

Final Minutes



Clean Air Strategy Project Team Meeting 9

April 11, 2008

10:00 – 3:30

CASA Offices, Edmonton

In attendance:

Name	Organization
Jennifer Allan	CASA
Len Bracko	Alberta Urban Municipalities Association (afternoon)
Michael Brown	ERCB (by phone)
Christine Byrne	Imperial Oil, CAPP
Kerra Chomlak	CASA
Peter Dzikowski	Alberta Infrastructure and Transportation
Gerry Ertel	Shell Canada, CPPI
Tim Goos	Environment Canada
Sharon Hawrelak	CASA (item 4)
Tony Hudson	Alberta Lung Association
Steve Kennett	Pembina Institute (by phone)
Myles Kitagawa	Toxics Watch Society (alternate for Martha Kostuch)
David Lawlor	Enmax
Alex Mackenzie	Alberta Health and Wellness (morning)
Al Mok	Suncor, CAPP
Bettina Mueller	Alberta Environment (afternoon)
Kim Sanderson	CASA
Nashina Shariff	Toxics Watch Society
Mike Zemanek	Alberta Health and Wellness

With regrets:

Name	Stakeholder group
Debra Code	Enmax
Caroline Kolebaba	Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties
Long Fu	Alberta Environment
Martha Kostuch	Prairie Acid Rain Coalition
Ken Omotani	TransAlta
Anita Sartori	CNRL, CAPP
Jason Schultz	TransCanada
Srikanth Venugopal	TransCanada

Action items:

Item	Who	When
Action 9.1: Kim will work with the co-chairs to start a draft document.	Kim, co-chairs	ongoing
Action 9.2: The subgroup will review draft 2 of the discussion guide; draft 3 will be circulated to the team by end of day, April 15. The team will provide comments by April 21.	Public Consultation Subgroup, team	April 15 April 21
Action 9.3: Kerra and Bettina will develop a plan to address the funding situation and report back to the team by April 15.	Kerra and Bettina	April 15
Action 9.4: Jennifer will poll for a meeting date in May (May 20, 21 or 22).	Jennifer	April 14

Al Mok convened the meeting at 10:10 am.

1. Administrative Items

a) The agenda and meeting objectives were reviewed and approved.

b) Approval of the minutes from meetings 7 and 8.

Meeting 7: Two amendments were made: On page 3, the second line under Industrial Point Sources was amended to read: "...a shift away from point source management..."; and on page 4, the first bullet under Behaviour was amended to read: "Incent industry to operate beyond compliance standards."

Meeting 8: Myles Kitagawa asked to have the parenthetical note that he is Martha Kostuch's alternate added to his name in the attendance table.

With those changes, the minutes were approved by consensus.

c) Action items follow up.

Jennifer had previously distributed a list of action items and their status. The team reviewed these and updates were provided as appropriate. Action items not listed in the following table were complete prior to this meeting.

#	Action	Status / Discussion
2.6	Jennifer to arrange presentations on Water for Life and the Land use Framework (LUF) will be arranged.	A draft LUF is expected to be out in May, and the team can get copies then for review by each member. Carry forward.
4.4	Bettina will coordinate a presentation (or participation in the workshop) by Ken Stubbs from the Metro Vancouver.	The GVRD has a good template for managing air quality and we could learn from it. It was suggested that the team focus on what GVRD has done, why and how, and why their strategy worked. What are the underpinnings and drivers? Does Alberta have the same problems and how far do we need to go?
4.6	Jennifer and Kerra to ask Alberta Energy for an update on the Integrated Energy Policy, specifically when the team could have a presentation.	Alberta Energy provided a short update to the CASA board in March; they will give a fuller report in June. Carry forward.

