

Final Minutes



Ambient Monitoring Strategic Planning Team Meeting #19

Date: Tuesday 19 September, 2006
Time: 10:00 – 3:30
Place: TransAlta 110 – 12th Avenue SW, Calgary

10035 108 ST NW FLR 10
EDMONTON AB T5J 3E1
CANADA

Ph (780) 427-9793
Fax (780) 422-3127
Email casa@casahome.org
Web www.casahome.org

In attendance:

Name	Organization
Rob Bioletti	Alberta Environment
Matthew Dance	CASA
David McCoy	Husky Oil / Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers
Bob Myrick	Alberta Environment
Ken Omotani	TransAlta Utilities
Roxanne Pettipas	ConocoPhillips Canada / Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers
Chris Severson-Baker	Pembina Institute
James Vaughan	Alberta Energy and Utilities Board
Ian Peace	Residents for Accountability in Power Industry Development

Regrets:

Name	Organization
Karina Bodo	Alberta Health
Findlay MacDermid	Residents for Accountability in Power Industry Development
Myra Moore	Fort Air Partnership
Keith Murray	Alberta Forest Products Association
Mike Pawlicki	Lafarge Canada Inc.
George Pfaff	Petro-Canada Edmonton Refinery / Canadian Petroleum Products Institute
Kim Sanderson	CASA
B.J. Vickery	Lafarge Canada Inc / Alberta Chamber of Resources
Brad Watson	Lafarge North America
Kevin Warren	PAMZ, PASZA, PAS, WCAS
Brian Weins	Environment Canada

Action Items:

Task	Who	When
9.2: Load the data to the web site and provide the working group with access information.	Matthew	ASAP
14.1: Forward the parameters that are included in the SO2 and NOx forecasts to Matthew and the team.	Matthew	Ongoing
18.8: Compile a short document that cross-references workshop questions to sections of the report where these questions are addressed, or to other documents as appropriate.	Matthew	December
19.1: Invite Kevin and Myra to join the Implementation and Funding sub-group.	Matthew	ASAP
19.2: Invite the DC9 to join the team	Matthew	ASAP
19.3: Forward Bob's map to the team.	Matthew	ASAP

Final Minutes

Bob Myrick convened the meeting at 10:00 am.

1. ADMINISTRATION

a. Introductions

Introductions were made around the table.

b. Approve agenda and meeting purpose

Bob reviewed the agenda and meeting purpose. The agenda was approved as tabled.

c. Approve minutes

The minutes from the last meeting were approved as tabled.

d. Review action items

Task	Status
9.2: Load the data to the web site and provide the working group with access information.	Carry forward.
14.1: Forward the parameters that are included in the SO ₂ and NO _x forecasts to Matthew and the team.	On going.
18.1: Consult with Chris Severson-Baker about having an NGO co-chair for this team and who should take on this duty, and advise Matt.	Findlay did confirm with the NGO Caucus that he will take on the role of NGO chair for this team.
18.2: Consult with AENV to determine before the next meeting who will serve as the government co-chair.	Bob confirmed that he will sit as the government interim chair.
18.3: Organize a co-chair's meeting prior to the next team meeting to discuss chairing duties.	Not done.
18.4: Talk to individuals in the health sector and convey the team's messages to them and encourage them to develop better lines of communication around this project.	Complete
18.5: Invite the Calgary Health Region to join the team and advise that they would need to work with other health regions to provide an integrated perspective.	Carry forward
18.6: Confirm with Alberta Agriculture, Food and Rural Development and CASA industry representatives to determine if they are satisfied with the current situation and if they would like to join the team. It may also be prudent to contact the NRCB.	Complete
18.7: Update the guidance tools section, incorporating feedback from the workshop, and will add information on case studies.	Complete
18.8: Compile a short document that cross-references workshop questions to sections of the report where these questions are addressed, or to other documents as appropriate.	Carry forward to December
18.9: Draft a letter to CHR, for signature by the co-chairs, and will circulate the draft to the team for comment.	Complete. Matthew will forward to the CHR ASAP.
18.10: Set up the small groups, forward any information pertinent to their topic, and poll for dates for at least one teleconference for each group in August.	Complete
18.11: Contact Myra and Karina to get them into one of the small groups.	Carry forward
18.12: Poll for dates for a full team meeting in mid-September.	Complete.

