will take a few months to set up the MIC after the March board meeting.
- Proposed time frames ranged from four to six years.

*The team agreed that it would test with stakeholders a time frame of four years for all funds and equipment to be allocated, and five years for the full system to be operational. This still amounts to a total of \$11-million over four years.*

**Action 42.8: Mike will make changes to the Gantt chart to reflect the extended bars for the agreed-upon time frame.**

## **8 AMSP Recommendations**

The team discussed recommendations that could be tested with stakeholders. The intent was to have a defined, predictable funding mechanism to ensure that new monitoring is covered, and that provides flexibility in terms of collecting funds fairly. For airsheds to proceed with implementation, they need assurance that funding will be certain. For new monitoring, it is likely that industries that are already paying will pay a little more, those that are not paying now will get a bigger hit, and at the end of four years, it will balance out. Zones will work toward aligning their funding formulas with whatever the team recommends.

### *Preamble and recommendation for funding for the first four years:*

*During the first four years, things will continue as they presently are – the provincial backbone, zones, etc. – and AENV will continue to contribute to this monitoring. The team is proposing that the funding formula be phased in, as described below, to provide certainty for the first four years. Estimates are based on government providing 75% of the \$11-million required, and industry providing 25%.*

- 1. AENV commits to request annual funding through the GoA budgeting process for small industrial emitters and diffuse emitters.*
- 2. Large industrial emitters fund their portion of the new provincial network according to the funding formula.*
- 3. For industrial emitters that don't provide funding voluntarily, AENV commits to pursue payment through regulatory mechanisms.*
- 4. The GoA commits to cover any shortfall not captured by the above funding recommendations for this special arrangement.*

*To ensure long-term sustainable funding for the AMSP (i.e., after the first four years), the team recommends that Alberta Environment develop within two years, and implement in the subsequent two years, a sustainable long-term funding mechanism that ensures equitable contributions from large and small emitters.*

AENV is presently allocating about \$1.25-million per year to air monitoring. Seventy-five percent of \$11-million over four years is \$8.25-million, or about \$2-million per year, nearly double the current

amount. For the GoA, it will be important to link the benefits and rationale to the vision in the AMSP.

The team agreed that members need a solid rationale to use in discussions with their stakeholders about why the new network is needed and why it should be supported. These points should be linked to the objectives of the new network. Points include:

- The present network is not adequate to answer the questions we have about human health, acid deposition, monitoring of smog formation, etc.
- The monitoring network needs to be responsive to emerging issues and growth.
- The last plan was not fully implemented, so catch-up is needed.
- Monitoring is an important foundation of cumulative effects management.
- The new network will:
  - Double the size of the acid deposition network
  - Add population-based monitors at three to five locations to improve monitoring in large urban centres
  - Add four to five new transboundary stations
  - Increase the passive network to cover the whole province
  - Increase PM and ozone monitoring upwind and downwind of affected areas

**Action 42.9: Bob will ask if his shop wants a presentation from the team to go over the proposed recommendations before the presentation to the board, and advise Linda.**

**Action 42.10: CASA and Kim will prepare a short briefing note for the team that summarizes the funding recommendations, rationale, and arguments for why sectors should support them.**

## 9 Next Steps

For the team's final report to be included in the March 2009 board book, it must be finished by February 16.

Work plan for the next few months includes:

1. Team members to brief sectors to get buy in for the proposed funding approach before the CASA board meeting on December 9.
2. Team members need to share final text of board report with stakeholders. This text needs to be ready for stakeholder review by January 15.
3. Next meeting Dec 15 in Calgary.

Team members should have a special meeting with sectors that have not been directly engaged with this team (e.g., forestry, CCPA, agriculture, cement, mining). This could occur when the CASA board's industry caucus meets prior to the December 9 board meeting.

**Action 42.11: Kerra will find out when the industry caucus is meeting and advise the co-chairs. If this date is unsuitable for the co-chairs, the industry caucus will be sent the briefing note and Kerra will poll for another date.**

## 10 Next Meetings

The next meetings will be:

- Monday, December 15 in Calgary
- Wednesday, January 14 in Edmonton
- Monday, February 9 in Calgary

Team members should raise any showstoppers from their sectors at the December meeting, which will include the following agenda items:

- Final report and recommendations
- Workshop report, with the aim of reviewing and signing off on the report and feedback to participants

A final report for stakeholder review will be prepared after the January 14 meeting, with the aim of having all stakeholder input by February 1.

The team will aim to sign off on its final report and recommendations to the CASA board at the February 9 meeting.

**Action 42.12: Kim will revise the report, address gaps, and work with Bob to identify material that may be better suited to an appendix.**

**Action 42.13: Kim will extract the recommendations from the main report and include them in a separate document to be sent to the team with the briefing note.**

The meeting adjourned at 2:30.