#	Action	Status / Discussion
4.8	Len will send St Albert's environmental management system document to Jennifer who will circulate it to the team via email.	Carry forward
5.1	Myles and Jennifer to circulate the information Myles obtained from the Capital Airshed Alliance to the team.	Myles advised that the three airsheds preparing PM and O3 management plans have updated their emissions inventories and are nearly ready to make this information available. This work covers a broader area than just the CMAs. Carry forward.
5.2	Gerry and Jennifer to circulate the information Gerry obtained for emissions in the Calgary census metropolitan area to the team.	This information is available but will be superseded by the work mentioned in action 5.1.
5.4	Mike Zemanek to locate Alberta Health's information on indoor air quality and send the link to Jennifer for circulation to the team.	Carry forward.
5.5	AENV will discuss how the Air Emissions Trends and Projections Report could better reflect emissions by region and Long and Bettina to report back to this team at the next meeting.	Carry forward.
5.6	Dave Belyea will locate a list of the mandate initiatives and send it to Jennifer for circulation to the team.	Carry forward. Jennifer will follow up.
5.8	Jennifer will find Ken Stubbs' (Metro Vancouver) presentation in the CASA archives and circulate it to the team.	This presentation has been located. It focuses on the monitoring system. The team decided if a member is interested, they would contact Jennifer. Delete this action item.
5.9	Long will send the AENV Transportation Emissions report to Jennifer for circulation to the team.	In progress; the report is not quite ready.
5.10	Bettina will summarize the key process points from the UK air management framework and send to Jennifer for distribution when available.	Carry forward
6.1	Ken, Myles and Mike Z. will do further work on the values and principles and bring suggestions back to the team. If anyone wants to join this small group, they should advise Jennifer very soon.	Draft in progress; target is April 28 delivery.
6.2	Each sector will prepare a vision and mission statement to start the team's discussion.	None of the sectors has yet completed their statement. Carry forward.
6.5	Jennifer and the co-chairs will identify which meeting would be the next information gathering meeting.	Carry forward
7.2	Robyn Jacobsen will contact SRD and ask for information regarding forest fire management practices.	Jennifer advised that Robyn needs more direction about what she should be asking. The team discussed this item noting the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The team should stick to strategic issues and not get into details like risk management associated with prescribed burns. Hopefully, SRD would develop policies and procedures in line with what the CAS requires. • Policies and practices are not the same thing. How does SRD view its strategic role and its practices with respect to air quality? They need to deal properly with the effects their decisions have on air quality.
8.1	Sharon will ask Calder Bateman to do a quick scan,	Done

#	Action	Status / Discussion
	including checking with municipalities in each area where meetings will be held to find out if other major activities and events are occurring at the time the CASA meetings are planned.	
8.2	Bettina will talk to the AENV executive to see if there is a bit more leeway in timing.	Carry forward.
8.3	Team members with ideas about how to structure these sources should send them to Jennifer for distribution to the team.	Done
8.5	Jennifer will set up three subgroups to try fleshing out three priority areas. The following were suggested: industry point sources, agriculture and urban design.	The agriculture group is still forming, but the other two subgroups will meet next week. Forestry will be addressed later on.
8.6	Jennifer will poll for dates for at least two meetings, one at the end of March and one in April.	Done.

d) CASA Update

Jennifer and team members provided an update on the following CASA teams:

- Confined Feeding Operations (CFO): The CASA board approved the final report and recommendations in March. The team will have a media event to release the report, and will reconvene in 2011 to review progress.
- Indoor Air Quality (IAQ): The CASA board agreed that IAQ will be the topic for the 2009 CASA science symposium, to be organized by the IAQ team.
- Performance Evaluation Committee (PEC): The PEC presented its final report to the board. They concluded that, to the extent that strategic air quality planning is carried out by AENV, CASA has been effective, but support and knowledge related to other departments is low. The board will discuss the PEC's findings further at its June retreat.
- Human and Animal Health: This team recommended, and the board agreed, that the Syndromic Surveillance Network being piloted by AHW and Capital Health be used as a mechanism to implement a human health air quality monitoring system for Alberta. The network will access a number of different databases and, based on a predetermined set of conditions, will identify anomalous conditions related to unusual symptoms and environmental exposure.

2. Report Structure and Narrative

The team discussed the draft table of contents for the CAS, focusing initially on implementation, and then providing comments on the various sections.

Implementation

There were different views on how much detail to include about implementation; comments included the following:

- Implementation details should not be part of the CAS; we could recommend another process for implementation. The CAS will inform others about how to do the work to fulfill the strategy. The CAS will assume that a management system for implementation either exists or will be generated.

