

CASA Board of Directors Meeting

June 24, 2020,

Remote – Zoom Conferencing

In attendance:

CASA Board Members and Alternates:

Randy Angle, NGO Rural

Leigh Allard, NGO Health

Ann Baran, NGO Rural

Rob Beleutz, Mining

Bill Calder, NGO Urban

Jim Hackett, Utilities

Rob Hoffman, Petroleum Products

Ahmed Idriss, Utilities

Benjamin Israel, NGO Industrial

David Lawlor, Alternate Energy

Don McCrimmon, Oil and Gas, large
producers

Mark McGillivray, Alternate Energy

Alison Miller, Petroleum Products

Dan Moore, Forestry

Keith Murray, Forestry

Rich Smith, Agriculture

David Spink, NGO Urban

Martin Van Olst, Federal Government

Bev Yee, Provincial Government -
Environment

Andre Asselin, CASA Executive Director

CASA Secretariat:

Alec Carrigy, Katie Duffett, Lauren Hall, Anuja Ramgoolam

Guests:

Jenna Curtis, Sushmitha Gollapudi, Sharon Willianen, Alberta Environment and Parks

Virginia Nelson, Alberta Agriculture and Forestry

Andria Panidisz, CAPP

Gary Redmond, Alberta Capital Airshed

Karla Reesor, Peace River Area Monitoring Program

Regrets:

James Baldwin, Chemical Manufacturers

Holly Johnson-Rattlesnake, Samson Cree
Nation

Mary Onukem, Métis Settlements General
Council

Kathy Rooyakkers, Local Government -
Rural

Ruth Yanor, NGO Industrial

**Clean Air Strategic Alliance
Board of Directors Meeting
June 24, 2020**

Executive Summary

The board addressed a few administrative items, including changes to CASA signing authorities.

Recognizing that CASA projects have been affected by the pandemic and economic conditions, the executive committee initiated a discussion with the board to test if:

- the current CASA projects are still relevant to everyone,
- members have the capacity to continue participating at this level of activity, and
- there are higher priority projects or activities CASA could take on that would better support its members.

The board considered the status and significance of each current project and agreed that four of the five projects now underway should continue; these are the Ambient Air Quality Objectives, Electricity Framework Review, ROVER III, and the CAAQS Symposium. Board members agreed that the Governance Review Committee would be paused until further notice.

In terms of potential new work, the pandemic is an opportunity to measure the impact that consumer transportation has on air quality, given the marked decline in commuter traffic during the COVID-19 lockdown. AEP has already collected some data and analysis is nearly complete. This will be shared with the board when it is ready. Board members agreed to form an ad hoc group to further scope the issue and report back at the September board meeting.

As requested by the EFR Project Team, the board approved an amended project charter and timeline extension, which will see the team complete all tasks and deliverables by December 2020. As well, the board approved a proposal from the executive committee for revising CASA's Performance Measures Strategy.

As part of the GoA update, President Bev Yee provided comments on the department reorganization, explaining some of the rationale and expected outcomes. She also spoke about the short-term relief offered to industry on environmental reporting and monitoring due to the pandemic. At this time, the enabling ministerial orders have been rescinded and environmental monitoring and reporting are returning to normal July 15.

**Clean Air Strategic Alliance
Board of Directors Meeting
June 24, 2020
Remote – Zoom Conferencing**

Meeting Summary

Andre Asselin convened the business meeting at 10:08 a.m. immediately following the AGM.

1 Administration

1.1.1 Convene Meeting and Approve Agenda

The chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and briefly reviewed the agenda.

Decision: The agenda was approved by consensus.

1.2 Actions from December 13, 2019 Board Meeting

There was one action from the last board meeting, and an update was provided in the package. Andre noted that engagement related to road dust management is ongoing.

1.2 Summary of Previous Meeting

Clarifying edits were submitted by board members and incorporated prior to the meeting.

Decision: The board approved the summary of the December 13, 2019 board meeting by consensus and the summary will be posted to the website.

