

Final Minutes



Ambient Monitoring Strategic Planning Team

Meeting #44

January 14, 2009

CASA Offices, Edmonton

In attendance:

Name	Stakeholder group
Linda Jabs	CASA
Bob Myrick	Alberta Environment
Findlay MacDermid	Residents for Accountability in Power Industry Development
Ian Peace	Residents for Accountability in Power Industry Development
Ken Omotani	TransAlta Corporation
Roxanne Pettipas	ConocoPhillips/ CAPP
Krista Phillips	CAPP
Kim Sanderson	CASA
Chris Severson-Baker	Pembina Institute
David Spink	Prairie Acid Rain Coalition
Kevin Warren	Parkland Airshed Management Zone (by phone)
Mike Zemanek	Alberta Health and Wellness (afternoon only)

With regrets:

Name	Stakeholder group
Michael Bisaga	LICA and PASZA
Keith Murray	Alberta Forest Products Association (corresponding)
Brian Wiens	Environment Canada

Action Items:

Action items	Who	Due Date
33.9: Team representatives will brief the Deputy Minister about informing the minister about the AMSP and funding.	TBA	Before June 2009
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	Feb. 1/09
43.2: Linda will compile the comments on the briefing note and work with the co-chairs to allocate responsibility for addressing each comment.	Linda Jabs, co-chairs	Jan. 26/09
43.4: The Cost subgroup will determine the implications of having 100% of fence line monitoring in the provincial system, and what the impact would be on diffuse and large emitters.	Cost subgroup	Feb. 2/09
43.8: Kim Sanderson to include the revised implementation schedule in the report.	Kim Sanderson	Feb. 9/09
44.1: AENV/Bob will add an inset for the WBEA region to show the details of the monitoring cluster, as was done for the Edmonton	Bob Myrick	Feb. 9/09

Action items	Who	Due Date
region. AENV/Bob will also create similar monitoring maps for passive/static monitors and deposition monitors		
44.2: Linda will see if the funds allocated to printing the final report are still sufficient, and adjust the budget accordingly.	Linda Jabs	Feb. 2/09
44.3: Bob will inquire: a) if funding could be secured from Ecotrust to support capital costs for the new network, and b) who is eligible to apply for Ecotrust funding.	Bob Myrick	Feb. 9/09
44.4: Linda will work with Ken to set up a meeting with the PPA buyers; the team will be represented at this meeting by Bob and Krista.	Linda Jabs	Jan. 30/09
44.5: The Costs subgroup will draft a backgrounder in preparation for each of the industry meetings, using the December 5, 2008 briefing note as a starting point.	Costs Subgroup	Jan. 30/09
44.6: David will write up arguments for supporting Scenario 3(b) (including about 15% of the compliance stations in the provincial funding formula) and they will be circulated to the team for review.	David Spink	Jan. 27/09
44.7: Krista will write arguments for supporting Scenario 3(a) (include 100% of compliance monitoring in the provincial funding formula) and they will be circulated to the team for review.	Krista Phillips	Jan. 27/09
44.8: Team members will review the two draft documents from Bob – the main report and section 12 on the Monitoring Network Design and provide comments to Linda who will work with Kim.	Team members	Jan. 28/09
44.9: Linda will advise the team by Friday, Jan. 16 how much time they have to provide comments and what format the comments should be in.	Linda	Jan 16/09

1 Welcome

Bob convened the meeting at 10:10 and reviewed the meeting purpose and objectives.

2 Administration

a. Approve agenda

The agenda was approved, with agreement to end by 3:00 pm.

b. Approve minutes from Meeting 43, December 15, 2008

The minutes were approved by consensus, with two minor changes to page 4, text below action 43.3, bullet 1:

- Change “public good” to “benefit the public”
- Insert “readily” before “accessible.”

c. Review action items from Meeting 43

Action items	Status
33.9: Team representatives will brief the AENV Deputy Minister about informing the minister about the AMSP and funding the team presents its recommendations to the CASA Board.	To be done prior to presentation to CASA board.

Action items	Status
41.10: Bob will arrange for someone in AENV to put together an updated map with all the monitoring stations in Alberta.	Done. Map was circulated to the team. (See action item 44.1) Further maps will be done for deposition stations and all passive and static stations, and all maps will be added to the report.
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 b) AMSP will do presentation to the Feb. 24 CAS meeting.
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. Linda is working on the revised budget. Printing costs for final report should be part of the budget. (See action 44.2)
42.7: Bob will get information from AENV's climate change staff on the criteria for applying for funding from the Ecotrust fund.	Done. Information was circulated to the team. (See action 44.3)
42.11: Linda will work with the co-chairs to find a suitable date in January for the co-chairs to meet with industry representatives.	In progress. (See action 44.4)
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.	Delete. Covered by action 42.3
43.2: a) Team members should provide any outstanding comments on the briefing note to Linda by Dec. 19. b) Linda will compile the comments and work with the co-chairs to allocate responsibility for addressing each comment.	a) Done. b) In progress.
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.	Delete. No longer relevant
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.	Carry forward.
43.5: Team members will test with their stakeholders whether they agreed that all fenceline monitoring should be included in the provincial network.	To be discussed today
43.6: NGOs will further discuss and clarify concerns about possible burden on taxpayers of bringing all fenceline monitoring into the network.	To be discussed today
43.7: Bob will use track changes to condense the AMSP, with any updates to Scenario 3(b).	Done. Bob has revised the AMSP in two sections (section 12 and the rest).

