

CASA Board of Directors Meeting September 28, 2018, Calgary, Alberta

In attendance:

CASA Board Members and Alternates:

Ann Baran, NGO Rural
Benjamin Israel, NGO Industrial
Bill Calder, NGO Urban
Brian Ahearne, Petroleum Products
Claude Chamberland, Oil and Gas Large Producers
Dan Moore, Forestry
David Spink, NGO Urban
Jim Hackett, Utilities

Kathy Rooyakkers, Local Government – Rural
Rich Smith, Agriculture
Rick Blackwood, Provincial Government - Environment
Rob Beleutz, Mining
Ruth Yanor, NGO Industrial
Wayne Ungstad, NGO Rural
Andre Asselin, CASA Executive Director

CASA Secretariat:

Rosie Alzaman, Katie Duffett, Cara McInnis, Douglas Mills, Kim Sanderson, Candice Sawchuk

Guests:

Jenna Curtis, Alberta Environment and Parks (AEP)
Karla Reesor, Alberta Airsheds Council

Presenters:

Rick Blackwood, *GoA's CASA Cross-Ministry Coordinating Committee (Item 2)*
David Spink and Jim Hackett, *Electricity Framework Review Project Team Update (Item 3)*
Randy Angle, *Ambient Air Quality Objective Project Team (Item 4)*
Ann Baran and Rob Hoffman, *ROVER III Project Update (Item 5)*
Rick Blackwood and Bill Calder, *Executive Committee Presentation (Item 6)*
Andre Asselin, *Executing Communications and Performance Measures Work (Item 7); Update on Indigenous Engagement (Item 8)*

Regrets:

Ahmed Idriss, Utilities
Alison Miller, Petroleum Products
David Lawlor, Alternate Energy
Holly Johnson-Rattlesnake, Samson Cree Nation
Humphrey Banack, Agriculture
Keith Murray, Forestry
Leigh Allard, NGO Health

Mary Onukem, Aboriginal Government - Métis
Martin Van Olst, Federal Government
Scott Wilson, NGO, Consumer
James Baldwin, Chemical Manufacturers

**Clean Air Strategic Alliance
Board of Directors Meeting
September 28, 2018**

Executive Summary

The CASA board acknowledged the contributions of Peter Noble in light of his recent departure from the board. Peter also served as industry vice president. His replacement for the Petroleum Products sector will be Alison Miller. Jim Hackett will be the new industry vice president. Dan Moore was welcomed as the new alternate director for the forestry sector.

As part of the performance measures review, a number of low-rated recommendations were identified and brought forward. The board decided to make no changes to monitoring the low-rated recommendations at this time; rather, they will be considered in - and after as needed - the upcoming strategic planning discussions. The board also agreed to defer a decision about how CASA undertakes performance measurement activity until after the strategic planning session. However, it was agreed that the Communications Committee will be disbanded and responsibility for the annual report will be transferred to the Executive Committee.

Three project teams reported on their work, with the board making the following decisions:

- The board approved the amended charter for the Electricity Framework Review Project Team, which showed a revised budget. This project is not yet funded and funds will be solicited.
- The recommended 1-hour daily maximum ozone Ambient Air Quality Objective of 150 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (76 ppb) was approved and will be transmitted to the GoA to inform its AAQO setting process. This is a reduction from 160 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (82 ppb).
- The board approved the revised project charter for the ROVER III project, including the change in project schedule and reallocation of funds. Data collection is expected to begin in spring 2019 and project funds are still being sought.

This meeting included three presentations for which no decision was required, but board members had an opportunity to engage in discussion:

- The board heard an overview of the GoA's CASA Cross-Ministry Coordinating Committee and how it considers advice and recommendations from CASA.
- In light of previous issues raised by board members and subsequently discussed by the Executive Committee, the executive gave a presentation to clarify these matters and get further board input.
- An update on Indigenous engagement was provided, noting that staff recently participated in a Water Ceremony with the Samson Cree First Nation.

**Clean Air Strategic Alliance
Board of Directors Meeting
September 28, 2018, Calgary, Alberta**

Meeting Notes

Bill Calder convened the business meeting at 9:02 a.m.

1 Administration

1.1 Convene Meeting and Approve Agenda

The chair welcomed everyone, noting that the meeting was occurring on the traditional lands of Treaty 7 First Nations and Métis. He reviewed safety procedures and logistics for the venue. Bill acknowledged Peter Noble's departure from CASA due to new employment responsibilities and noted his contributions over the years. Alison Miller will replace Peter, representing the Petroleum Products sector and Jim Hackett will become the new industry vice president. Dan Moore is the new alternate for the forestry sector. Rosie Alzaman and Candice Sawchuk have recently joined the CASA staff. Those present introduced themselves.

