

Final Minutes



Ambient Monitoring Strategic Planning Team Meeting #37

Date: Thursday April 17, 2008
 Time: 10:00 am to 3:30 pm
 Place: ConocoPhillips, Calgary

In attendance:

Name	Stakeholder group
Kerra Chomlak	CASA
Bob Myrick	Alberta Environment
Ian Peace	Residents for Accountability in Power Industry Development
Roxanne Pettipas	ConocoPhillips
Krista Phillips	CAPP
Kim Sanderson	CASA
Chris Severson-Baker	Pembina Institute
David Spink	Prairie Acid Rain Coalition
Merry Turtiak	Alberta Health and Wellness
Kevin Warren	Parkland Airshed Management Zone
Brian Wiens	Environment Canada

With regrets:

Name	Stakeholder group
Michael Bisaga	Lakeland Industry and Community Assoc.
Findlay MacDermid	RAPID
Bettina Mueller	Alberta Environment
Keith Murray	Alberta Forest Products
Ken Omotani/ Angela Ball	TransAlta Corporation
James Vaughan	ERCB
Mike Zemanek	Alberta Health and Wellness

Action Items:

Action items	Who	Due Date
33.9: The co-chairs will brief the new Deputy Minister about informing the minister about the AMSP and funding.	Bob Myrick, Roxanne Pettipas, Ian Peace	May
37.1: Bob will take back wording for the new recommendation to AENV plus the revised principle wording and come back with revised alternative wording that is acceptable to AENV. He will advise the team by April 24 whether a call or meeting with AENV is needed.	Bob Myrick	April 24
37.2: Bob will circulate information to the team on mechanisms being used or considered to fund work on groundwater and air monitoring.	Bob Myrick	April 24
37.3 Bob will test whether AENV would be open to having a multi-stakeholder group involved in developing a long-term funding	Bob Myrick	April 30

Action items	Who	Due Date
mechanism for the diffuse and small industrial emitters.		
37.4: Bob will provide information on the links between the AMSP team and the CAS team with respect to potential recommendations regarding funding of air monitoring.	Bob Myrick	April 30
37.5: Bob will compile cost estimates for covering diffuse anthropogenic emissions across the province.	Bob Myrick	April 30
37.6: A small group comprising Bob Myrick, David Spink, Kevin Warren and Krista Phillips will assess costs for the existing portion of the proposed provincial monitoring system to determine who is now contributing, how much, and how this contribution might change with the enhanced network. This assessment will be for both annual operations and capital costs and will be done by CAC sector, including residential, and by airshed zone to the extent possible.	Bob Myrick, David Spink, Kevin Warren and Krista Phillips	
37.7: Kerra will set up a meeting of the Cost Subgroup prior to the next team meeting.	Kerra Chomlak	April 30
37.8: Kevin will contact the airshed zones to request information on the amount of revenue they get from each sector.	Kevin Warren	April 25
37.9: Kerra will email the current budget to the team.	Kerra Chomlak	April 24
37.10: Kerra will poll for a team meeting after the Cost Subgroup sets their meeting date.	Kerra Chomlak	April 25

Roxanne convened the meeting at 10:25 am. Those present introduced themselves.

1 Administration

a. Approve agenda and meeting purpose

Roxanne reviewed the agenda, meeting purpose and emergency procedures. Ian advised that the NGOs would like to have a co-chair for this team and will caucus during a break and inform the team of their decision. The team agreed to discuss the matter of funding and costs earlier in the meeting. With these amendments, the agenda was approved by consensus.

b. Approve minutes from Meeting #36 (March 13).

The minutes were approved as circulated.

c. Review action items from Meeting #36

Action item	Status
33.9: The co-chairs and other team members as appropriate will brief the new Deputy Minister about informing the minister about the AMSP and funding.	This has not yet been done. The team agreed this should be deferred until the key outstanding issues have been better addressed. The purpose of the briefing is to get support from AENV for the recommendations. With recent changes at the DM and ADM levels, these individuals also need

Action item	Status
	to be briefed. Carry forward. After the next team meeting, a date will be requested for the briefing.
36.1: Brian Free to assign team members to breakout sessions to act as recorders.	Done
36.2: Roxanne and Angela to advise Brian Free regarding workshop funding from their organizations.	Done. CAPP provided support.
36.3: Brian Free to add the CASA logo/template to all of the PowerPoint presentations.	Done.
36.4: Bob Myrick, Roxanne Pettipas, Brian Wiens, Ian Peace, Kevin Warren, David Spink to make final revisions to their PowerPoints and send them to Brian Free for final formatting and distribution.	Done.

