

Final Minutes



Clean Air Strategy Project Team Meeting 17

December 10, 2008

10:00 am – 3:30 pm

CASA Offices, Edmonton

In attendance:

Name	Organization
Jennifer Allan	CASA
Don Bradshaw	Alberta Energy
Christine Byrne	Imperial Oil, CAPP
Peter Dzikowski	Alberta Infrastructure and Transportation
Gerry Ertel	Shell Canada, CPPI
Long Fu	Alberta Environment
Debra Gardiner	Enmax
James Guthrie	TransAlta
Tony Hudson	The Lung Association
Steve Kennett	Pembina Institute
Myles Kitagawa	Prairie Acid Rain Coalition
Alison Lewis	Graymont Western Canada
Al Mok	Suncor, CAPP
Bettina Mueller	Alberta Environment
Allan Mumby	Alberta Airsheds Council
Kim Sanderson	CASA
Anita Sartori	CNRL, CAPP
Al Schulz	CCPA
Nashina Shariff	Toxics Watch Society
Mike Zemanek	Alberta Health and Wellness

With regrets:

Name	Organization
Michael Brown	ERCB
Lawrence Cheng	Alberta Environment
Tim Goos	Environment Canada
Carolyn Kolebaba	Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties
David Lawlor	Enmax (PPA Buyers)
Jason Schultz	TransCanada
Srikanth Venugopal	TransCanada
Merry Turtiak	Alberta Health and Wellness

Action items:

Task	Who	When
12.1: Team members who identify documents of value to the Straw Dog Subgroup will prepare a short synopsis, including how it relates to the CAS, and forward the summary and the document to Jennifer.	Team members	Ongoing

Task	Who	When
16.1: Jennifer will distribute Bettina's AQMS presentation to the team.	Jennifer	Dec. 15
16.2: Team members will send any further comments or wording suggestions on the draft strategic directions to Jennifer for distribution to the SDSG.	Team members, Jennifer	Dec 12
16.3: Jennifer will post breakout group feedback from meeting 16 and any additional comments on the draft text to the Sharepoint site.	Jennifer	Dec 19
17.1: CASA will select a location for the two-day meeting in January.	CASA staff	Dec 19
17.2: Jennifer will email the presentation Bettina made to the Board to the team.	Jennifer	Done.
17.3: Al and Jennifer will review what is in the consultation report, cross-check with the goals and actions in the rolling draft, and bring a summary to the January workshop.	Al and Jennifer	Jan 9
17.4: The SDSG will develop criteria and high level guidance to determine which pollutants we need trigger levels for, as noted in Regional Planning, Goal 2.	SDSG	Dec 15
17.5: The Governance subgroup will look at roles and options in the air quality management system, particularly related to shared governance.	Governance Subgroup	Jan 9
17.6: The Beliefs, Values and Principles subgroup will further refine the slides.	BVP Subgroup	Jan 6
17.7: Team members will forward any comments they have on Part One to their co-chair and to Jennifer.	Team members	Jan 6
17.8: Team members will forward any key stakeholder dates in 2009 to Jennifer in an effort to coordinate stakeholder consultations.	Team members	Jan 12

Al Mok convened the meeting at 10:05 am. Those present introduced themselves.

1. Administrative Items

- a) **Approval of agenda and meeting objectives**
Al reviewed the agenda and meeting objectives.
- b) **Approve minutes from meeting 16**
The minutes from meeting 16 were approved by consensus. Action item 12.1 is ongoing, so it will be removed from the action item follow-up. The minutes were approved by consensus.
- c) **Action items follow up**

Task	Status
16.1: Jennifer will distribute Bettina's AQMS presentation to the team.	Carry forward.
16.2: Team members will send any further comments or wording suggestions on the draft strategic directions to Jennifer for distribution to the SDSG.	SDSG may be done with their teleconference next week. Put a deadline on this of Dec. 12.
16.3: Jennifer will post breakout group feedback from meeting	This was emailed to the team, but

16 and any additional comments on the draft text to the Sharepoint site.	Jennifer will also post on the Sharepoint site.
16.4: Team members will forward suggestions for offsite locations for the January retreat to Jennifer.	To be addressed under the budget item.

d) Budget Update

The Public Consultation Subgroup meets Dec. 16. If team members have any input to phase 3 consultations or to the public consultation budget, they should talk to their representative on the subgroup or to Sharon Hawrelak. CASA staff have determined that costs for holding the January workshop at a Calgary venue would be significantly more than Edmonton. Potential venues in Edmonton have been identified. The team agreed that CASA staff could select a location in Edmonton for the January workshop. More budget information will be available after the Public Consultation Subgroup meeting.

