

Final Minutes



Ambient Monitoring Strategic Planning Team Meeting #43

Monday, December 15, 2008
CAPP Offices, Calgary

In attendance:

Name	Stakeholder group
Michael Bisaga	LICA and PASZA (by phone)
Linda Jabs	CASA
Bob Myrick	Alberta Environment
Ian Peace	Residents for Accountability in Power Industry Development
Roxanne Pettipas	ConocoPhillips/ CAPP
Krista Phillips	CAPP
Kim Sanderson	CASA (until 1:30)
Kevin Warren	Parkland Airshed Management Zone
Brian Wiens	Environment Canada
Mike Zemanek	Alberta Health and Wellness (until 1:30)

With regrets:

Name	Stakeholder group
Keith Murray	Alberta Forest Products Association (corresponding)
Ken Omotani	TransAlta Corporation
Chris Severson-Baker	Pembina Institute
David Spink	Prairie Acid Rain Coalition

Action Items:

Action items	Who	Due Date
33.9: Team representatives will brief the new Deputy Minister about informing the minister about the AMSP and funding.	TBA	Before March 2009
41.10: Bob will arrange for someone in AENV to put together an updated map with all the monitoring stations in Alberta.	Bob Myrick	Dec 15
42.3: Linda or Kerra will talk to Jennifer Allan, the CAS project manager, to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) request the removal of the unbolded text associated with item 4c in the Knowledge and Information section, and b) suggest that the AMSP team do a presentation to the CAS team to share the AMSP team's work and discuss if there is anything the CAS can do support funding for the AMSP implementation. 	Kerra Chomlak or Linda Jabs	Dec 1
42.4: The CASA secretariat will prepare an estimate of costs for the team to finish up its work, review with the co-chairs and present a revised budget for the next meeting.	Linda Jabs	Jan 12
42.7: Bob will get information from AENV's climate change staff on	Bob Myrick	Dec 15

Action items	Who	Due Date
the criteria for applying for funding from the Ecotrust fund.		
42.11: Kerra will work with the co-chairs to find a suitable date in January for the co-chairs to meet with industry representatives.	Kerra Chomlak	Dec 31
43.1: Linda will follow up with the CAS team to find out if they are agreeable to deleting the unbolded text regarding the AMSP in CAS item 4c.	Linda Jabs	Dec. 31
43.2: Team members should provide any outstanding comments on the briefing note to Linda by Dec. 19. She will compile the comments and work with the co-chairs to allocate responsibility for addressing each comment.	Team members, Linda, co-chairs	Dec 19
43.3: Roxanne and Krista will contact Ken Omotani and ask him to provide comments on the briefing note to the team by Dec. 19.	Roxanne Pettipas Krista Phillips	Dec. 16
43.4: The Cost subgroup will determine the implications of having 100% of fenceline monitoring in the provincial system, and what the impact would be on diffuse and large emitters.	Cost subgroup	Jan 14
43.5: Team members will test with their stakeholders whether they agreed that all fenceline monitoring should be included in the provincial network.	Team members	Jan 14
43.6: NGOs will further discuss and clarify concerns about possible burden on taxpayers of bringing all fenceline monitoring into the network.	NGO members	Jan 14
43.7: Bob will use track changes to condense the AMSP, with any updates to Scenario 3(b).	Bob Myrick	Jan 7
43.8: Kim Sanderson to include the revised implementation date in the report.	Kim Sanderson	Jan 7
43.9: Brian Wiens to talk with Allan Legg for clarification regarding the types of questions he had in mind on Population Based Monitoring.	Brian Wiens	Jan 14
43.10: Linda to talk with Sharon Hawrelak, Communications Manager and craft a cover letter to workshop participants with key messages and the Workshop Summary Report.	Linda Jabs Sharon Hawrelak	Feb 9
43.11: Linda to poll for dates for the Costs Subgroup conference call prior to Christmas to last no longer than 1.5 hours.	Linda Jabs	Dec 23

1 Welcome

Roxanne convened the meeting at 10:30 and reviewed the meeting purpose and objectives.

