

EPT and Sub-groups Public Feedback Assessment

Date: 19 September 2003
Time: 9:00 – 11:00
Place: Teleconference (403.340.7102)

In attendance:

| Name | Organization |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Justin Balko | Alberta Health and Wellness |
| Matthew Dance | CASA |
| Ian Peace | RAPID |
| Mike Kelly | TransAlta |
| Martha Kostuch | Bert Riggall |
| Christine Macken | CASA |
| Brian Mitchell | Mewassin Community Action Council |
| Nashina Shariff | Toxics Watch |
| Sari Shernofsky | CASA |
| David Spink | Alberta Environment |
| Geoff Williams | CASA |
| Ruth Yanor | Mewassin Community Action Council |

Action Items:

| Task | Who | When |
|----------------------------------|---------|--|
| ACTION: Organize a PCSG meeting. | Matthew | For the week of September 22 nd . |

Martha Kostuch convened the meeting at 9:13 am.

1. Administration

a. Approval of meeting agenda.

It was agreed that agenda items 3 and 4, 'Review of public input' and 'How is the input to be used by the EPT?' be discussed concurrently.

b. The meeting purpose.

The meeting purpose was agreed to as follows:

Discuss how to incorporate the public feedback into the draft recommendations.

c. Meeting participants

A roll call was done on the teleconference to establish meeting participants.

2. Public Meeting Overview

Sari Shernofsky provided a brief public meeting overview as follows:

- The meetings occurred on September 6th in Chestermere and September 13th in Stony Plain
- Approximately 50 people attended each meeting

- People from the local community and outlining areas were in attendance.
- There was a reasonable high level of understanding of most topics, and poor level of understanding of some topics (i.e. emissions trading).
- The workshop format worked well for these two meetings
- There was a positive tone in that people were participating and supportive

3. Review of public input and how the input is to be used by the EPT.

The following process was agreed to:

The feedback received by the public will be discussed, in general terms, according to the following headings:

- Renewable and Alternative Energy
- Energy Efficiency and Conservation
- NOx and Sox
- BATEA
- Mercury and Particulate Matter
- Greenhouse Gas
- Hotspots
- Continuous Improvement
- Transitional units
- Monitoring
- Other Issues:
 - Smell
 - Dust
 - Enforcement

It was agreed that the following questions will be addressed under each heading:

- Should changes be made to the recommendations?
- If we do, how?
- If we don't, why not?

Renewables and Alternative Energy

- There was a fair amount of support from the public for renewable and alternative energy.
- There is the barrier issue of how to get renewables and alternative energy onto the grid. The barriers are legislative and market based.

Should the draft Renewables and Alternate Energy recommendations be changed?

It was agreed by consensus that the renewables and alternative energy recommendations should not be changed because these issues were raised by the NGO's and addressed in the Renewable Sub-group recommendations. It was also noted that a 3.5% increase in renewable energy by 2008 was the best that could be done at this point and there will be additional targets after 2008.

Energy Efficiency and Conservation

- There is government support for energy efficiency and conservation and barriers identified.

Should the draft Energy Efficiency and Conservation recommendations be changed?

It was agreed by consensus that the comments made by the public have been addressed by the recommendations from the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Sub-group, or will be addressed by the implementation team. Therefore no changes to EPT recommendations are required.

NOx and SOx

Emissions Trading – Baseline versus Cap and Trade.

- There was not a consistent message or high level of understanding from the public on this topic.
- There was some resistance to emissions trading.
- Will emissions trading reduce emissions?
- People would like more emissions trading information.
- There was not a lot of input provided from the public on this topic.
- There is a big information and education challenge.
- The EPT should try to describe the benefits associated with emissions trading such as less cost and rapid emissions reductions.
- There was not a clear message from the public meetings that one or baseline or cap and trade would be favored over the other.

Should changes be made to the NOx and SOx recommendations?

It was agreed by consensus that no changes are required of the NOx and SOx recommendations.

NOx and SOx Reductions and Timing

- Most people thought that there should be faster reductions than those being proposed by the EPT.
- We did not hear anything from the public that have not been identified by the EPT.
- Timing of emission reductions is a difficult issue.
- It is important to keep in mind that the EPT is going to be agreeing to a whole package that includes, in addition to NOx and SOx, reductions in mercury and other benefits. How do we communicate this to the public?
- Also, compared to the status quo, this is a major improvement.

Should changes be made to the reductions and timing recommendations?

It was agreed by consensus that no changes be made to the NOx and SOx reductions and timing recommendations.

BATEA

- There was a desire by the public to have environmental health costs factored into the BATEA review.