Action 17.1: CASA will select a location for the two-day meeting in January.

e) CASA Update

There are no new updates on other teams since the last CAS meeting. Bettina presented the CAS team's update to the CASA Board on December 9. She summarized the comments from the Board, which included:

- A request to see input from the public consultations broken down by geographic area.
- Consideration needs to be given in the CAS as to how government is accountable for responding to public complaints (e.g., from CFOs).
- A lot of information is available, the challenge is getting it to people who need it.
- With respect to data sharing, the challenges relate more to resourcing than to structure of the CASA Data Warehouse.
- The Board would like copies of the public consultation report when it is available.

Action 17.2: Jennifer will email the presentation Bettina made to the Board to the team.

f) Public Consultation Update

The "What We Heard" report is expected to ready by December 12, and will be publicly available. The team needs to consider how it will address concerns and issues raised by the public to ensure accountability. The team may wish to develop a companion document that describes how the consultation has influenced the strategy and includes some of the rationale for developing a new CAS, similar to what was previously in the rolling draft.

Action 17.3: Al and Jennifer will review what is in the consultation report, cross-check with the goals and actions in the rolling draft, and bring a summary to the January workshop.

2. Breakout Group Reports

Before beginning the breakout group activity, Myles provided more information about the concept of industrial parks, using the example of Cape Charles, Virginia's sustainable technology industrial park. He described how this community deliberately chose to deal with serious social and economic problems by twinning their economic development and environmental objectives. Examples included developing the agriculture industry while protecting productive land, and developing their heritage tourism industry while protecting natural and cultural assets.

The team briefly discussed these ideas, noting the following comments:

- What was the intention behind this initiative and were there economic incentives?
- How can we elaborate on the ideas in the CAS without adding a lot of text about sustainable development? Could we use boxes to give examples or case studies?
- Health determinants are also important. How do these link to air quality? Local food production and security may also need to be fleshed out.
- An essential question is who is our audience for the CAS? The language must be appropriate for them to understand what we mean.

3. Breakout Group Reports

The team split into two breakout groups to review and discuss the strategic directions of Governance and Regional Planning. The intent was to identify areas in the strategic directions that members can support and area where changes are needed. The Straw Dog Subgroup will review this input and discuss at its next meeting. The breakout group reports are appended to these minutes, and actions arising are noted below.

Action 17.4: The SDSG will develop criteria and high level guidance to determine which pollutants we need trigger levels for, as noted in Regional Planning, Goal 2.

Action 17.5: The Governance subgroup will look at roles and options in the air quality management system, particularly related to shared governance.

It was requested that the team delete the following sentence under Goal 1a in the Governance section: "As the department of Energy has committed to fund the air management system, no further funding from other departments is required."

4. Beliefs, Values and Principles

Myles presented version 12 of the subgroup's thinking on beliefs, values and principles, focusing on the points that the subgroup was asked to address:

- Keeping clean areas clean
- Singular economic vested interest
- Achieving harmony without tradeoffs

The subgroup noted that it wants to get agreement on the slides, then additional clarifying text will be developed for the report. The team noted several points, including some that were outside the focus areas:

- Did the team ask Albertans what they value? The response was “not directly” but these are the things the team has heard.
- We also value the health of air, land and water. This can be elaborated on in the accompanying text.
- Re minimum source performance standards: better wording is needed since different approaches are required for new and existing facilities.
- Several bullets speak to decision making; can these be combined?

Action 17.6: The Beliefs, Values and Principles subgroup will further refine the slides.

5. Part One

There was not time to review and discuss part one of the consolidated draft.

Action 17.7: Team members will forward any comments they have on Part One to their co-chair and to Jennifer.

6. 2009 Timeline and January Meeting Objectives

Jennifer had previously distributed timelines for completing the report and directed team members to it.

Action 17.8: Team members will forward any key stakeholder dates in 2009 to Jennifer in an effort to coordinate stakeholder consultations.

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 pm.

Break-Out Group Reports

Regional Planning

Report 1

Goal 1

- Intent is good, no expressed showstoppers, but test for fit with other policies
- Explain the lists' relevance to air
- Should the onus be on municipalities to do sustainability plans? Participation of other stakeholders likely needed.
- Term "clustering" not clear

Goal 2

- use of the word region is a bit unclear; do we really mean the 7 LUF regions? If so, be clear
- role of zones is a recurring message
- two concepts relating to airshed zones: administrative boundaries as zones are structured, and the other concept refers to a more realistic area about how pollutants are dispersed.
- Potential showstopper relates to developing trigger levels for all CACs
- The intent of this goal should be more than just preventing AAQ exceedances.
- Where does the authority for these regional plans come from – who owns them?