2 Administration

a. Approve agenda

The agenda was approved.

b. Approve minutes from November 20-21 Meeting 42

The minutes were approved by consensus.

c. Review action items from Meeting 42

Action items	Status
33.9: Team representatives will brief the new Deputy Minister about informing the minister about the AMSP and funding.	Before March 2009
39.2: All AMSP team members should talk to their sectors to encourage them to support air monitoring as part of the new Clean Air Strategy. Merry and Mike will champion with the CAS team the idea of ambient monitoring being an important part of the CAS, and that the CAS is an opportunity to secure support for long-term funding for monitoring. The intent is to raise the profile of ambient monitoring within the CAS, as it is relevant to all four contemplated strategic directions.	Done. Mike noted that there is a recommendation in the draft CAS to support the AMSP.
40.3: Team members are to test Scenario 3(b) with their particular stakeholder groups and report back their findings to the next AMSP meeting.	On today's agenda
41.10: Bob will arrange for someone in AENV to put together an updated map with all the monitoring stations in Alberta.	Carry forward
42.1: Kerra will draft key messages related to the release of the Cape report and circulate to the team by Nov 25. Members will respond by Nov 28.	Done
42.2: Bob Myrick will confirm if the Cape report will be posted on the AENV website and advise Kerra. If it is, the CASA website will provide a link to the report. If not, CASA will post the report. Kerra will advise the team when the report is posted.	Done. The report will be posted on the CASA website.
42.3: Linda or Kerra will talk to Jennifer Allan, the CAS project manager, to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) request the removal of the unbolded text associated with item 4c in the Knowledge and Information section, and b) suggest that the AMSP team do a presentation to the CAS team to share the AMSP team's work and discuss if there is anything the CAS can do support funding for the AMSP implementation. 	a) Done. See action 43.1. b) The CAS team is having a two-day meeting in January and Linda has requested time on the agenda.
42.4: The CASA secretariat will prepare an estimate of costs for the team to finish up its work, review with the co-chairs and present a revised budget for the next meeting.	Carry forward.
42.5: Team members will provide comments on the AMSP monitoring terms document including Monitoring Types, Monitoring Subprograms and Monitoring Stations.	No comments received. These definitions are now in the glossary of the main report and comments can be provided as part of the overall review.
42.6: Team members will review all the items labelled #4 in the workshop response table, and this will be the starting point for discussion at the December meeting.	On today's agenda
42.7: Bob will get information from AENV's climate change staff on the criteria for applying for funding from the Ecotrust fund.	Carry forward. This is one option under consideration for future funding.
42.8: Mike will make changes to the Gantt chart to reflect the extended	Done.

Action items	Status
bars for the agreed-upon time frame.	
42.9: Bob will ask if his shop wants a presentation from the team to go over the proposed recommendations before the presentation to the board, and advise Linda.	On today's agenda
42.10: CASA and Kim will prepare a short briefing note for the team that summarizes the funding recommendations, rationale, and arguments for why sectors should support them.	Done
42.11: Kerra will find out when the industry caucus is meeting and advise the co-chairs. If this date is unsuitable for the co-chairs, the industry caucus will be sent the briefing note and Kerra will poll for another date.	Carry forward. The co-chairs will work with Kerra to find a suitable date in January.
42.12: Kim will revise the report, address gaps, and work with Bob to identify material that may be better suited to an appendix.	Done
42.13: Kim will extract the recommendations from the main report and include them in a separate document to be sent to the team with the briefing note.	Done

Action 43.1: Linda will follow up with the CAS team to find out if they are agreeable to deleting the unbolded text regarding the AMSP in CAS item 4c.

3 Stakeholder Feedback on Briefing Note

Team members reported on feedback from their sectors.

Feedback from Industry

Krista and Roxanne reported that industry has discussed the briefing note, including in the Board industry caucus (attended by forestry, oil and gas, power generation and chemical producers) and other industry briefings. Additional discussion with industry is needed (see action 42.11).