Bill briefly reviewed the agenda for the meeting, noting that information reports appear at the end of the agenda in order to focus discussion on more substantive items. The agenda was adopted as presented.

1.2 Actions and Minutes from April 12, 2018 Board Meeting

The minutes of the April 12, 2018 meeting were adopted by consensus. The action item from that meeting is completed, as noted in the briefing package.

1.3 Annual Report Development and Approval Process

This process is outlined in the briefing note for information. Hard copies of the 2017 annual report were provided to board members.

1.4 Monitoring Low-rated Recommendations

Andre Asselin introduced this item, noting that part of the Performance Measures (PM) review looks at low-rated recommendations. Some of the low-rated recommendations go back a number of years and the board needs to decide whether to continue monitoring them.

Discussion

- In previous years, the PM Committee noted in its review who was contacted, the information they provided, and what the eventual rating was. There is insufficient detail in the current tables; e.g., for the 2002 recommendation on acidifying emissions, to say AEP has taken the advice is too loose; more accountability is needed to ensure the board is kept up to date.
 - A review was done in 2007, five years after the recommendation was made, and AEP did a presentation on how they incorporated the advice and information into their framework.

- It was suggested CASA review its performance measures following the Strategic Planning session and in light of the results of that session to determine which performance measures it will adopt going forward.
- GoA needs to consider many factors when developing policy based on advice from CASA. Despite there being consensus, there may be other considerations that affect how and if recommendations are implemented. The presentation later in this meeting will provide more details on the overall process for responding to CASA recommendations.
- The Acid Deposition Management Framework was prepared by CASA and CASA did an initial assessment. The framework was supposed to be assessed every five years. The GoA subsequently did two five-year assessments and another one is underway. This five-year assessment is the key point in the recommendation with respect to managing acidifying emissions and we should track it to ensure it gets done.
- The activities described in some of these low-rated recommendations may be tasks that the EMSD would measure and monitor as part of its role. AEP can look at this further prior to the CASA strategic planning session, where PMs will be part of the discussion, and advise the board.
- Some of the low-rated recommendations may be addressed through other processes; e.g., the EFR work.

Decision: The board decided to make no changes to monitoring the low-rated recommendations at this time; rather, they will be considered in the upcoming strategic planning discussions.

Action 1: Rick Blackwood will enquire how EMSD measures and monitors recommendations that are ultimately assigned to it as part of its role in supporting CASA and share that information with Andre prior to the strategic planning workshop.

2 Information Presentation on the GoA's CASA Cross-Ministry Coordinating Committee and how Advice and Recommendations are Considered

Rick Blackwood gave an overview of the GoA's CASA Cross-Ministry Coordinating Committee (CMCC) and how it considers advice and recommendations from CASA. His presentation will be circulated to the board after the meeting. The CMCC is an internal GoA committee where collaboration and coordination are essential. It comprises senior managers and above with solid technical knowledge from ten departments and agencies. CMCC provides a formal venue for various ministries to talk about Alberta's Air Quality Management System and find efficiencies for working together. It is chaired by AEP's ADM, Strategy Division. This approach enables other ministries to find out about CASA's ongoing and priority work, to provide coordinated input as appropriate, and to remain engaged and informed. The current government is in the fourth year of its mandate; priorities include regulatory certainty with strong environmental performance, and a focus on health and education. Policy development is an iterative process and to improve the likelihood that CASA recommendations will be implemented, they need to be SMART (specific, measurable, action-oriented, realistic and time-bound). The CASA process already specifies the intent to develop SMART recommendations. Although CASA

recommendations have high value, there may still be challenges for various reasons when it comes to implementation.

Discussion

Q: Are all CASA recommendations evaluated at the ministerial level?

Rick Blackwood (RB): Probably not. When recommendations go forward, they would be connected to a particular policy instrument. Recommendations are screened and staff determine how to respond; e.g., a recommendation that is “non-SMART” would likely not go further up as it would be too broad. All recommendations go first to CMCC for discussion and if they are forwarded to a minister, they would be tied to a policy question. If a recommendation pertains to AEP policy but has an impact on Energy, for example, those two departments would interact and, if they agree, take the recommendation forward jointly. If there are differing opinions, they would collaborate and take forward separate views to their ministers.