Discussion with team (follow-up responses and comments in open bullets)

- There is general acceptance of the concept of "not polluting up to levels", but if we are talking about intensively developed areas, we may be approaching those levels. What are the boundaries on this concept, if any?
 - The group didn't discuss the boundaries. The concern with the phrase is that too often it gets used as "room in the space." If the goal is only not to exceed, that almost endorses the idea that we are free to use up that headspace.
 - This relates to what requirements we have for sources in the area. Just because air quality is relatively good and we're not close to the threshold, doesn't mean that a source in the area can operate below what we consider to be the best technology of the day. Emitters have asked why they are asked to do more if there is no danger of exceeding the AAQOs.
- In an intensely developed area, new facilities are looking at BATEA, and existing facilities are doing continuous improvement. In that scenario if AAQOs were approached would it cause the same concern?
 - There could be drivers to ask for accelerated emissions reduction because of other considerations in the area. Imposing source requirements is not just about meeting AAQOs. Many factors go into considering what the limits will be. We don't want people to think that as long as they don't exceed AAQOs, they can do whatever they like.
- Both scenarios should be reflected in the CAS. Perhaps the phrase "prevent an exceedance of Ambient Air Quality Objectives" should be removed from Goal 1.

Report 2

General

- Concern about implementation and how it will be done
- Too much focus on LUF
- Plan needs to drive toward continuous improvement, considering social, economic and environmental aspects
- Re setting triggers, AENV will need to collaborate with other governments
- Need explicit statement about incorporating the sustainability element
- Consistency with regional plans?
- How will non-point sources be addressed?
- Who will be responsible for doing regional plans and decision making authority?
- No showstoppers

Goal 1

- Challenge to convince municipalities of their role. Maybe not “every Alberta municipality” needs to do a sustainability plan.
- What is the intent of 1c?

Goal 2

- When trigger levels are being set, AENV needs to work with others e.g., AHW
- Some concern re process for setting AQOs
- Too focused on AAQO and need more on pollution prevention technology

Discussion with team

- re goal 2, if some threshold is exceeded, so what? What impact do thresholds have on authority? Link to who does what and why. If region can manage, okay, if they can't who does?
- Who is our audience? If RACs in the LUF are our audience, we need to make it clear that this is aimed at them.
- re Goal 2a, we are trying to define what this early warning system would look like. We can put lot of detail and say this is what it should look like, or just tell RAC that it needs to be in their plans.
- Who owns the plans? Municipalities may have the tools to deal with non-point sources, but the LUF says regional plans will trump the MGA.
- Regional plans will be much broader, and municipalities will be one player.
- Concern about focus on municipalities as opposed to the 7 LUF regions. Looking historically at what municipalities have done, there is not a great track record. They are challenged in terms of resources, etc. Edmonton and Calgary and AUMA are not at this table and we need to have confidence that they can or will deliver what we ask. Are we also expecting smaller municipalities to take on these things?
- The 7 regions are too big from an air perspective. Municipalities may have all the same data, but they will have different tools and resources. They need to be involved but not take the lead.
- Do we mean municipalities, or the LUF regions?
 - SDSG didn't ever expect individual municipalities to take this on.
- Re page 8, paragraph that says every municipality needs to incorporate environmental considerations into their planning process. Do we want them to have a separate plan, a new one or use their existing process?

- This as an advocacy piece and we don't have the rationale to support it.
- Regional planning is necessary based on AQOs. As air quality gets worse, we need to do these things. Also, across the province there should be minimum levels for new and existing facilities no matter where you are or what your air quality is. In addition to the red, yellow, green (RYG) system, municipalities still need to incorporate air quality management into their planning processes. We are talking about something that is separate from RYG system.
- The AUMA presentation to the team in December 2007 talks about urban sustainability planning. Many municipalities are doing sustainability projects. Maybe we are saying that GOA should step forward to support and encourage the development of these plans since they have economic and social benefits too.
- What are we asking? Are we asking that the RACs incorporate air management planning or that we want to develop air management plans for all seven LUF regions? If the former, we have to give them the tools, etc. If we are saying do something like Watershed Management plans, make that clear.
- Urban form is at the subregional level in the LUF process. Goal 1 is urban form.
- Sustainable urban form is evolving like BATEA, but there currently is no place can go to say this is best urban design practice to get good air quality. Need to position as best practice and maybe have a short list of best practices.
- Concept of trigger levels is supported, but how do we select the ones for which triggers will be done? SDSG should propose some criteria and AENV should consider alternatives to doing them for all CACs.
- Physical/geographic airshed regions are the foundation for air quality management, which suggests a practical reason why we shouldn't tie our goals to the seven LUF regions.
- We don't know yet how the 7 regions will plan or how the sub-regions will work. We do know there will be a plan for Calgary and Edmonton.
- If the structure only deals with one geographic area and doesn't consider a wider air management area, this could be a problem. We can make a recommendation and say that airshed based planning is important and needs to happen in this manner for these reasons. If those airshed areas line up with the LUF regions, that should be done as much as possible, And if not, we need a mechanism to link these regions.
- The main thing is to get air considered in the regional planning model. Can we identify what would be the physical manifestation of an air management unit? Air could span several regions so this could be the catalyst for getting regions to work together.
- Unless we get Edmonton and Calgary to manage their emissions, we have a problem. Need to do this first before can get them to think about impacts on other regions.