1.4 Change to Signing Authorities

To conduct the business of CASA, contractual agreements must be negotiated, and authority is required to make payments. CASA's bylaws require the signing officers be approved by the CASA board. The requirements for signing authority on payments are that any two approved signing authorities are required for cheques of \$25,000 or less, and for cheques over \$25,001, signatures of one approved staff member and one approved director are required.

Recent turnover among staff and directors requires that signing authorities be updated. The executive committee recommended the board remove Rick Blackwood, Peter Noble, Bill Calder, and Cara McInnis, and add Tom Davis, Jim Hackett, Leigh Allard, and Anuja Ramgoolam.

Decision: The board approved the changes to CASA's signing authorities.

2 Board Discussion about Affirming Priorities and Responding to Member Needs in the Current Economic and Social Context

Internal projects and external project teams, working groups, and committees have been affected by the pandemic and economic conditions for many reasons. For example, the border with the US is closed to non-essential travel, members' capacity to participate in CASA's work has been limited or changed, and some stakeholder priorities may have shifted.

The executive committee discussed this matter and had the following questions for the Board of Directors:

- Are the current CASA projects still relevant to everyone?
- Do members have the capacity to continue participating at this level of activity?
- Are there higher priority projects or activities CASA could take on that would better support its members?

Bev Yee commented that AEP has moved to a multi-year grant for additional stability but is feeling some pressure in terms of how the funds are provided. Grant recipients might be asked to take installments over the course of a year if need be. But the GoA commitment to funding CASA and the AWC remains. GoA sees the value of bringing folks together to talk about these policy issues that are critical to the province and we will continue to participate. Sometimes it might be challenging, and we have multiple demands; resources aren't what they used to be. But for us, CASA is a priority. The discussion of priorities is important at a time when resources are tighter. AEP is doing that across the board and across the entirety of their business to identify the things that are of the highest priority and will make the biggest difference.

Andre noted that CASA has not yet received its 2020 funding but he is working with AEP on it. CASA is spending money that has been allocated to other projects and will replenish these amounts once the core funding arrives. That happens every year. It's been challenging but we are adapting as best we can to the challenges and opportunities.

It's keeping expenses down, and the pandemic has offered some unique observations; e.g., the reduction in traffic has improved air quality. He has been in contact with the Alberta Airsheds Council regarding the potential for a project looking into this unique opportunity.

Andre noted that the executives decided not to bring the multi-year strategic plan for discussion or approval at this meeting as CASA needs to take a shorter-term focus in ensuring it is meeting its members needs in this unprecedented time.

Discussion:

Board members had a wide-ranging discussion considering the questions put forward by the executive committee.

CASA has five projects underway, which is beyond the current staff capacity. The Electricity Framework Review (EFR) and Ambient Air Quality Objectives (AAQO) are nearly complete. The ROVER III team is facing delays due to the closed US-Canadian border, and Service Alberta is having some delays. Staff and the team are working on ways to move it forward. The CAAQS symposium project is working on a project charter, and the Governance Review has been paused since March.

- Andre focused first on AAQO. Is the AAQO project still relevant and do members have the capacity to continue? Board members supported continuing with the AAQO project and moving it ahead.