Q: Key stakeholders such as Health and Energy are no longer at the CASA board table, which makes the CMCC especially important. I believe it has done a good job to date. However, items that go back to GoA are often complicated and nuanced and I’m not sure that sense is always conveyed. Depending on the issue, there might be times when it would be good for the CMCC to hear from a non-government stakeholder who could also respond to questions when CASA work is being presented. Might this be a possibility? If so, the CMCC should build this mechanism in.

RB: I don’t see why not; we’d just need to make the scheduling work.

Q: If there is disagreement on the CMCC, what happens?

RB: We work incrementally to resolve problems; e.g., if the disagreement is between AEP and Energy, we would meet with the Deputy Ministers, explain the issue, and get their guidance.

Q: Could you explain how policy questions are prioritized and brought up?

RB: We can anticipate some of them because they are driven by bigger issues. Sometimes there are various drivers while others can emerge quickly and require a quick response. Others could be related to a political question. The campaign platform has been a big driver for the current government. For things like air, we often do get advance notice and we know that many of these issues have been around for a long time. We have to be conscious of what is changing around us to respond effectively. The GoA is getting better at reviewing and revisiting environmental policies as needed.

Q: There have been occasions when a team has developed SMART recommendations, but then the GoA pushed back and said it did not want a specific implementation date or a lot of details. GoA may need to provide more guidance ahead of time in some cases.

RB: There are often subtleties to the process and at times we may simply not have resources to implement a recommendation by a specific date.

3 Electricity Management Framework Review Project Team

David Spink and Jim Hackett presented an update from the EFR project team, which is undertaking the third five-year review of the 2003 Electricity Management Framework.

Recommendation 29 in that document outlines what is required in each review. The work is being done in two phases and is prioritized as requested by the GoA. Phase 1 will be completed by December; the work is on target and teams is working towards consensus. Phase 2 activity will begin early in 2019. The original project budget was based on previous reviews, but the scope for the current work has changed. Conducting public consultation for this project was deemed unnecessary during phase 1 and unachievable in the limited timeframe. The team will develop a plan to communicate the outcomes when both phases of the review are completed. Two rounds of intensive public consultation were part of developing the initial framework in 2001-2002 but most of the feedback did not help inform the eventual framework. The team has amended its original budget and now requires an additional \$35,000. The project is not yet funded, and the team is looking for sectors to contribute.

Discussion

- Particulate matter (PM) has been an issue since 2003 and this team should address it. Also, a communications plan does not necessarily allow for engagement with affected communities. Is the team collaborating with organizations that are doing outreach in affected communities?
 - There has been a lot of change since the last review and the team recognizes that managing PM is a very important topic for discussion. But we also need to understand these changes, including the implications of moving from coal to gas and how that shift alone will affect PM emissions. We need to consider if the intent of the framework with respect to PM management will be achieved and, if not, how to address it. With communications, we know we need to piggyback on work that others, such as airsheds, are doing.
- It's not clear to me where funding for key tasks such as updating the NOx air emissions standards will come from.
 - That task needs to be done by December. Given the timelines and the expertise around the table, the team has decided to do the work itself rather than hire a contractor.
- Who set this timeline, as it seems ridiculously tight? It's also a big mistake to simply communicate rather than consult.
 - The GoA requested that this work be expedited. The team is assessing the numbers and having a technical discussion about what needs to be changed. The team has discussed the issue and does not believe at this point that consultation would be helpful as there is no product to consult about.
- Given the pending phase-out of coal, I do not think funds should be spent on a PM management system study at this time. If that approach changes, we can revisit the matter. Since the required funds are not needed until 2019, that should give industry partners more flexibility in potentially contributing. Finally, we should collaborate with other groups to do the communications and outreach rather than having CASA heavily involved in providing information to the public.
 - Despite the coal phase-out by 2030, there are other things related to PM that we don't know. The funds should be allocated to enable us to do the review and have the discussion and a lot of the work can be done in-house. We are talking about PM_{2.5} which is also a factor in natural gas combustion. The team needs to have a robust discussion and these funds are here as a placeholder for now.

- AEP can go back to the Air Policy group to look at the timelines. CASA needs to understand what Air Policy wants to see for an outcome. If they require CASA to do public consultation for the outcome to be defensible, it can't be too rushed.
- The GoA request was for CASA to provide advice on the objectives that are included in the project charter. That advice may inform GoA's decision to set emission standards. It is likely that GoA would still have to consult with the public if it adopts the advice regardless of what CASA does.
- I would need to see the term "consultation" reflected in the revised budget to support the decision.