Level of Detail

- We need to get consensus on what is the right level of detail for the CAS. Some would like to avoid identifying a specific group with specific responsibilities and producing a specific product. But if don't articulate specific expectations, concern is that there will be no ownership and no accountability.
- We should get into as much detail as possible until agreement is not possible.

- Some sections require a lot of detail, especially governance. We need enough detail that future groups can get the guidance they need. Perhaps it could go into an appendix.

Loose end: Accountability if thresholds are exceeded.

Governance

Report 1

General

- Ensure alignment with other policies
- Should specify the components of the AQMS (3a, 3e)
 - Define role of airsheds and CASA
 - Who are the players and what their roles?
 - In the context of shared responsibility model – readers need to be able to see here are the players and the role they play
- Establish detailed governance structure
 - How is ultimate governance authority deployed out to organizations?
 - How is accountability shared?

Goal 1

- How many bodies? What's the scale? Just GOA bodies? Clearly identify these
 - Does it really focus on non-point sources/orphaned issues?
 - Are we naming the governance structure? Who acts, who's accountable?
 - Legislative accountability resides in government but delegation does occur – map it
 - May not be placed appropriately
 - Policies shouldn't contradict each other.
- Bodies must consult
- Actions don't all support the goal
- Are 1a and b talking about CASA? If so, specify. (Governance subgroup says this is not CASA.)
- Does this goal really speak to two things?
 - Avoiding policy conflict
 - Assigning responsibility for orphaned issues

Goal 2

- Does “sub-regional” add confusion?
- Check language with LUF to ensure consistency

Goal 3

- actions seem to fit better under goal 1
- goal 3 reads as implementation rather than a goal
- 3e – Is this airshed monitoring zones as they are currently configured? Or is this the physical airshed zones. Airshed monitoring zones are self-determining.

Report 2

- Decouple LUF from this draft and focus more on air. This draft is too broad
- Make CAS not dependent on LUF. Refer to bodies to do them, but not that are part of LUF
- Need for multi-stakeholder processes across this governance structure. That wasn't clear in a lot of places.
- Are they all realistic and implementable? E.g., one oversight department?
- Recommendation for audit function for department, is this possible on multi-stakeholder organizations?
- There is already an appeals process for EPEA. Is it feasible to do a larger appeals process? Can this be collapsed?
- CASA may have role in implementing the framework, but this is not specific enough. If CASA has a role, we should specify what that should be.
- Re working with feds to develop AAQOs, we should focus on what Alberta does and can do, rather than try to solve a bigger problem.
- Question re role of airsheds and existing frameworks and how they fit with CAS
- Question re regulatory nature of the recommendations and how regulations fit with policy pieces; need more clarity
- Should we focus on "the what" rather than who and how to reduce level of detail

Discussion with team

- Need to be more explicit about decision-making process. Talk about what processes are already out there (e.g., one in CASA and one in GOA). Should be some direction as to which process should be used by which bodies.
- There is a difference between decision making process and authority; i.e., delegation of authority vs. who is responsible for decisions. Don't confuse these. Group needs to identify several options for the authority concept.
 - CASA can recommend policy to GOA, but the minister decides. The authority is not delegated to CASA to make the decisions. The authority stick is always in the background.
- Need to describe government's roles in this governance model: assurance, facilitation, infrastructure. Shared responsibility is part of this. If shared responsibility falls apart, GOA assures that decision will be made. Describe the established governance structure, explain exactly how it works and then we can make recommendations as needed for adjustments. Also the shared governance structure, what works, etc.

Summary

- Decouple CAS and LUF to focus on air, CAS not dependent on LUF
- Be explicit about decision-making processes and when to use; describe government roles and responsibilities re AQMS
- Goal 1 :Clarify orphaned issues, coordination
- Goal 3 – specify components of AQMS (3a, e)