

Final Minutes



Clean Air Strategy Project Team Meeting 10

April 28, 2008

10:00 – 3:30

TransCanada Offices, Calgary

In attendance:

Name	Organization
Jennifer Allan	CASA
Angela Ball	TransAlta Corporation (alternate for Ken Omotani) (morning only)
Len Bracko	Alberta Urban Municipalities Association (by phone)
Michael Brown	ERCB
Kerra Chomlak	CASA
Debra Code	Enmax
Peter Dzikowski	Alberta Infrastructure and Transportation
Long Fu	Alberta Environment (by phone)
Tim Goos	Environment Canada (by phone)
Sharon Hawrelak	CASA (by phone for item 4)
Tony Hudson	The Lung Association
Steve Kennett	Pembina Institute
Myles Kitagawa	Prairie Acid Rain Coalition (alternate for Martha Kostuch)
Caroline Kolebaba	Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties (by phone)
Al Mok	Suncor, CAPP
Bettina Mueller	Alberta Environment
Kim Sanderson	CASA
Anita Sartori	CNRL, CAPP
Victor Tanti	Calder Batemen (by phone for item 4)
Srikanth Venugopal	TransCanada
Mike Zemanek	Alberta Health and Wellness

Facilitators

Arden Brummell	Scenarios to Strategy Inc (S2S)
Greg MacGillivray	Scenarios to Strategy Inc (S2S)

With regrets:

Name	Organization
Christine Byrne	Imperial Oil, CAPP
Gerry Ertel	Shell Canada, CAPP
Alex MacKenzie	Alberta Health and Wellness
Ken Omotani	TransAlta
Jason Schultz	TransCanada
Nashina Shariff	Toxics Watch Society

Action items:

Task	Who	When
10.1: Bettina will provide the CCME information on airsheds to the team.	Bettina Mueller	May 7
10.2: Jennifer and the public consultation subgroup will set up a teleconference this week with interested team members to discuss revisions to the discussion guide and the timing. A proposal will be brought to the team Monday May 5.	Jennifer and the public consultation subgroup	May 1

Steve Kennett convened the meeting at 10:10 am. Those present introduced themselves. Steve asked the group to pause and silently reflect on the recent passing and contributions of Martha Kostuch to this team, to CASA and to Alberta.

1. Introduction and Review Meeting Objectives

The agenda and meeting objectives were reviewed and approved. Srikanth and TransCanada were thanked for hosting the meeting.

2. Framework

The facilitators suggested that the team needs to think broadly about the Clean Air Strategy, but also needs to bring the content into a suitable structure that is simple and easy for people to understand and relate to. They proposed three main areas of discussion for this meeting:

- Discuss the structure for the report to give it a clearer framework.
- Identify the key themes and directions that characterize the overall strategy.
- Talk about the focus areas noted previously. What are they and how could they be laid out?

Greg began by reviewing the strategy pyramid, which was later distributed by email to the team. The consultants suggested some ideas for what the team might include in each section of the pyramid, from vision down to implementation and measuring success. Members made a number of comments about the framework; comments from S2S are noted in open bullets:

- We need to consider what the intended use of the CAS will be. The GOA is a user and has a role but others are also involved in managing air quality. How does what emerges from our work provide useful guidance? We should not engage in the work they will do as part of implementation.
- Goals need to be associated with the desired future state, not derived from main components. They should emerge as measures of components.
 - Goals could be identified under strategic directions, although they might be different kinds of goals than those further down the pyramid.
- We need higher order goals that are derived from our vision. It may be more appropriate to have objectives appear further down. Objectives are what you implement to get to the end state. In terms of process, as we develop the strategy, do we not consider if the goals

and other elements are aligned with the strategic direction? The team has not yet completed its work in the higher orders of the pyramid.

