Minutes

Ambient Monitoring Strategic Planning Working Group Meeting #6

Date: November 18th, 2004
Time: 9:30 – 3:30
Place: 1st Floor Oxbridge Place
9820 106 Street, Edmonton

In attendance:

Name	Organization
Justin Balko	Alberta Health and Wellness
Matthew Dance	CASA
David Graham	Alberta Environment
Bill Hume	Environment Canada
Myra Moore	Fort Air Partnership
Keith Murray	Alberta Forest Products Association
Bob Myrick	Alberta Environment
Ken Omotani	TransAlta Utilities
Mike Pawlicki	Lafarge Canada Inc.
Roxanne Pettipas	ConocoPhillips Canada / Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers
George Pfaff	Petro-Canada Edmonton Refinery / Canadian Petroleum Products Institute
Chris Severson-Baker	Pembina Institute
James Vaughan	Alberta Energy and Utilities Board
Kevin Warren	PAMZ, PASZA, PAS, WCAS.

Regrets:

Name	Organization
David McCoy	Husky Oil / Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers
Ian Peace	Residents for Accountability in Power Industry Development
Michael Queenan	Residents for Accountability in Power Industry Development
B.J. Vickery	Lafarge Canada Inc / Alberta Chamber of Resources

Action Items:

Task	Who	When
3.7: Outline the AAQ monitoring requirements specified in industrial approvals.	Bob Myrick	On going
5.1: Ensure that there are links between the Ambient Air Quality Monitoring Strategic Planning Team and Ecological Effects Workshop Committee and that the potential of holding a joint workshop is explored.	Matthew	Ongoing
5.8: Hold a workshop by the end of March, 2005.	The team	March 2005
6.1: Post Word versions of the 1995 and 1997 reports on the CASA web site.	Matthew	15 December

6.2: Complete the jurisdictional review for these addition jurisdictions: Germany, Sweden, Alberta.	Bob	7 January 2005
6.3: Update the jurisdiction review document to reflect new information.	Matthew	7 January 2005
6.4: Create a matrix to track the best practices of each jurisdiction.	Matthew	7 January 2005
6.5: Invite Kim Sanderson to the next meeting.	Matthew	13 January 2005
6.6: Investigate the costs, mechanisms, and steps necessary to make real time data capture happen for the AAQM network.	Bob Myrick	13 January 2005
6.7: Poll for Workshop Subgroup participants and meeting date.	Matthew	15 December 2004

1. Administration
a. Introductions
Introductions were made around the table.

b. Approve agenda and meeting purpose.
The agenda and meeting purpose were approved as tabled.

c. Approve the July 8th meeting minutes.
The minutes were approved as tabled.

d. Review action items.
3.7   Complete. It was suggested that, in the future, this table be broken into the following categories: Government, Industry and Airshed Zones and that it be displayed on a map.
5.1   Ongoing.
5.2   On agenda.
5.3   On agenda.
5.4   Complete.

ACTION 6.1: Matthew will post Word versions of these reports on the CASA web site.

5.5   Complete.
5.6   Complete.
5.7   Complete.
5.8   Ongoing.
5.9   Carry forward.

2. Coordination Workshop
Matthew outlined the intent and purpose of the Coordination Workshop as follows:
1.   To develop a better understanding of what the project teams are doing; and
2.   To provide a forum to identify key dependencies/linkages between CASA Teams to help CASA project teams operate more efficiently.

The team reviewed the AMSP presentation for the Coordination Workshop and provided the following suggested additions:

- Indicate that the team is planning a workshop.

It was decided that Roxanne Pettipas would present on behalf of the AMSP Team.

3. Review of the jurisdictional template.
Team members reviewed the jurisdictions that they were responsible for:

United Kingdom
- Nation wide NO2 passive monitoring network
- Comprehensive web site that was laborious to use.
- Twice daily air quality forecasting
- National objectives for vegetation monitoring.
- Maintain an atmospheric emissions inventory
- If an air quality objective is exceeded, and action plan comes into effect to address this exceedance.