- We need to provide some direction about implementation to ensure the CAS doesn't just gather dust. It would not be a detailed implementation plan, but a "plan, do check, act" management system. We should identify the risks and how to manage them.
- We can recommend that an implementation plan be done to identify risk management interventions that will ensure long term implementation. If the GOA accepts it, then we can put pressure on the GOA to implement.
- Should the strategy describe how resources will be deployed to achieve the vision or is this getting into tactics rather than strategy? The strategy should not tell people what to do and how, but should enable alignment. We can define the characteristics of implementation, but we don't have the resources to develop all the details.
- How will we be able to determine in five years if the strategy has been successful if we don't include some implementation details?
- The 1991 CAS created CASA as the main vehicle for determining strategic direction; we need an element in the new CAS to tell us how to get where we want to go.
- We need to look at what issues we want to address, what are the obstacles and how much guidance we can provide. There was good progress in some areas of the 1991 strategy but not others, some of which may be related to management systems and accountability. The new CAS needs to address those areas. Secondly, Water for Life (WFL) discusses other partners and their roles, and it was called a strategy. One criticism of WFL was that there was not enough detail on governance, so some bodies did not have enough strategic direction on issues. We should look at WFL and see if there are elements we can adapt.
- Some key elements must be in the CAS and we can flesh those out, knowing we don't want all the details. The 1991 notion of a consensus-based body to manage clean air was fundamental to success even though that was an implementation detail.
- Pace of implementation progress is a challenge in multi-stakeholder processes. A strategy can lay out a plan but the pace must be realistic and acknowledge that there will be external influences. People also need to see how things fit together.
- Efficient design can help the pace so we should help implementers move efficiently and effectively.
- The team could try to identify who has key roles in implementing the CAS, but that assumes we know who they are and what they should do, and someone could be left out. GOA ministers, for example, will know they need to act.
- The bigger risk to overall success is having a strategy in which no one thinks it's their job to implement, rather than everyone thinking it's their job. If we don't allocate some accountability, major players may read it and say "this is not my responsibility." This is a bigger risk than leaving someone out. The CAS needs to be sufficiently compelling that air quality decision makers will know they need to respond. Most departments are not likely to say their mandate is to protect air quality, when in fact the decisions they make do affect air quality. The CAS can make these connections explicit.
- We agree that we want guiding mechanisms, not a lot of detail. The level of implementation detail will vary from sector to sector and with each piece of strategy. We may want to have different levels of detail in different sections.

In summary, the team wants to be cautious about mixing strategy with implementation planning, although some key implementation items need to be part of the CAS because they are critical to the CAS success. For the time being, the team will not worry about labeling points as strategic or implementation, but will think about how to integrate these concepts later on.

There was general support for outlining the conditions, or characteristics, necessary to implement the Clean Air Strategy.

Part One

- Add a sentence or two about the health impacts of air emissions.
- Explain why air quality is important, what Alberta's air quality is like, how we know if it's good or bad, and how it compares with other jurisdictions.
- Look at the trends and ensure there are clear connections between what is described in part 1 and what we propose in part 2. Part 1 needs to provide the rationale for part 2.
- The CAS should have a vision and mission to help define the destination, but we need to distinguish the mission and vision of the strategy from that of CASA and the team.
- Call section 2 "Policy Context" and include reference to the CASA frameworks here.
- Consider doing a broad environmental scan that looks at political, social, economic and other opportunities and challenges.

Part Two

- We have not reached consensus on the priority areas, so it is premature to say what those will be.
- The challenge will be developing the outcomes in section 6. The example is at about the right level.
- Building the argument will be key as we go from general to specific. We may need another section that looks at cross-cutting themes like cumulative effects and governance issues to bridge from part 1 to part 2. We identify these challenges and opportunities, then propose solutions.
- Section 5 is intended to focus on prevention rather than end-of-pipe solutions.
- In section 6, it would be good to have 3-5 high level goals.
- Section 8 should talk about the features and characteristics of implementation. What are the key components of a management system that will support the CAS in guiding implementation?

Part Three

The team agreed that documenting its process is important, particularly given the work that will go into the public consultation, but this detail does not need to be in the main report. Members agree to include a short summary of the process and the public consultations in part one, then add an appendix with more detail.

Part Four

The team discussed whether and how it will include recommendations in the CAS. As with all CASA teams, the draft recommendations will need to be tested with stakeholders before they are

presented to the CASA board. The team can start to think about recommendations but will likely not want to finalize them until the public consultations are done.

Generally, the team agreed it will want to make some recommendations, but may want to use a different term (e.g., path forward), and that some actions will be identified at a high level as part of the strategy. The team also agreed that work could begin on a draft, focusing on part one.

Action 9.1: Kim will work with the co-chairs to start a draft document.

3. Integrated Decision Making and Governance

Steve and Bettina reviewed their thinking to date on how to address integrated decision making and governance. Generally, the question is what needs to be done in the new CAS to avoid the issues faced by the 1991 strategy in terms of implementation and decision making. For example:

- AENV delivered on the areas of the 1991 strategy that were in their mandate, but a number of other areas that were outside their mandate were more problematic.
- Decisions by other GOA departments have important implications for air quality, but those implications are not taken into account as much as they should be when decisions are made.
- There is a sense that the CAS has been seen as AENV's strategy not the GOA's strategy. All departments whose decisions affect air quality need to be engaged.
- Cumulative effects issues are largely related to fragmented decision making and silos and the new CAS should try to address this.