- In the end, everything needs to be consistent with the principles and values.
Strategic directions are paramount, along with principles, vision and mission.
- Strategic directions are tools to help us achieve our goals. Maybe strategic directions are really principles and values; e.g., is pollution prevention a strategic direction or principle?
 - The team needs to ask what has changed from 1991. Strategic directions are key and we need to talk about them in a context that makes sense.
- Goals should guide how you choose strategic directions, not vice versa. A goal might be that Alberta's air quality is among the top ten in North America. A strategic direction could be to ensure the point source system continues to work effectively and non-point source management is developed to be equally good.
- Water for Life does not have a vision; it has goals and outcomes which are similar to what we have under vision. Maybe we should look at the questions on the right side of the vision, as these seem more like high level goals.
 - It might help to see how the pyramid applies to the table of contents and if it can help to clarify the TOC. What are the big thrusts and key points of the CAS?
- We are trying to move from the details to a higher level and we don't want to throw out any ideas developed to date. What are the overarching themes we want to get at? We need a comprehensive strategy that reflects big, bold, long-term thinking.

The team briefly reviewed the themes that emerged from the interviews done as part of the stakeholder consultations and considered how those and other ideas could be incorporated into the team's work. The following points were noted:

- We should ensure the whole province is covered by airsheds.
- We are really talking about minimizing emissions, which can be done through pollution prevention and back end controls.
- A key theme is behaviour and values, especially related to public values, and the ability of the system to respond to those values.
- Some ideas are subsets of others. We should pick 4-5 key strategic directions, then as we discuss other ideas, try to fit new ones under those 4 or 5.
- Reducing emissions is connected to air quality. If our goal is to keep Alberta's air clean, we have to minimize emissions of air pollutants from all sources.
- It seems that two distinct strategic premises are informing our work. One asks if we have to do anything; that is, do we even think there is a problem, and if so, we only respond when harm is proven. This is a reactionary approach, as opposed to pollution prevention and keeping clean areas clean, which presumes that lowering emissions is better and that action won't wait until there is conclusive proof that the air is dirty. Did the team not decide that this more anticipatory, proactive approach is the one we would adopt?
- It's hard to tell what parts are in good shape and what needs attention. This work has to be reconciled and rooted in our emissions inventory. Are we really hitting the high points? We want the CAS to be about avoidance, not reactive, and we need to make the case for that approach. We should not assume we don't have a problem.

- What is acceptable clean air quality? What does it mean? How do we deal with it? Air quality in Alberta is relatively good most of the time. Maybe we should ask Albertans if it is okay that some areas have worse air quality so others can have better air quality.

The team brainstormed ideas about what the major elements of the CAS could be. They will need to capture people's imagination and help them understand the directions the team recommends government take. Then the team worked to slot the brainstormed ideas into the four major theme areas that emerged:

1. Pollution Prevention

- Future oriented (“bending the curve”); we want the CAS to look forward to figure out what we can do now to avoid future problems.
- Use industrial ecology as a tool to move from linear to closed loop thinking (cause and effect relationships); this would also help to bend the curve.
- Need continuous improvement mechanisms, as current regulations and standards do not encourage industry to incorporate continuous improvement
- Must be participatory

2. [Regional] [Airshed] Planning

- Proactive planning to better manage non-point source emissions.
- Regional planning (airsheds – management not just monitoring)
- Establish airsheds across the entire province – include public education
- Cumulative effects from both multi-pollutant and multi-source perspective

Note: Some members wanted to see the heading for #2 called Regional Planning with airsheds under it, while others thought the heading should be Airshed Planning, with regional planning as a subsection. Some concerns were expressed about suggesting there are clear boundaries for airsheds.

3. Governance

- The CAS should be an enabling, comprehensive and integrated document that provides a framework for a governance system and decision making, clarifying roles and responsibilities of government, industry and others.
- Accountability and measurement
- Prioritize
- Policy elegance – adopt integrated approaches that satisfy multiple policy objectives.
- Don't impose injustice with respect to air quality, protect right to clean air, minimum environmental standards for air quality.
- Proactive planning to better manage non-point source emissions.

4. Knowledge, information, and awareness pointing toward changing behaviour

- Knowledge and information – research, education and awareness
- Behaviour/value change
- Monitoring and measuring progress; assessment

Two ideas from the brainstormed list cut across more than one theme area:

- Developing a plan for non-point sources
- Transportation planning

It was noted that the CAS should be results driven, but this might better be called a value or principle.

The team reached consensus on three areas that would be called “strategic directions” for the CAS: pollution prevention, governance, and knowledge and information with the intent of leading to behaviour change. It was noted that further wordsmithing may be needed on these three headings.