Action items	Status
	Draft was circulated to team on Jan 9
43.8: Kim Sanderson to include the revised implementation date in the report.	Carry forward.
43.9: Brian Wiens to talk with Allan Legge for clarification regarding the types of questions he had in mind on Population Based Monitoring.	Done. Brian forwarded an email to team with response.
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.	Done. Draft was circulated, team has until Jan 16 to provide any comments.
43.11: Linda to poll for dates for the Costs Subgroup conference call prior to Christmas to last no longer than 1.5 hours.	Done.

Action 44.1: AENV/Bob will add an inset for the WBEA region to show the details of the monitoring cluster, as was done for the Edmonton region. AENV/Bob will also create similar monitoring maps for passive/static monitors and deposition monitors.

Action 44.2: Linda will see if the funds allocated to printing the final report are still sufficient, and adjust the budget accordingly.

Action 44.3: Bob will inquire: a) if funding could be secured from Ecotrust to support capital costs for the new network, and b) who is eligible to apply for Ecotrust funding.

The team agreed to present an update to the CASA board on March 18 to give the board an update on the project and areas of non-consensus, with the final report in June.

3 Meetings with Industry

The team was reminded that various industry sectors have concerns about the funding formula and need more information. The team discussed what information needs to be assembled to support industry members in briefing their sectors and what work is needed to enable the proposed funding formula to be supported by all stakeholders. The following points were noted on the whiteboard:

What does industry need to support the AMSP?

- Specific numbers; i.e., what am I paying for?
- What is included in the funding formula?
- Who is responsible for paying what
- Where are the “dots on the map” – are they paying where they should be paying?
- Timing of implementation

The team agreed there should be a meeting with PPA buyers, and that initially, other sectors would meet with team representatives as a group (oil and gas, forestry, cement, chemical and petrochemical among others). If it appears that meetings with individual sectors are needed, those will then be arranged. Further work on the funding formula must be done first.

WBEA is also planning a specific meeting to discuss the funding formula and AENV expectations with respect to airsheds.

Action 44.4: Linda will work with Ken to set up a meeting with the PPA buyers; the team will be represented at this meeting by Bob and Krista.

Action 44.5: The Costs subgroup will draft a backgrounder in preparation for each of the industry meetings, using the briefing note dated December 5, 2008 as a starting point.

4 Consensus and Non-Consensus Items

The team agreed to look first at what is and what is not included in the provincial network. The key issue is whether compliance stations are in or out of the funding formula. Some CAPP companies have concerns of fairness if required to pay for its own fenceline monitors as well as for monitoring in other parts of the province. This issue was also discussed at meeting 43.

A range of points were made on this matter:

- CAPP recognizes there is a regional need for some fenceline monitoring, and the results can be made available to the public.
- Fenceline monitors protect regional air quality in the area surrounding the facility.
- In airshed zones, there is a protocol for incorporating fenceline monitors into the airshed program, and if they haven't been rolled into the program, there are reasons why.
- In WBEA, there is a lot of redundancy and many of these compliance stations would likely never be rolled up into a provincial system. Companies there want to continue to operate their fenceline stations, but some could possibly be used as background stations.
- 15% of current compliance was proposed previously for consideration as part of the provincial network. But that still left industry paying 85% in addition to their fenceline monitoring, which was a problem.
- The most relevant monitoring station for a facility is at the fenceline. Industry pays for that monitoring of SO₂, so why should they also pay for SO₂ monitoring a few kilometres away by a zone? Fenceline monitors also pick up emissions from other sources. A facility monitors its own upset for maybe only a few hours a year, and the rest of the time it's monitoring background. CAPP needs to better understand why fenceline monitors may not contribute to the provincial network when a fenceline monitor is monitoring more than just one facility's emissions.
- The rationale for requiring fenceline monitoring is that if you are a big emitter, you could exceed the local AAQOs; if you are a very small emitter with no chance of exceeding the objectives, you are not required to do fenceline monitoring. Perhaps we make a best guess at how many molecules are being picked up from other places, and go with the 15%, which is consistent and defensible. When monitoring is measuring emissions from a facility, 95% will be directly attributable to that operator. Emissions do not represent ambient air quality.
- Right now, most fenceline monitoring is for SO₂, but in future there could be requirements for NO_x or other emissions.

- Fenceline monitoring is concerned about impacts on vegetation, wildlife, soils, etc. which is why monitoring is needed even in remote areas to ensure AAQOs are not exceeded.
- We could put everything into the funding formula but then our funding formula will change, and we will have to have the same discussion again about what is fair and reasonable for stations put in for the various purposes described in the AMSP.
- If 100% of compliance stations are brought into the network, it will increase costs across the industrial sectors. Though we do not know the effect on individual emitters, we can be certain the costs for all emitters (of SO₂) will increase to cover the entire facility-specific compliance monitoring network costs. Those most likely to have fenceline monitoring are big emitters, so smaller emitters' bill will go up. Bills for big emitters might go down a bit because their costs are high and emissions are high.

Proposed Plan:

Action 44.6: David will write up arguments for supporting Scenario 3(b) (including about 15% of compliance stations in the provincial funding formula) and they will be circulated to the team for review.

Action 44.7: Krista will write arguments for supporting Scenario 3(a) (include 100% of compliance monitoring in the provincial funding formula) and they will be circulated to the team for review.

1. David and Krista write up their respective arguments.
2. The Costs Subgroup discusses these two documents, determines costs and comes back to the team with information.
3. The team reviews and decides what to recommend for inclusion in the funding formula.
4. Team representatives meet with industry stakeholders, using this information as part of the briefing package, as noted in earlier actions.

5 Report and Recommendations

Action 44.8: Team members will review the two draft documents from Bob – the main report and section 12 on the Monitoring Network Design and provide comments.

Action 44.9: Linda will advise the team by Friday, Jan. 16 how much time they have to provide comments and what format the comments should be in.

6 Next Meeting

The next meeting will be Monday, February 9 in Calgary

The meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.