- Turning to the EFR project, the team is requesting a timeline extension because it proposed to complete its work by the end of the year. Board members indicated their continuing support for the EFR project.
- For ROVER III, many delays have occurred that are outside the team's control. The contractor cannot cross the border without an exemption and staff are applying for such an exemption. As well, the pandemic has affected traffic volumes.
 - CASA gathered a lot of good information from earlier ROVER projects and this work should continue. It will support the work of other projects too.
 - Although traffic patterns have changed, we can't predict what levels will come back to. The project is trying to get a profile of heavy-duty trucks (car emissions are being measured too). The goal is to get the field work done in 2020.
 - The board agreed to continue its support for the ROVER III project, although it may need to be revisited in September if further delays occur.
- The next project to consider is the CAAQS air quality symposium, which has clearly been affected by the pandemic and the inability to hold large gatherings. Is the project still relevant and do members have the capacity to keep working on it?
 - AEP is supportive of this project, but they may need to find other ways to deliver it. The purpose is very relevant and important.
 - The team is still working to determine what format will be most effective and to ensure we are not duplicating other efforts. We are targeting CASA members as well as groups that work in the industries that will be affected by the CAAQS. At the next meeting on July 13, we will narrow the scope and decide how to proceed. The reach could be greater if it is a virtual event.
 - CAAQS are a very important air quality management tool. Almost all those who will be affected by the CAAQS are at the CASA table, so CASA is a wonderful forum to provide advice and ideas to government on how to deal with this challenge. Ideally the working group will be able to come to the board in September with a clear plan.
 - We want to ensure that what we do is useful for AEP. The province is going to be challenged in near-term achievement of the CAAQS. If the purpose is to generate solutions, we want to ensure we meet AEP's timelines.
 - AEP noted that timeframes should still be okay if something is ready to go by spring next year.
 - This issue won't go away, it's important, and we should keep the project going.
 - The board agreed to keep working on the CAAQS symposium project.
- The last project is the CASA Governance Review Committee (GRC), which was paused when the contract project manager stepped away in March. The committee is composed of board members, and in-person meetings have been encouraged to facilitate honest and open discussion. The GRC was initially planning to include a standing item on its work at board meetings to get feedback. The GRC's intent was to potentially make recommendations that would change the way CASA operates. The work could still be done remotely but that could make it harder to keep people engaged and have meaningful discussions. Without Matt, this also becomes a substantial workload for staff, so the GRC may need to reconsider its approach. This project came out of the multi-year strategic plan, but a lot has changed since then.

- This is not an immediate term priority and could be paused until we have more clarity on our “new normal.”
- The GRC will have one more meeting to do a status update.
- The board agreed to put the GRC into abeyance until further notice.

Andre then asked the board to consider if there is a project that CASA should be taking on, particularly given the opportunities provided by the pandemic in terms of reduced commuter traffic.

- The industry caucus discussed this briefly. The pandemic is an opportunity to measure the impact that consumer transportation has on air quality. It would also be a chance to partner with airsheds.
- We have good information to work with like firm dates on the phased reopening.
- AEP did some monitoring and specifically looked at concentrations of NO₂ between March 22 and April 24. There was a 25% decrease in NO₂ in the two large cities. This might inform things like urban planning and could influence consumer and citizen behaviour. Data are also coming out of Europe and China. The topic needs to be scoped further but there is an opportunity.
- This situation links strongly to our non-point source (NPS) pollution work and recommendations. Transportation was noted as having a very significant influence on air quality in the province. The role for CASA and perhaps a project would be to get interested stakeholders together and consider what we want to look at, and how might we interpret that information, recognizing that AEP and airsheds would need to do a lot of the work to analyze data. The result could be a report or some thoughts about how this links with some of the recommendations in the NPS report.
- Why is CASA the right group for this? It would be helpful if AEP could share its analysis at a future meeting to help us figure out the “so what” from a CASA perspective.
- AEP intends to post the results of the analysis but it’s not quite ready. Once it’s ready we’ll share it directly with CASA board members. Is the NPS project and recommendations part of the starting point or review to see where we are relative to that? It would be good to look at that work more closely.
- The airsheds are already doing some work in this area and the Airsheds Council is interested in further discussion to ensure we aren’t duplicating anything. Airsheds should be included in the ad hoc group.
- The value of the meeting of this ad hoc group will depend on the release of AEP’s results.

Action: Staff will reach out to the board and Airsheds to identify members for an ad hoc group to discuss the scope of a project looking into the impact of reduced consumer transportation emissions on air quality due to the pandemic and report back at the September board meeting and, if appropriate, follow up with a Statement of Opportunity.

Action: Andre will follow up with Jenna Curtis for a timeline regarding expected release of the air quality report, which will inform the ad-hoc group.

Action: Staff will prepare an updated Operational Plan that reflects the board’s priorities over the next twelve to fifteen months and distribute to the board.