The team agreed to do further work on regional/airshed planning and to look at potential options, including assessing the views of team stakeholders on a preferred approach.

Action 10.1: Bettina will provide the CCME information on airsheds to the team.

3. Framework for Focus Areas

The facilitators suggested the team should work to simplify the framework for the focus areas. The list from the workshop is reflected in the current table of contents:

- Cumulative effects
- Urban air quality
- Energy
- Industrial point sources
- Area sources
- Agriculture and forestry
- Indoor air quality

One idea was to group these into urban, rural and industrial categories. For example, if we look at the urban category, what are the big challenges related to urban air quality? This might include vehicles, area sources, design and prevention. In other words, under that title there may be 3-4 big issues that we identify as key for the CAS to address, and the team may want a goal under each of these.

Team members made the following comments:

- Are we designing how we are going to address these areas for the purpose of the discussion guide? These points could lead people if they appear in a public document; we want to strike a balance in how we ask for their input and not lead them too much. Aren't we supposed to take the 3-4 strategic directions and apply them to the problems embodied in the list of 7 (i.e., apply them to the problems associated with energy, urban form, etc. and come up with actions)? The consultations should help us identify what issues people want the CAS to address, and these seven are likely not too far off.

- Another way to think about it is whether those are the things for which we need to develop goals. The focus areas are more like issues. This list of seven may not remain as it is in the eventual CAS. The next logical step would be to identify high level goals and outcomes that affect air quality. We can set goals for these 3-4 strategic directions, or we can take the 7 areas and try to build them up.
- The urban, rural, and industry categories are not appropriate. They should not be pulled apart and artificial boundaries created.
- We need to better line up the data and trends to ensure that whatever issues we end up with can be justified; e.g., transportation is noted as an issue, but data suggest declining emissions for VOCs, PM and CO.

The team discussed pollution prevention as a strategic direction to try and determine some goals. The following were noted:

- The air quality “print” is understood and acceptable to all Albertans.
- The public is engaged and motivated to participate in the system.
- Alberta is in the top ten jurisdictions in clean air technology adoption (the metric could be the lowest per capita emissions).
- Limits and interventions to “bend the curve” are well understood.
- Urban and industrial systems minimize emissions by avoiding pollution at the design stage.
- Alberta makes major investments in alternative energy sources, significantly shifting the ratio of alternative to conventional energy.
- Mass transit infrastructure is easily accessible.
- Management system provides flexibility mechanisms to reduce emissions beyond compliance (flexibility includes allowing technology innovation).
- Adopt approaches that achieve multiple policy objectives – policy elegance – for water, energy efficiency, etc.
- Paradigm shift to systems thinking so emissions are prevented.
- Use industrial ecology as a tool to move from linear to closed loop thinking (cause and effect relationships).
- Life cycle analysis of alternatives.
- Limits are identified and clearly understood so we know what intervention is needed to ensure we never reach the limits.

The facilitators noted that these may not all be strategic goals, but just because goals are being set further down, doesn’t mean they aren’t strategic. The team should flesh out what it means by these four strategic directions then use that language to build goals. That will also be the language used to set goals further down the pyramid. Goals may not be needed for the 3-4 strategic directions. Pollution prevention does not easily translate into a goal, for example.

The team may want to consider goals for the strategic directions instead of applying each strategic direction to each focus area. This way, the strategy could recommend a few major actions as opposed to many recommendations. The team felt that each strategic direction should be flushed out in terms of its meaning, then the team can decide if goals will be identified.

Generally, the team agreed that work should begin to build the rationale and the basis for a new CAS. The trends data and information can contribute to building this story. The story will also have to explain how Alberta's efforts align with those of others (federal, municipal, etc.).

This was the last meeting for which Arden and Greg have been retained to work with the team. On behalf of the team, Steve thanked them for their guidance in helping the team get off the ground.

4. Team Timelines and Public Consultation

Sharon Hawrelak and Victor Tanti joined the meeting by phone for this item. The team has been working intensively to get the discussion guide ready for upcoming public consultations, and discussed the status of the guide and next steps. Victor and Sharon responded to questions and comments by the team. Their comments are noted with open bullets.