Ontario
- Continuous monitoring for a number of substances
- Network is based on population density
- Provincial responsibility for the structure of the network
- Good user friendly website
- Air Pollution Index provides trigger levels for management response

New Zealand
- Urban populations
- Not very much industry
- 38 permanent monitoring stations
- Similar monitoring technologies
- Regional councils on NZ are responsible for the monitoring within their region
- No real time data, only archival data

Australia
- 79 monitoring sites in 8 jurisdictions
- Populations greater than 25 000 are required to be monitored
- Population density formula defines the requirement for additional monitoring stations.
- Similar density requirements as Alberta (monitors / population density)
- No industrial monitoring is evident – industry may only need to submit paper copies of data.

Greater Vancouver Regional District
- Industrial base similar to Alberta

- Long terms database (back to the 1950's)
- Complex terrain to monitor
- High population density
- No ecosystem or human exposure monitoring
- Funding is through municipal tax base and emissions fees.
- Innovative elements include
  - Video sites for the internet
  - Visibility monitoring
- PM is the main A/Q issue
- There is an amount of cross border pollution
- GVRD has a state of the art monitoring program
- Good public information

British Columbia (not including the GVRD)
- 66 monitoring sites
- NAPS equipment
- Reporting in real time including an industrial monitoring database
- Odor index based on H2S
- Verified data on website is password protected
- Website is data focused
- The BC website integrates land, water and air
- Complex user-friendly website

California Air Resources Board (CARB)
- Monitoring is population driven
- Measure the usual parameters
- Mandated to protect human health
- Government funded from industrial fees

ACTION 6.2: Bob will complete the jurisdictional review for these addition jurisdictions: Germany, Sweden, Alberta.

3.a. Does this meet our needs?
The team discussed the information provided, as follows:
- Key components that warrant further examination include:
  - Websites
  - Funding alternatives
  - Management frameworks
  - Operations – how are the monitoring networks operated.

ACTION 6.3: Matthew will update the jurisdiction review document to reflect new information.

ACTION 6.4: Matthew will create a matrix to track the best practices of each jurisdiction.

The matrix may look like:

	Colorado	GVRD	Alberta current	Alberta ideal
Operations				
Website				
Funding				
Management framework				

- CARB reports on the actions at a regional level with a focus on those most at risk.
- BC's system seems to capture compliance based monitoring and makes the data available to the public.
- Can the Alberta system include the current AQ on line?
- Alberta can improve on the communication and outreach components.
- Who will be responsible for implementation?
- Perhaps this team should conduct a bench-marking exercise where emissions, monitoring and population density are overlapped on a map.
- This bench-mark may indicate if the AAQM network is complete / adequate
- The different type of monitoring can be indicated on the map – ecological, human exposure, etc.

4.   1995 and 1997 document review
Discussion:
- It was noted that only one team member provided input to the review.
- Several others indicated they had reviewed the report but have not yet submitted their comments
- The strategic plan is 10 years old, what is currently being done?
- How do we compare to the best practices of the different jurisdictions under review?
- We may not want to review the 1995 strategic plan at all, simply draft a new plan. Or, the team may want to review the 1995 strategic plan after the jurisdiction matrix is complete.
- How hard is it to implement a real time data capture system for the ambient air monitoring network?
- What does the QA/QC process look like for real time data?
- It is vital to provide the context and interpretation if the data, to define a communications component of the new strategic plan.

ACTION 6.5: Matthew will invite Kim Sanderson to the next meeting.

ACTION 6.6: Bob Myrick will investigate the costs, mechanisms, and steps necessary to make real time data capture happen for the AAQM network.

5.   Next steps
The team agreed to the following next steps:

1. Continue jurisdictional review
2. Team members review the strategic documents

6.   Other business
   a.   Workshop

ACTION 6.7: Matthew will poll for Workshop Subgroup participants and meeting date.

7.   Next meeting
Date: Thursday January 13th.
Time: 9:30 – 3:30
Place: ConocoPhillips, Calgary

8.   Adjournment
David Graham adjourned the meeting at 2:49.