The NGO sector advised that Ian Peace will serve as NGO co-chair.

d. AENV position regarding funding for the new network

The team discussed the March 13 email sent by Bob with AENV’s feedback. The three key issues were reviewed and Bob provided updates on AENV’s thinking, as appropriate:

- AENV can’t commit that AENV or GOA will cover funding for diffuse and small industrial emitters.
- Toxicity of the pollutant was not factored into the funding formula. Bob noted that this did not come up in the workshop, and is no longer an issue insofar as the funding formula is concerned.
- AENV agreed generally with the principles and subprograms but felt more information was needed about the dots on the map. Some people also thought too much monitoring is being proposed and it may not be implementable. Bob advised that AENV and the GOA support the plan but as the plan is implemented, the dots must be rationalized. The proposed stations need to be scientifically evaluated and assessed to avoid redundancy.

The key issue relates to how funding will be secured for diffuse emitters and small industrial emitters. AENV requests funds on an annual basis with no assurance that those funds will be provided in the GOA budget. They would like to explore other options to ensure consistent funding, such as establishing a dedicated fund for supporting air monitoring on a long-term basis, or the possible use of a regulatory mechanism to direct dollars for this purpose. In the interim, AENV is unable to commit to covering the costs for diffuse emitters, which will require some adjustments to funding principles 3 and 4.

The team discussed this information on AENV’s position, with members providing the following comments:

- Perhaps AENV could commit to prioritizing their spending in alignment with the funding principles. If the funding envelope gets bigger, AENV could increase its allocation to the AMSP, and if it is smaller, funding would still be allocated according to these principles.
- If there is a funding shortfall, would monitoring stations be dropped or would others be expected to fill the gap? The team intended that this work would become part of AENV’s core business and shortfalls would not arise.

- Timelines are needed around a longer-term funding plan. If such a plan could be done within a couple of years, then implementation of the AMSP could be adjusted to take that into account.
- Quick action is needed, especially with new airsheds being formed in the two major cities where diffuse emitters are significant sources. The proposed system would not be a significant new cost per capita if spread across the entire province.
- Previous GOA budget cutbacks have had a significant impact on environmental programs and long-term sustainable funding is key to implementing this plan; funding was a major obstacle for the previous AMSP. It would be good to develop anticipated costs for diffuse emitters and see what the numbers look like. The team needs to provide strong support to help make the case for a long-term GOA mechanism to cover ambient monitoring costs for diffuse emitters.

The team agreed to propose the following wording for a new recommendation that Bob can test with the appropriate individuals in AENV; the draft funding mechanism would be discussed in more detail at the next AMSP team meeting:

The AMSP project team recommends that:

[AENV or a multi-stakeholder group] develop a long-term sustainable funding mechanism to account for the emissions from diffuse and small industrial emitters (based on the principles) to be implemented by January 1/ April 1, 2011.

A second recommendation proposing that AENV commit a specific amount of funding each year was discussed, but not drafted at this time.

The team also discussed revisions to funding principle #3, drafting potential options for Bob to take back to AENV for discussion. There is still a hope that AENV will agree to fund the diffuse emitters' portion of the monitoring costs in the short term; members agreed to the following options, noted in square brackets:

For emitters who are not currently paying their share of the monitoring costs, the provincial government will take responsibility for obtaining the share of funding apportioned to diffuse anthropogenic emissions. Until a mechanism is in place for obtaining the funding share from diffuse emitters, the provincial government will [cover the costs directly] [take responsibility for these costs] [take responsibility for these emissions/sources] (to be discussed further: alternative wording to be developed)

Action 37.1: Bob will take back wording for the new recommendation to AENV plus the revised principle wording and come back with revised alternative wording that is acceptable to AENV. He will advise the team by April 24 whether a call or meeting with AENV is needed.

Bob advised that AENV is exploring various options for long-term funding for air monitoring, noting that a mechanism is in place to support groundwater monitoring and that it may be possible to coordinate long-term funding options with the Clean Air Strategy now being developed.

Action 37.2: Bob will circulate information to the team on mechanisms being used or considered to fund work on groundwater and air monitoring.

Action 37.3 Bob will test whether AENV would be open to having a multi-stakeholder group involved in developing a long-term funding mechanism for the diffuse and small industrial emitters.

Action 37.4: Bob will provide information on the links between the AMSP team and the CAS team with respect to potential recommendations regarding funding of air monitoring.