Decision: The board agreed to approve the EFR Project Team's amended charter with two changes: the revised budget as presented and changing "Communication" to "Communication/Consultation."

Action 2: Rick Blackwood will consult with AEP's Air Policy group regarding the timelines for the EFR review and the extent to which they think public consultation is required to obtain and support the desired outcome from CASA. This information will be provided to the team directly as soon as possible and the board will be updated at the next CASA meeting.

Benjamin Israel announced to the board that Pembina Institute is withdrawing from the EFR Project Team due to lack of funding to support the work the Institute needs to do as part of its participation. Bill Calder noted that the executive committee has discussed the matter of NGO funding and expects further discussion to occur.

4 Ambient Air Quality Objectives Project Team

Randy Angle reviewed the project timelines and mandate, and the work done to date by the active subgroups. The team is reviewing and advising on AAQOs for six substances, and is on schedule for all reviews. Following its review of jurisdictional requirements, health effects, and historical monitoring data, the team recommends that the current 1-hour daily maximum ozone AAQO of 160 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (82 ppb) be revised to 150 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (76 ppb).

Discussion

- The rationale for this recommendation is not shown in the briefing material. I would like to see the rationale clearly linked to the recommendation when it goes to the GoA.
 - AEP compiled ample background on each substance; the document is available but is very technical. Other supporting material, in addition to being technical, is quite lengthy.
 - This is very technical work and involved a great deal of statistical analysis. At the last board meeting, the team presented the proposal for ozone and requested that board members provide any feedback to staff or their sector representative. The CAAQS for ozone are being updated and there will be a new number for 2025. We think this number will be compatible with the new CAAQS. The CAAQS will continue to be pushed downward so Alberta is ahead of the game. Based on our analysis, there are no big implications for a lower number.

- Is there potential non-compliance with the proposed new AAQO in any specific locations or sectors?
 - Ozone is a secondary pollutant so is not emitted directly. If this level is exceeded, there could also be CAAQS exceedances. We looked at all monitoring stations and don't think the new AAQO would change allocations for management plans in the airsheds. I don't recall precisely if this is more related to urban areas, high altitudes, etc. but could get that information if desired.
- Alberta seems to have a higher background ozone level. Do we know why that is?
 - Alberta is not the only province. The source is the upper atmosphere, so at higher elevations, we see higher ozone levels, which is why there are limits on what we can do to reduce it.
- It would be good if the rationale and a list of H₂S/TRS subgroup members could be distributed to the board.

Decision: The board agreed to approve the revised ozone objective for transmittal to the GoA to inform its AAQO setting process.

Action 3: Staff will add the team's rationale for the recommended ozone AAQO to the document that will formally transmit the advice to the GoA and distribute it to the board, along with a list of H₂S/TRS subgroup members.

5 ROVER III Project Team

Ann Baran and Rob Hoffman reviewed the history of CASA ROVER projects, noting that this third iteration of the work was informed by the Non-point Source team's recommendations. Data collection is planned in five municipalities: Calgary, Edmonton, Red Deer, Grande Prairie, and Fort McMurray. However, changes to the timeline are needed, largely because the equipment required to collect NO_x emissions data for heavy-duty vehicles will not be available until spring 2019. A budget adjustment is also necessary to reallocate funds to cover a Service Alberta fee related to developing input and output files for registration information. The overall budget total remains unchanged. Full funding has not yet been secured, and the team is looking for sectors to contribute.

Discussion

- When is full funding for the project needed?
 - It must be in place by Q1 of 2019.
- Are there any confidentiality issues related to licence plate information?
 - No. The information we receive will pertain only to vehicle make, model, year, etc. and will include no personal information.

Decision: The board approved the revised project charter, including the change in project schedule and reallocation of funds.

Rick Blackwood took the chair.

6 Presentation from the Executive Committee

Rick Blackwood and Bill Calder made the presentation, noting that the executive committee (EC) had felt it necessary to engage the board in discussion about issues that had been raised previously. The EC, including Peter Noble, discussed these items and is now seeking board feedback. The three key points are 1) changes to GoA participation in CASA, 2) perceived impact on CASA of amalgamation with AWC, and 3) role of the executive committee. Clarification for each topic was presented, followed by an opportunity for board input.