- It would be very difficult to include environmental and health costs in the 5 year BATEA review. It would be more appropriate to have environmental and health costs assessed at the approvals level where more stringent plant standards can be assigned.

Should the BATEA recommendation be changes?

It was agreed by consensus that the recommendations for BATEA would not be changed.

Mercury and Particulate Matter

- We heard from the public that the technology should be put on sooner but that people were also reasonable happy with the reductions.
- Why are we not moving faster to reduce mercury emissions?
- Actually, 2009 is a quick timeline to order, have manufactured and install the mercury reduction technology. In addition, companies in the USA are already experiencing a wait time due to the lack of manufacturing capacity.

Should the draft Mercury recommendations be changed?

It was agreed that no changes would be made to the draft Hg recommendations.

Greenhouse Gases

- There was the perception by the public that the EPT approach to GHG was a sideways step.
- But, the EPT did not receive any strong advice on how to proceed.

Should the draft GHG recommendations be changed?

- The draft recommendation address the specific issues raised by the public.
- It was agreed that no changes would be made to the draft GHG recommendations.

Hotspots

- The public defines a hot spot as a geographic area with a lot of plants rather than a geographic area with a defined air quality impact.
- People were upset that the Wabamun area did not meet the criteria for hotspots.

Should the draft Hotspot recommendations be changes?

- This issue will be discussed at the next Straw Dog Sub-group meeting.
- The definition of a hotspot is not a new issue.
- It was suggested that the following be put forward to the SDSG to consider for inclusion in the hotspot definition:
 - Cumulative effects
 - Timing and volume of emissions
 - Number of emissions sources
 - Mixture of emissions

It was agreed by consensus that the SDSG would consider this input in defining Hotspots.

Continuous Improvement

- Members of the public indicated that existing plants should be required to meet new limits every 5 years.
- New approvals should be required to ratchet down emissions.
- Requiring new emissions standards for plants every five years would be prohibitively expensive. In addition, new technology may be introduced into the market, but it is may not be practice to upgrade a plant for financial reasons.
- Each plant undergoes an internal annual review for environmental performance. If environmental improvements can be gained, they are.
- It was suggested that a clear explanation of the tension between continuous improvement and grandfathering should be provided by the SDSG.

Should the draft CI recommendations be changed?

It was agreed by consensus that the draft CI recommendations do not need to be changed.

Transitional Units

- Did not hear a lot from the public on transitional units.

Should the draft transitional unit recommendations be changed?

- By consensus, no.

Monitoring and Reporting

- Input from the public was very diverse and included:
 - Real time stack monitoring
 - Access to emissions forecasts
 - Good and easy access to information
 - Public education and awareness
- The report and recommendations does deal with these issues raised by the public.
- We do have real time ambient reporting, but not stack reporting. The process of reporting stack emissions includes a check and verification of the data gathered.

Should the draft Monitoring recommendations be changed?

It was decided by consensus that there would not be any changes to these recommendations.

Other Issues

- Issues raised include dust, smell and enforcement.
- Social impacts of plant sighting.
- Media interest in export.

Should the draft recommendations addressing these issues be changed?

Dust, smell and enforcement:

These three issues have been addressed by the EPT's final report and recommendations.

It was decided by consensus that no changes to the final recommendations are required for dust, smell and enforcement.

Social impacts of plant sighting:

These concerns are addressed in the approvals process.

It was decided by consensus that no changes to the final recommendations are required for the social impacts of plant sighting.

Media interest in export:

Export is explicitly addressed in the x-factor recommendation. If large scale export occurs, a review of the EPT proposed framework will occur.

It was decided by consensus that no changes to the final recommendations are required for export.

4. Next Steps

a. Final report

Who is going to prepare a response characterizing the concerns raised by the public and how the EPT has addressed these issues and concerns?

Sari Shernofsky indicated that her contract included this work.

The following suggestions were made regarding the format of this response:

- One paragraph describing concerns and with one paragraph addressing the concerns described.
- The response should be formatted as a matrix with something like the following headings:
 1. What we heard.
 2. What we did.
 3. How and why the concerns were addressed.

Who is this response going to?

1. To be included in the EPT final report.
2. Sent to the public meeting participants.
3. On the CASA website.

Does the Public Consultation Sub-group need a final meeting?

It was decided that the PCSG would meet again to sign off on the PCSG final report.

ACTION: Matthew will organize a PCSG meeting.

What is required from the PCSG for the EPT Final Report.?

- A brief description of the process and results of the public meetings.
- The matrix of public concerns and how those concerns were addressed by the EPT.
- The detail of the public consultation process will be in the PCSG Final Report.

5. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:47.