3 Electricity Framework Review (EFR) Project Team

At the December 2019 board meeting, the EFR project team requested a project extension until April 2020, at which point the board would be asked to review and approve a revised project charter with an updated task schedule for the remaining outstanding project tasks. The project team met in January and February 2020 to review the remaining tasks and has developed a timeline with all tasks and deliverables to be completed by December 2020. The team is requesting the board approve the updated project charter and timeline.

Decision: The board approved the amended EFR project charter by consensus.

4 Revising the Performance Measures Strategy

CASA has followed a multi-year performance measures strategy to report on performance measures, performance indicators, and air quality data linked to its strategic plan targets and project team recommendations for many years. This process was facilitated by a standing Performance Measures Committee. Due to consistent challenges in previous years with achieving quorum from CASA's three sector groups to participate in the Performance Measures Committee, decreased core funding, a changing strategic environment, and a need to reduce administrative red tape throughout the organization, the Executive Committee is proposing the following approach to revising the Performance Measures Strategy, where staff will:

- Review the previous Performance Measures Strategy to identify strengths, weaknesses, gaps, and opportunities.
- Suggest updates to the strategy to the Executive Committee and then present them to the board for consideration and sector engagement.
- Draft performance measures for the strategic plan when it is approved.
- Work with the board to incorporate feedback provided on the Performance Measures Strategy as well as new performance measures for the strategic plan.
- Prepare final drafts and present them to the Executive Committee and the Board of Directors for final approval.

Given that the pandemic has shifted CASA's focus from following a multi-year strategic plan to shorter-term horizons, staff will work on the performance measures strategy first, and consider the performance measures for the multi-year strategic plan when it is approved. Performance measures will be reported on annually.

Board members had no comments or concerns with the recommended process related to revising the Performance Measures Strategy.

Decision: The proposed process for revising the Performance Measures Strategy was approved by consensus.

5 Information Reports

Two reports were provided for the board's information:

Executive Director's Report

There were no questions on the Executive Director's report.

Government of Alberta Update

Bev Yee offered some comments on the GoA update, first providing context on the department reorganization which is in the final stages. There's a desire to see AEP work together in a more integrated way, with stronger ties between the policy work and the operational work, which is implementation of policy. In particular, that was done with fish and wildlife as part of the resource stewardship division. We want to ensure our work in the field better informs policy. This approach was also taken in the Lands Division. Another key aspect of integration relates to environmental, economic, and social objectives. AEP wants to ensure all those things are considered across the scope of our work. We also wanted to strengthen the role science plays in informing policy. A lot of the science work has been centralized in the Resource Stewardship Division and is helping to make sure there aren't any gaps there and the work remains and continues to be credible and is used in the best way to inform policy development. Lastly was distribution of workload. While this department has a significant role as a regulator, policy and operations are also key. That seemed to overwhelm in terms of workload for an ADM. So, the reorg was about better distribution of workload too. There are already benefits of the new structure.

Bev then spoke about environmental reporting and monitoring. Because of COVID, the AEP minister did put ministerial orders in place that provided short-term relief to industry on some elements of environmental reporting—that is, those things that were low risk, had no impact on public safety and did not have any negative impact on environmental health. Industry was still required to keep documentation and to provide it if requested, they just didn't have to file the reports with us. At about the same time there were a lot of requests to AER and AEP from the regulated parties looking for some flexibility on environmental monitoring because of COVID. A lot of the news reporting characterized it as all environmental monitoring being suspended, but that was not true. Only about 2-5% of all environmental monitoring requirements were suspended to provide temporary relief. All of that has been rescinded and things are returning to normal July 15. We still want people to maintain physical distancing and to stay safe while they are gathering data.

Discussion:

- The relief in terms of monitoring and reporting created a lot of angst in a number of communities. There were three main areas of concern. First was the question as to whether all of the relief or options for relief that were provided were necessary. For the industry and airsheds I talked to, the relief was there, but only if they really needed it did they use it. For example, WBEA was basically business as usual. I don't think anyone took advantage of it. Secondly, as you know, among the Indigenous communities the concern is there was no consultation or advanced notification and there may be some lessons to be learned from that. Thirdly, in terms of the suspension and relief, some was appropriate, but there was no indication when that relief was given as to whether some of that reporting would be made up; they have to submit annual reports. There was uncertainty there. The stakeholders I polled did not think AEP and AER were taken

advantage of when regulated entities sought relief on air related monitoring and reporting issues.