Final Minutes

1. Sub-group Updates

a. Data and Information Management

- A brief update was given.

b. Implementation and funding

There is some concern from all stakeholders at how the 'new' Alberta Ambient Air Quality system will be implemented and funded. Some considerations that should be addressed when developing 'the plan' include:

- The decision criteria and process for assessing the current ambient air quality monitoring network
- The addition of new AAQ monitoring in response to, among other things, changes in population and industrial activity.
- Integration between the different levels of monitoring – Industrial, Regional - Zonal, Provincial and National.
- Implementation of frameworks

Funding is an issue for several reasons:

- Finite funds available
- Unfair division of funding responsibilities
- It is very difficult to get funds from non-point sources (home and vehicle emissions).
- Municipalities, generally, are not actively involved with airshed zones
- How much does it currently cost to monitor, and how much will an enhanced monitoring cost.
- Who currently pays for monitoring?
- More monitoring does not necessarily mean better monitoring – we need to define gains in efficiency as well as new monitoring

There is a range of possible options available for funding the AAQ monitoring network; from the status quo to an emissions tax similar to BC. Both options do not support the long-term viability of a monitoring network though. Currently, industry pays a 'flat rate' and does not have a financial incentive to reduce emissions. If industry were charged per tonne, monitoring costs would decrease as emissions decreased.

The team should produce a map with proposed monitoring sites in addition to the sites already monitored. Specifically, the team should develop a straw dog map indicating the current monitoring, proposed new sites as well as the rationale, and cost to implement and any other 'gaps analysis' data. Additionally, we should review the process and other considerations in the cost to bridge the gap from where we are currently, to what we are proposing. The starting point for this map could be the first health criterion – population. For example, there are currently two cities in Alberta with a population greater than 20 000 where there is no monitoring.

Bob presented a PowerPoint of an enhanced monitoring network.

Next Steps for the funding and implementation sub-group:

Final Minutes

1. Put dots on a map based on based on the population thresholds found with the health indicators
2. Define the monitoring requirements for each station
3. Based on Airshed Zone Annual Reports, define the approximate cost of current monitoring in Alberta.
4. Cost out the enhanced monitoring
5. Consider any additional parameters that should be monitoring.

ACTION 19.1: Matthew to invite David McCoy, Kevin and Myra to join the sub-group.

ACTION 19.2: Matthew to invite the DC9 to join the team

ACTION 19.3: Matthew will forward Bob's map to the team.

c. System Management Subgroup

Bob presented an update on behalf of the System Management Subgroup.

Three approaches are examined:

- Status Quo
- Multi-stakeholder
- Traditional

Status Quo Approach

- Currently, AENV as the System's Manager for the Provincial Monitoring System
- Day-to-day operations of the data warehouse are managed by AENV
- CASA owns the system and co-ordinates the funding
- The CASA Operations Steering Committee tracks progress in achieving the strategic plan and sets the annual budget for the Data Warehouse

Does the status quo work today?

- Current OSC is not effective
- Lack of stakeholder buy-in to the "old" plan and the implementation process – things have changed
- If the voluntary process breaks down, what is the regulatory backstop?
- System management process needs to be reviewed periodically (three to five year)
- Need for agreed upon performance measures and performance targets (number of stations implemented per year)
- Need true multi-stakeholder commitment!

Multi-stakeholder Approach

- Equal multi-stakeholder partnership
- Rotating Chair
- Equal/appropriate multi-stakeholder funding
- Sub-committees to look after technical components
- May or may not report to CASA
- Multi-stakeholder non-profit society

Final Minutes

- Governance could be similar to airsheds
- There would be an ambient monitoring budget and account
- Will require more effort and participation than current process

Traditional Approach

- Alberta government will implement the system.
 - Approvals
 - Airsheds
 - AENV network
- Multi-stakeholder consultative process

System Performance Measures

- Implementation of CASA plan
- % of monitoring sites implemented
- Could be broken down by parameter, geography, population, ecoregion
- % of audit passes by station and/or parameter
- % of monitoring stations that submit data to the provincial web site on time
- % of co-located cross media sites (precip/soils, air/crops)

Discussion

Bob presented a good overview of the range of options available for the management of the system. Rather than consider the three options in isolation, it was noted that a blend of the 3 options might provide the maximum benefit. When designing the management system, the team should consider fundraising and the possible backstop mechanisms for non-consensus. In addition, the performance measure piece is vital to monitor the long-term success. But, it is important to differentiate between the performance of the management system and the performance of the monitoring network.

3. Consultation

The team agreed that there was a need to further consult with stakeholders on the next draft of the report. There was some division of agreement on how to best do this. Some members felt that another workshop would be the most appropriate, while others felt that a full range of options should be considered before deciding on a specific path. The range of options mentioned include – mail out, information sessions, written comment submission.

4. Adjournment