Several concerns and questions were raised by industry:

- 100% of fenceline monitoring should be included in the network. Industry members are concerned about having to pay twice, for their compliance stations and for other monitoring, and those that are not currently contributing funding don't want to start.
- Who will own and operate the fenceline stations once they are incorporated into the provincial network?
- There should be a *de minimus*; if a facility emits less than a certain amount, they would be excluded from the funding formula. Some airsheds do this now for the smaller emitters, and would make administration easier.
- Recommendations won't likely be supported by the CASA board until implementation funding is in place.
- Some facility operators voluntarily run good neighbour stations. Will these become part of the provincial network or will industry still be expected to operate them?
- Accuracy of data used to inform the CAC inventory used to calculate the funding formula, specifically accuracy of data reported to NPRI. Some things might be over- or under-reported and this could be a problem when dollars are attached to the numbers. The team should address this through the recommendation that AENV will be moving to make data inventories more accurate. Emitters have a responsibility to

ensure the data used to report their emissions is accurate, but better emission factors for pollutants are needed. For diffuse sources, we need to look at what the federal government is using to report. This was not a showstopper.

- If a facility has fenceline monitoring as part of its EPEA approval, and there are amendments, who is responsible for managing the fenceline?
- How will planning continue to be done at an airshed level (e.g., if a zone wants to do more monitoring, add stations, modify existing stations)?
- Is it possible that industries operating in a less industrialized region will be subsidizing monitoring in more heavily industrialized regions? This is not clear. The system must be fair and should support over-monitoring.
- Issues related to the apparent arbitrary boundaries of various airsheds.
- Some monitoring is done in response to local issues; what happens in this case? How do airsheds continue to do monitoring for local reasons through this funding formula?

Team members discussed these points briefly, noting:

- If we incorporate fenceline into the system, the cost per tonne will have to go up for H₂S and SO₂.
- Is there a possibility that taxpayers could be asked to pay for site-specific compliance monitoring?
- About 95% of emissions of H₂S and SO₂ emissions come from industrial sources as part of their compliance monitoring. The other 5% is from small industrial sources; taxpayers may initially cover off some costs for small sources but large sources would continue to pay for their emissions.
- Most H₂S and SO₂ monitoring would be assigned to industry and they would pay regardless of which scenario is chosen.

Feedback from Alberta Environment

Bob Myrick reported two major comments from Alberta Environment:

- If the GoA is expected to backstop the funding, they have to develop some options before committing to this recommendation. Bob and his shop are developing innovative options and will present to their ADM in January, with a recommended funding option going to the Deputy who will take it to the minister.
- If the team needs more time, submitting the report in June would be acceptable, and it could then be rolled out with the Clean Air Strategy.

Feedback from Airsheds

Kevin Warren advised that the Airsheds Council discussed the briefing note at their December meeting. Several executive directors and program managers indicated they needed to discuss this with their boards, which won't be meeting until 2009. Airsheds noted the following concerns and questions:

- How does fenceline monitoring fit? Should it be included or not?
- The strategic plan part is good. Issues are mostly related to implementation and funding. The team may be too aggressive with the implementation schedule. The infrastructure needs to be put in place (MIC, formal processes, etc.), then the four year implementation could begin at that point.

- Fear of losing control to address local issues and potential competition to get funds. For whatever reason, for example, it could cost more for airshed A to monitor than airshed B. This may have more to do with implementation.
- Airsheds are being pushed more into management and funds will be needed for this.
- Is this approach giving the MIC quasi-regulatory powers? Not everyone wants to see airsheds go this way.
- Possibility of future downloading to municipal governments for diffuse sources. Even if AENV picks up 75% to get things started, who will have responsibility for non-point sources in the long term? Airsheds did not raise any key showstoppers, but cost allocation does concern municipalities and this would be a showstopper.

Action 43.2: Team members should provide any outstanding comments on the briefing note to Linda by Dec. 19. She will compile the comments and work with the co-chairs to allocate responsibility for addressing each comment.

Action 43.3: Krista/Roxanne to contact Ken Omotani and ask him to provide comments on the briefing note to Linda by Dec. 19.