- Bev Yee: I appreciate those comments. What we found was that it was that only used if people really needed it; we didn't see anyone taking advantage of the situation and many continued to monitor throughout. In terms of Indigenous communities, we could have done better there. AER agrees they could have done better. No one is off the hook for reporting. All it meant was a bit of a delay or postponement on required reporting.
- It was good that no one used the relief when they didn't need it, but it was important for example, for greenhouse gases. There was a concern from our end that verification or auditing around greenhouse gas emissions might occur, so it was very important that we know we have that. From our end we had to almost shut down the plant because people weren't able to be working in them. Even our employees weren't allowed in the plant even though we had taken precautions. We shouldn't lose sight of that. The pause goes beyond air and things like that.
- Has AEP completed work on the database for the annual emissions inventory reporting (AEIR) (#11 in the update)? That database was promised when AEIR was brought in. Where are you on having that up and running? And regarding the Industrial Air Emissions Management Program (IAEMP) (#12), is this an add-on to AEIR? Is it going to be province-wide?
 - Sharon Willianen (SW): The team is fairly close to referring the first year of AEIR submissions, although there is still some discussion with some facilities for clarification or information they might still need to provide. It won't be online right away because they're looking at how to incorporate it with the overall air management program update. The intention is to share with industry and others. The IAEMP is being run out of our resource stewardship division and it is specific to the Red Deer and North Saskatchewan areas of the province. I'm not aware of any intention to expand beyond those two areas. It is focused on NO₂.
- The design of the IAEMP was a result of those regions going red; it may expand.
- Regarding item 2, industrial stakeholders might remember the CEMS code came out as a draft, was pulled back, and a second draft was being prepared. Has it been delayed because of the pandemic? When does AEP see that coming out?
 - SW: I don't have a date for draft 2 of the CEMS code. The team is incorporating comments on draft 1. They're taking some extra time to look at it through the lens of red tape reduction but I can check with them to get a more realistic timeframe.
- Regarding item 4 related to the federal government and CAAQS on PM_{2.5} and that discussions might restart in mid-2020, has there been anything further?
 - SW: They're still starting with the background information that's necessary for those discussions. I don't have a timeframe but my understanding is that as soon as they can have some meaningful conversations, things will resume. Maybe end of this year, or early next year.

Action: Sharon Willianen will provide an update on the AEIR when it is available and will forward any updates on the IAEMP and the release date of the second draft of CEMS code.

6 New or Other Business

There was no new or other business.

One board member noted that the agenda notes an option for an in-camera session at the end of the meeting. This was discussed at the industry caucus, which felt that in-camera discussions were not being a good fit for a virtual meeting, should we choose to have one. But we would like to gather any kind of in-camera discussion for this meeting through our caucuses and this could be gathered by the executive for discussion with the executive committee.

Andre noted that the opportunity for in-camera section was added but it is not typical. We would turn off the recording if the board wanted that. It can happen within the caucuses but be dealt with it at the executive level first.

The next meeting is planned for September 17 in Edmonton, but it will likely be held remotely.

The meeting adjourned at 11:46 a.m.

The following action item arose from the meeting:

Action: Staff will reach out to the board and Airsheds to identify members for an ad hoc group to discuss the scope of a project looking into the impact of reduced consumer transportation emissions on air quality due to the pandemic and report back at the September board meeting and, if appropriate, follow up with a Statement of Opportunity.

Action: Andre will follow up with Jenna Curtis for a timeline regarding expected release of the air quality report, which will inform the ad-hoc group.

Action: Staff will prepare an updated Operational Plan that reflects the board's priorities over the next twelve to fifteen months and distribute to the board.

Action: Sharon Willianen will provide an update on the AEIR when it is available and will forward any updates on the IAEMP and the release date of the second draft of CEMS code.