Another suggested approach was to align the diffuse and the large industrial sources to bring them under one umbrella; that is, establish one large fund and make funds available to all monitoring programs. However, it was noted that airsheds do more than monitor and it would not be advantageous to have airshed zones competing with each other for funding.

AENV has developed a strategy for implementing coverage of diffuse anthropogenic emissions in Edmonton and Calgary and is proceeding to consider how to implement it. Some of these emissions do come from industry (e.g., trucking), but NGOs have said they would support having these emissions covered by taxpayers nevertheless.

The team felt it needed to define “significant industrial emitters.” **It was agreed that this term refers to emitters who are required to conduct or support ambient air monitoring as part of their operating approval, and that they will pay monitoring costs in accordance with their emissions.** Those who do not have such an approval would fit into the group of emitters whose monitoring costs need special funding (small industrial and diffuse emitters).

Members agreed generally that it would be good to know what the estimated costs are for covering diffuse anthropogenic emissions across the province, and that it would help the team make its case if industry could compare what they are paying now for monitoring vs. what they are likely to have to pay with the proposed system. Industry contributes toward ambient monitoring in three ways: compliance, regional (airsheds), and provincial. The team has a cost for the provincial network, some of which is already in place and being paid for through various means. If the enhancements will cost another \$4-million, we need to determine how much of the current system is being paid for through zones, and how much of the existing zone monitoring will become part of the proposed provincial network. Workshop participants were clear that they want to know how much more it will cost and that there should be no “double dipping.” Funding could come from the provincial network for the provincial stations then zones could fund the additional stations. Compliance monitoring is on top of this. It is also important not to have two systems, where diffuse sources outside an airshed zone are treated differently from those inside a zone. In calculating the costs, it was suggested that two test cases be done for the zones: one for an existing zone and one for a new urban zone.

Action 37.5: Bob will compile cost estimates for covering diffuse anthropogenic emissions across the province, and explain to AENV reps that the total new cost we are talking about are in the 4 million range.

Action 37.6: A small group comprising Bob Myrick, David Spink, Kevin Warren and Krista Phillips will assess costs for the existing portion of the proposed provincial monitoring system to determine who is now contributing, how much, and how this contribution might change with the enhanced network. This assessment will be for both annual operations and capital costs and will be done by CAC sector, including residential, and by airshed zone to the extent possible.

Action 37.7: Kerra will set up a meeting of the Cost Subgroup prior to the next team meeting.

Action 37.8: Kevin will contact the airshed zones to request information on the amount of revenue they get from each sector.

Members agreed to defer the rest of the discussion until the next meeting, including consideration of how any funding shortfall will be managed.

2 Debrief on March 19 Workshop

Members provided their assessment of the March 19 workshop. Generally, the team felt the workshop was a success.

- There was good feedback, with participants identifying some things the team overlooked. Knowing that AENV had some concerns may have created more pressure on AENV participants, especially with apparent support from participants.
- There were no surprises in the breakout groups, which was good. People understood the team is still trying to address some issues.
- The workshop was well planned and well organized, with ample chance for people to contribute.
- There was a lot of support for what we are proposing, but also some scepticism and questions, especially around the government paying. Also, have we really thought how hard the system will be to administer and what administration costs will be? The question remains as to whether we are analyzing and providing data and how far this team goes with this aspect. Finally, there is the question of when we will see full implementation. That hasn't been tested, and the team needs to confirm that the long time lines are really necessary.
- The question arises, if we make lot of changes based on workshop comments and feedback, do we need to go back to participants or can the team decide? Team members thought if there were big changes, the team should let them know, but we don't need another workshop. Participants could be encouraged to contact their sector's representative on the team if they have concerns, but the team may want to discuss this further.
- There was good consistency from different groups, so even if some things need to be changed, we got the kind of feedback to help us move ahead.
- The workshop showed how much work the team has done; although some things need a bit more fine-tuning, there was support for the plan at a high level.
- There were a number of suggestions for wording changes, and the team needs to decide how it will respond to those suggestions.

3 Team Workplan and Budget

Kerra advised the team that not all workshop costs have been compiled, but she expects them to come in slightly under budget. The team agreed to do a written status report to the CASA Board in June and aim to present its final report in September. The deadline to have the final report will be mid-August. It was noted that the team could ask the Board for direction if funding continues to be a sticking point.

Action 37.9: Kerra will email the current budget to the team.

Action 37.10: Kerra will poll for a team meeting after the Cost Subgroup sets their meeting date.

4 CASA Updates

The team may be interested in requesting a presentation on the Clean Air Strategy work. The CAS team will be holding town hall meetings as part of its consultations.

The meeting adjourned at 3:25 pm.