- One sector had concerns related to the product of the public consultation. They were uncomfortable with the approach, feeling that the consultations should be asking the public what they would like to see a new CAS address, rather than have leading questions and a town hall-type forum. A lot of thinking has gone into key areas in the discussion paper, but some things like agriculture and forestry emissions are uncertain; e.g., the paper says agriculture is an issue, but doesn't say what the issues are, and CASA has already dealt with CFOs. Further, the Alberta Energy strategy is going to address things like renewables so we don't want the public to think that will be a big part of the strategy.
 - Reference points are important for a consultation. Without 'anchors' the conversations can be all over the place, making it difficult to tabulate into meaningful input for the team.
 - Part of the purpose of the consultations is to test the focus areas and gauge response from both the public and stakeholders, and to measure the intensity of feelings. Although the team can establish points of reference, they want to ensure ample opportunity for people to respond with other ideas.
- A key concern is that the discussion guide does not present the underpinnings and context for the reference points.
 - It is important not to make the guide too technical. Everyone must be able to understand it, but data and more context could be added to some sections.
- The content must be correct, it must be at a high level and strategic to start the discussion. Would it help to present it so people understand these are not the only areas to be discussed?
- We could reframe some parts; e.g., discussing cumulative effects is part of the argument for why we need a new strategy. It could be acknowledged as a driver. Or perhaps we could introduce ideas to prompt the public without specifically naming issues or saying what we think we need to take action on; for example, here are issues we are considering in developing the Clean Air Strategy. We need to be sensitive to the possibility of provoking a big negative response if people end up thinking their sector is being portrayed as the problem.
- We need to better tell the story and have a rationale for why we think there are concerns, and where we will end up if nothing is done. What are some driving forces that affect air quality?

We can use simple graphics and text to show where emissions come from and provide better context.

- We risk missing the boat by trying too hard to articulate problems rather than identifying opportunities that sectors have to create better air quality. This isn't about how do we fix problem A or B.
- Depending on the intent, do we want to ask people what they think the solutions should be?
- The subgroup does not feel it can complete the task now being requested by the team, and the consultant may or may not be able to rewrite the controversial sections of the guide.
 - If the guide is not ready for printing in the next week, it will be a challenge to proceed with the current schedule. The first date is May 12, and people need a reasonable time to prepare and respond. If the spring window for consultation is missed (up to mid-June), public meetings can't happen until after mid-September.
- In northern Alberta, there might be better participation in late June as this is expected to be a late spring and rural residents won't be available until after mid June.
- One option is for the team to continue to work, do an initial round of consultation via the Internet, then have public meetings in the fall.
 - The town hall meetings will include an overview of the process, the people will have some discussion to identify focus areas and other areas they want to talk about followed by discussion about where they are at in their thinking.
- We are going out to get ideas, not defend a position. Team members with a keen interest in this matter could work to identify the gaps in the guide, figure out how to address them, then determine if there is time to make the changes and still proceed with the current consultation schedule.
- The November minutes identified three pieces that the team was looking for in the discussion paper and consultation plan. They do not appear in the current version and need to be added.
 - The consultant does not have the information to write the air quality context section(s) requested. CASA does have more technical information, but this must be addressed carefully so it's understandable and does not intimidate people or limit the group that is able to use the information and respond to it.
- Another option is to move pieces like cumulative effects to sections that say why we need a new CAS, and for other areas, use "ice breaker" sentences. We want people to react to things that affect air quality.

The things to be done are: 1) add content and context to frame the issues and provide some rationale by adding information on emissions, 2) consider what we are asking the public to focus on (do we want them to suggest solutions?), and 3) determine timing for revisions and the consultations. This must be resolved by May 5 to ensure time for revisions, printing and distribution of the guide prior to the town hall meetings.

Action 10.2: Jennifer and the public consultation subgroup will set up a teleconference this week with interested team members to discuss revisions to the discussion guide and the timing. A proposal will be brought to the team Monday May 5.

5. Next Steps

The next meeting will be May 21 in Edmonton. Starting in June, the team will meet on the second Tuesday of every month.

The meeting adjourned at 3.30 pm.