1. *Changes to GoA participation in CASA*

AEP has become a super ministry with some 2000 staff, which has expanded the DM's role. As previously noted, DMs across the GoA are now expected to provide more support for ministers. Demands on time have made it increasingly challenging to participate in organizations like CASA and AWC, but this does not reflect a lower priority for such activity. The AEP grant is expected to be renewed this year and it may be possible for Energy to contribute again. A multi-year funding commitment is also being sought. Bev Yee was recently named the new DM for AEP and, although she is familiar with CASA and AWC, the extent to which she will be able to participate is not yet clear.

2. *Perceived impact on CASA of amalgamation with AWC*

Decision making remains within CASA's authority. The government undertook a thorough review of agencies, boards, and commissions to identify opportunities to improve efficiencies. Although CASA and AWC are not in that category, it was decided to look for efficiencies here as well. Administrative amalgamation enabled a number of efficiencies to be found. Both entities are entirely separate with respect to how they operate and money is kept in different banks. The only crossover pertains to shared expenses, which the board is informed about. Practices have been modernized and the auditors have approved the way expenses are split. Because there is only one secretariat, some flexibility is needed in terms of things like setting board meeting dates to ensure that board support is effective and the goals of both organizations are met.

3. *Role of executive committee (EC)*

Some concerns were noted about the things the EC is taking on and the associated transparency. The EC role has evolved over time but there is no formal terms of reference or clear description of roles and responsibilities although these have appeared in various CASA documents. Various tasks were presented from these documents along with current practices. In the last two years, the EC has been responsible for overseeing production of the annual report, with input from the board. If additional roles are taken on with respect to communications and performance measurement, some discussion will be needed to ensure transparency.

Discussion

Board members noted that it is reassuring to hear that CASA has value to the GoA. It would be good to see Alberta Agriculture and Forestry more engaged, although they do participate via CMCC and on various project teams.

- I would like EC meeting minutes to be shared with the board.
 - Minutes are not approved until the following EC meeting and draft minutes are not typically shared. We could look at potential ways to expedite the approval process.
- It would be good to distribute any existing documents related to roles and responsibilities for staff and board members. The EC should definitely have terms of reference.
 - Four staff members have been spending about 2/3 of their time on CASA work, which will need to be adjusted soon to ensure sufficient time for AWC and for work in joint areas. This will be an item for discussion at the upcoming joint executive meeting.
- There have been some changes in the way things are done since the amalgamation, which may have created some angst. There is definitely value in formalizing our governance approach so we all understand what our roles and responsibilities are. We may also want to look at other governance models.
- Governance and roles and responsibilities will one of the first items of discussion for the strategic planning session. This could be an opportunity to update and integrate the full package of governance materials and determine if CASA is built to deliver what it is supposed to deliver.
- To improve transparency, would the EC consider soliciting input from board members on the executive director's performance?
- We are really talking about fine-tuning a mechanism that already works pretty well. The EC has done excellent work in my view and the board is in good hands.
- It would be good to get updates between meetings.
 - Andre encouraged board members to call him at any time if they have questions on anything in particular.

This discussion will continue and if board members have further thoughts or ideas, they should forward to Andre so they can be added to the strategic planning discussion as needed.

Action 4: Staff will collate the information on roles and responsibilities for the board, executive committee, the executive director, and any others that may be relevant to the discussion.

7 Communications Committee and Performance Measures Committee

Andre Asselin presented material related to the execution of communications and performance measures (PM) work, which arose from a discussion at the April 12, 2018 board meeting and the process for completing the 2017 annual report. He directed the board to the briefing package, which describes three options for ensuring the communications and PM work gets done, the pros and cons of each, and the resources required. The executive committee is recommending that it take over communications responsibilities with a focus on the annual report. The board would continue to provide input to the annual report but its main role in communications would be outreach and getting CASA products out to their sectors. For PM work, the executive suggests the committee be disbanded, recognizing that more work is needed to rethink the key elements and simplify CASA's approach. The strategic planning outcome will influence this process.

Once it is finished, there will be an opportunity for a communications strategy that aligns with the new strategic plan.

