

Final Minutes



Ambient Monitoring Strategic Planning Team

Meeting #45

February 9, 2009

Teleconference 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

In attendance:

Name	Stakeholder group
Michael Bisaga	LICA and PASZA
Bob Myrick	Alberta Environment
Findlay MacDermid	Residents for Accountability in Power Industry Development
Brian Wiens	Environment Canada
Krista Phillips	CAPP
Chris Severson-Baker	Pembina Institute
Kevin Warren	Parkland Airshed Management Zone
Linda Jabs	CASA

Guests:

Name	Stakeholder group
Kristina Friesen	Alberta Capital Airshed Alliance Executive Director

With regrets:

Name	Stakeholder group
Ken Omotani	TransAlta Corporation
Keith Murray	Alberta Forest Products Association (corresponding)
David Spink	Prairie Acid Rain Coalition
Ian Peace	Residents for Accountability in Power Industry Development
Mike Zemanek	Alberta Health and Wellness (afternoon only)
Roxanne Pettipas	ConocoPhillips/ CAPP
Kim Sanderson	CASA

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
42.3: Linda or Kerra will talk to Jennifer Allan, the CAS project manager, to 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 to support funding for the AMSP implementation.	Linda Jabs Kerra Chomlak	Feb 24/09
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	Mar. 11/09
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	Mar. 11/09
43.8: Kim Sanderson to include the revised implementation schedule in the report. See Action Item.45.??? with Bob , Mike and Linda to work on the Draft AMSP report.	Bob Myrick Michael Bisaga Linda Jabs	Mar. 9/09
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	Mar. 11/09
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	Ongoing before Industry meetings
45.1: Kevin will circulate the 3 maps showing the monitoring stations to the airsheds and request comments on their accuracy.	Kevin Warren	Mar. 15/09
45.2: Krista to check with John Squarek of SEPAC as to whether or not they want a meeting in advance of the Industry Caucus meeting that is being planned and get back to Linda.	Krista Phillips	Mar. 11/09
45.3: Linda to talk to the CFO Board member and ask who should be invited to the Industry Caucus meeting.	Linda Jabs	Mar. 11/09
45.4: Bob to have discussions with Director and ADM before the next team meeting and report back on the level of commitment for interim funding.	Bob Myrick	Mar. 11/09
45.5: Bob Myrick, Mike Bisaga and Linda to work on the report and circulate it to the team for review and comment.	Bob Myrick Michael Bisaga Linda Jabs	Mar. 11/09

1 Welcome

Bob convened the meeting at 2:05 p.m. and reviewed the meeting purpose and objectives.

2 Administration

a. Approve agenda

The agenda was approved by consensus with one change to item 5. There will be no discussion on the documents provided by Bob earlier today and for now they will stay with the Costs subgroup.

b. Approve minutes from Meeting 44, January 14, 2009.

The minutes were approved by consensus, with wording revisions to the last bullet on Item 4 with respect to Consensus/Non-Consensus Items:

- If 100% of compliance stations are brought into the network, it will increase costs across the industrial sectors. Though we don't 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 fence-line 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.

The costs for industry would be out of proportion to what they were actually emitting if fence-line (facility specific compliance) monitors are wrapped up into the funding formula.

c. Review action items from Meeting 44

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.
42.3: Linda or Kerra will talk to Jennifer Allan, the CAS project manager, to 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.	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)
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. The Briefing note will be revised at a subsequent meeting.
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.	Carry forward.
43.8: Kim Sanderson to include the revised implementation date in the report.	Carry forward. Bob to work with Kim as it needs words around it.
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	Done and sent to team.

Action items	Status
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.	Done.
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.	Carry Forward
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.	Ken has provided the names and an invitation/poll for dates will be going out shortly.
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.	Ongoing. Will be completed before the industry meeting.
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.	Done.
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.	Report coming under Agenda Item 3 (a)(ii).
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.	No comments received
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.	Done.

Action 45.1: Kevin will circulate the 3 maps showing the monitoring stations to the airsheds and request comments on their accuracy.

3 Board Presentation

- (a) Bob provided clarification on the purpose of the Board presentation which is to advise them of the areas of consensus and non-consensus. The team has to be very clear on why we are unable to reach consensus at this point in time. The Board must also be informed that the team will not be coming to the March 18 meeting with Final Recommendations as planned.

The major areas of non-consensus are:

- (i) Certainty of money – the team has agreed that the funding for the network needs to be in place and it was anticipated that the Government of Alberta (GoA) should be providing the interim funding. The team has discussed that the interim measure will be for the GoA should have interim funds in the budget and pursue a long-term funding mechanism. The team needs to understand the commitment from Alberta Environment to interim funding.
- (ii) The funding formula – both scenarios should be presented to the Board.

CAPP has reviewed this internally and reached consensus on Scenario 3(b) and accept that 10 to 15% of the facility specific compliance monitors will be included in the funding formula, provided that AENV commit to having a long-term, sustainable funding mechanism in place once the AMSP has been adopted.

The team needs a level of comfort around the funding issue prior to the industry caucus meeting.

Action 45.2: Krista to check with John Squarek of SEPAC as to whether or not they want a meeting in advance of the Industry Caucus meeting that is being planned and get back to Linda.

Action 45.3: Linda to talk to the CFO Board member and ask who should be invited to the Industry Caucus meeting.

- (iii) The team needs to clarify when year 1 starts. AENV cannot make commitments for implementation until the funding mechanism is in place. There will be a time lag as there will be 2 years to develop a funding mechanism and then another 2 years for implementation. In the annual budgeting cycle, there is potentially no new money for monitoring.

As the team works toward agreement we could recommend a staged process in order to achieve an accelerated implementation timeline. This would require a level of certainty around funding.

The team objective is to secure funding for small and diffuse emitters and we need to know what assurances we can get toward this objective. This could/should potentially be a discussion at the Board level so that AENV Board member can hear the rationale for interim funding.

Action 45.4: Bob to have discussions with Director and ADM before the next team meeting and report back on the level of commitment for interim funding.

- (c) The Board presentation should focus on the critical points which are the areas of consensus and outstanding items of non-consensus. There should also be clarity round the roles of the airshed and facility specific compliance monitors. If possible, the Board should be provided with an updated briefing note. The points in the briefing note have largely been agreed to but have not yet achieved consensus. The team needs to compare/contract this with the information be received from AENV.

4 Report Status

The latest version of the AMSP Draft Report should be circulated without the track changes so that team members can more readily identify areas of agreement as well as any gaps that exist. The monitoring section should be added in as well. The report must go to stakeholders for review if this is to go to the CASA Board in June.

Action 45.5: Bob Myrick, Mike Bisaga and Linda to work on the report and circulate it to the team for review and comment.

The anticipated timeline for the report is as follows:

Week of March 9 – report is circulated to the team

Week of March 16 – team comments to be received

Week of March 23 – Draft report provided to stakeholder groups for review and comment

Week of April 23 – Comments back from stakeholders and incorporated into draft

It is desirable, but not essential to roll the AMSP out with the Clean Air Strategy and it could be presented to the CASA Board in the context of the CAS.

5 Funding Formula

The team discussed input for discussion at the upcoming Costs subgroup meeting. Scenario 3(a) is 100% of facility specific compliance monitoring stations being included in the funding formula, with Scenario 3(b) including the airsheds and 10 to 15% of the facility specific compliance stations. Annual operating costs plus 10% of replacement costs and capital costs are being calculated for the first 5 years.

6 Next Meeting

Action 45.6: Linda to poll for dates in early March for the next AMSP meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.