Although the team has not yet decided whether all fenceline monitoring should be included, more analysis is needed to consider the ramifications. This includes estimates of cost per tonne to enable industry to look at the implications for their facilities and what should happen with fenceline monitoring. Additional points were noted by team members on this matter:

- The reason why 95% of fenceline monitoring was not included was that most results were not in the public domain. If fenceline monitoring data were in the public domain, this would be a public good. Industry has noted that fenceline monitoring data is in the public domain but is not accessible.
- Fenceline monitoring is done to assess air quality around a facility to better understand potential exposure of people and the environment. The intent is to ensure that emissions are below the AAQOs.
- A lot of compliance monitoring in response to the AMD ensures that emissions are below the AAQOs, and doesn't describe how to treat very small numbers (going to the nearest 10 ppb). If data are under 10 ppb how are you identifying trends, etc.? Many airsheds report to nearest 1 ppb. Not everyone would agree that AQOS are set to protect human health.
- For upstream oil and gas, fenceline monitoring is mainly SO₂ and benzene and those are set with human and environmental health in mind.

Another issue is accuracy of emissions inventories, and this should be addressed in recommendation 13.

Action 43.4: The Cost subgroup, or a derivative of this subgroup, will determine the implications of having 100% of fenceline monitoring in the provincial system, and what the impact would be on diffuse and large emitters.

Action 43.5: Team members will test with their stakeholders whether they agreed that all fenceline monitoring should be included in the provincial network.

Action 43.6: NGOs will further discuss and clarify concerns about possible burden on taxpayers of bringing all fenceline monitoring into the network.

4 AMSP Recommendations

The team reviewed the recommendations, noting that it is desirable to reduce the total number. Specifically, the team agreed to drop recommendations 5, 6, and 37 and to merge recommendations 17-20, 21-23, and 29-30. Additional changes to wording of recommendations were noted directly in the documents.

5 AMSP Draft Report

The team discussed the length of the Draft AMSP Report and agreed that the report should be condensed as much as possible. Bob will condense the AMSP and stakeholders are to review what Bob has done to determine the relevance for them.

Action 43.7: Bob will use track changes to condense the AMSP, with any updates to Scenario 3(b).

Action 43.8: Kim Sanderson to include the revised implementation date in the report.

6 Workshop Feedback and Response

The team discussed the workshop feedback and felt that the majority of issues arising out of the Workshop would be addressed in the AMSP Report. Some of the issues were deemed to be beyond the scope of the AMSP Project. In general, workshop participants felt that the AMSP team was on the right track when it came to ambient monitoring in Alberta. There was some discussion around #4 – Population based monitoring and further clarification is needed to ensure that the team has captured participants' concerns.

Action 43.9: Brian Wiens to talk with Allan Legg for clarification regarding the types of questions he had in mind on Population Based Monitoring.

The team agreed that the “Workshop Summary Report” be accepted and adopted.

Key messages to workshop participants should include that the team expects to have a report in the coming months that will go forward to the CASA Board of Directors. The AMSP Committee will be discussing the report with stakeholders prior to finalizing it. The team also anticipates that the AMSP will be finalized around the same time as the Clean Air Strategy.

The team agreed that given the discussion of the workshop feedback and the expertise that exists with the CASA Secretariat, they are to move forward with sending a cover letter with key messages and the Workshop Summary Report to workshop participants without the need of circulating it to the team prior to completion.

Action 43.10: Linda to talk with Sharon Hawrelak, Communications Manager and craft a cover letter to workshop participants with key messages and the Workshop Summary Report.

7 Next Steps

Workplan discussion moved to the next meeting.

The date for the Draft AMSP report to be provided to stakeholders for feedback will be determined at the January 14, 2009 meeting.

Action 43.11: Linda to poll for dates for the Costs Subgroup conference call prior to Christmas to last no longer than 1.5 hours.

8 Next Meetings

The next meetings will be:

- Wednesday, January 14 in Edmonton
- Monday, February 9 in Calgary

The meeting adjourned at 3:39 p.m..