Discussion

- Some unfinished work remains for the Communications Committee; e.g., creating templates for project teams to use in preparing their communications materials. The PMs should be revisited after the strategic planning is finished. In the past, the PM Committee brought its work directly to the board and did not go through the executive. I think any decision about this work should wait until after the strategic planning session.
 - The executive committee regularly reviewed the products developed by the PM Committee, typically presented by staff, and approved adding them to board meeting agendas for consideration and approval.
 - To get the annual report out in a timely manner, work needs to begin right after the strategic planning session, so a decision about communications should be made now.
 - We do need to do a better job of structuring PMs. A lot of the current measures are not things CASA can control or affect and don't reflect the performance of the organization. It is also hard to tell from the PMs if we are actually headed down the right path.
- Creating communications templates is a secretariat function. Each project team, with staff support, will develop its own communications plan and materials for its product(s). The communications plan comes to the board along with the final report so the board will see it and can comment. Board members are always encouraged to distribute CASA's products widely into their sectors.

Decision: The board agreed to:

- a) disband the Communications Committee and transfer responsibility for the annual report to the executive committee, and***
- b) defer a decision about executing PM work until after the strategic planning session.***

8 Update on Indigenous Engagement

Andre Asselin provided an update on Indigenous engagement, noting that staff have been working with many groups and organizations to initiate and build dialogue with Indigenous communities. He referred to the four key pillars described in the briefing package as a starting point where staff have identified opportunities to begin work in engaging Indigenous participation with CASA. Staff have taken corporate Indigenous training and Candice has ten years of experience working with and for Indigenous communities and governments. Staff have been working closely with Holly Johnson Rattlesnake and Kaylyn Buffalo of the Samson Cree Nation since July 2017 and have made positive progress. On September 24, staff were invited to participate in a traditional and sacred Water Ceremony at Maskwacis. Being invited to participate in Ceremony is a very important and critical first step to respectful relationship building, as it recognizes Indigenous protocol in engaging in new dialogues. When the opportunity to participate in the Water Ceremony was initially offered, it was determined that having staff attend was the right place to start, as they will be the initial relationship builders. In future, there may be opportunities for board involvement in other events, ceremonies, and

conversations. Staff have been invited to a meeting of an Indigenous-led water table on October 12, which is a positive outcome of the Water Ceremony.

An important clarification that CASA has made with the participants of the Water Ceremony, and that we will continue to reiterate is that CASA is not the Crown or industry, our process is not a substitute for the legal “duty to consult,” and we are not the ones who can fix individual problems.

Board training relating to Indigenous engagement and relationship building will begin at the next board meeting and will become a consistent agenda item.

Discussion

- Different CASA board members are likely to have differing experience with Indigenous groups and that experience depends where in Alberta you are and which groups you interact with.
- Based on my experience with a number of First Nations and Métis, it is hard to get them around tables like ours. We need to understand how Aboriginal people view air quality and the concerns they have, we need to tell them what CASA does and hear what they have to say, and we need to continue to work to get them to this table to hear their perspective, particularly with respect to traditional knowledge.
 - We aren’t yet at the point where we know how to get that perspective. We have to build the relationship first and will be looking to work with Indigenous communities on how they see themselves participating in all the various levels of our work.

9 GoA Update

In the interest of time, Rick Blackwood offered to provide his notes on the GoA update to the board after the meeting and take any subsequent feedback.

10 Information Reports

The following reports were provided in the briefing package as information and there were no questions or comments on any of the items:

- 10.1 Executive Director’s Report
- 10.2 Appointment of Industry VP
- 10.3 Appointment of new director
- 10.4 Appointment of new alternate director
- 10.5 Member withdrawal
- 10.6 Strategic Planning Steering Committee Status Report

11 New/Other Business

11.1 New/Other Business

There was no new or other business.

11.2 Evaluation Forms

Members were asked to complete meeting evaluation forms for review by the executive.

The next CASA meeting will be the strategic planning session on October 31-November 1, 2018 in Edmonton.

The meeting adjourned at 2:43 p.m.

Action Item	Responsible	Due
Action 1: Enquire how EMSD measures and monitors recommendations that are ultimately assigned to them as part of their role in supporting CASA, and share that information with Andre prior to the strategic planning workshop.	Rick Blackwood	October 26
Action 2: Consult with AEP's Air Policy group regarding the timelines for the EFR review and the extent to which they think public consultation is required to obtain and support the desired outcome from CASA. Rick will then provide this information to the team directly as soon as possible and the board will be updated at the next CASA meeting.	Rick Blackwood	October 26
Action 3: Add the team's rationale for the recommended ozone AAQO to the document that will formally transmit the advice to the GoA and distribute it to the board, along with a list of H ₂ S/TRS subgroup members.	CASA staff	October 12
Action 4: Collate the information on roles and responsibilities for the board, executive committee, the executive director, and any others that may be relevant to the discussion.	CASA staff	October 12