The team discussed these issues, with members noting the following points:

- The challenge is for other GOA departments to recognize the impact of their decisions on air quality. AENV cannot always influence emerging policy of other departments. The CAS needs to consider its potential impacts on other processes, strategies and policies (e.g., WFL, Land Use Framework) as well as what the CAS needs from these other plans. For example, the CAS will reduce air pollution which will help protect crops and livestock, while the CAS would also expect agricultural policies to minimize the impacts of that sector on air quality. We need to find these links to ensure good integration, and lay out a process to ensure this happens.
- Part of the challenge is also to reconcile existing conflicting policies.
- Areas of unregulated emissions will be more challenging; e.g., vehicles. Some members envisioned the CAS identifying implementers and guiding them in taking specific actions. The CAS should be crafted so it becomes a lure for GOA departments to implement strategies that align and protect air quality.
- The team needs to be clear on the scope and not limit the CAS to GOA policy. There are other public entities with an impact on air quality (e.g. municipalities)
- The Premier has directed departments (e.g., SRD, Energy, AENV) to work together, and it would be very helpful for the CAS to have early buy-in from other departments. The team needs to get representation from at least AE and possibly SRD to the table. Other

decision makers also need to be engaged to ensure that implementation goes beyond CASA and AENV.

- The team could recommend in the CAS a mechanism to ensure that air quality is considered in the decision-making process of all agencies, or it could leave this for an implementation team to address.
- There are also several levels of decision making to consider; provincial policy decisions are made by Cabinet, while many players are involved in regional land use decisions and it is expected that AENV's cumulative effects regulatory framework will be integrated into the LUF. Planning provides a way to force the integration that has not yet occurred. How regional planning entities are established and what their mandate will be remains to be determined.
- Executive Council has information on how the GOA develops policy, and some of this information could be helpful to the team. But the team is talking about more than just GOA processes; this work is relevant to all whose decisions affect Alberta's air quality.

The team brainstormed some processes that would lead to integrated decision making and aligning policies with an impact on air quality. These included:

- Policy-level environmental impact assessment
- Integrated regional planning (with links to other initiatives such as Land Use Framework)
- Recommend that another group develop a process, or a group be formed to develop the process
- New function for CASA and CASA board members. Members would be expected to implement CAS in their stakeholder groups
- A new organization formed to implement the CAS and integrated decision making

The team agreed to reflect further on what needs to be done to better integrate decision making and consider how to address this in the CAS. There was a recognition this may be one of the major elements of the CAS. This will be further discussed at the May meeting.

4. Update from Public Consultation Subgroup

Sharon Hawrelak provided an update on the work of the Public Consultation Subgroup and distributed copies of the revised consultation plan. This project falls under the GOA's need to consult with Aboriginal stakeholders, so CASA will work with AENV's Aboriginal Relations unit to see if the plan meets their needs.

Dates have been set for town hall meetings in May and June, and Sharon reviewed the proposed format for these meetings. Team members are strongly encouraged to attend and participate in one or more of these meetings, and it is hoped that one member from each sector will be present at each meeting. A draft discussion guide for the meetings is now available and is being reviewed by the subgroup. The story boards for the meetings will be very simple and will be based on the discussion guide. The intent of these consultations is to get an idea of what the public thinks are key air issues in Alberta. The website and hotline are being set up and information will be assessed as it comes in to determine if it should go to the team right away.

Al, Bettina and Nashina will make a presentation to the AENV conference on April 23. This will be similar to a mini-town hall meeting and will reflect what's in the discussion guide.

Team members provided the following comments:

- We need to recognize the rapid pace at which information is being developed, and ensure that the team is comfortable with what is going out to the public. We don't want to end up with widely divergent views from the public and the team. The discussion paper removed the term 'priority area' and refers to those areas as issues instead.
- The team has not reached consensus on priority areas or on whether that's what they should be called. These are simply things that affect air quality, and may or not be the things that appear as priorities for action in the eventual CAS.
- The consultations should include some information on current air quality.
- The consultations should ask people what they want provincial and municipal governments to do in the future, and what their vision is for air quality.

Action 9.2: The subgroup will review draft 2 of the discussion guide; draft 3 will be circulated to the team by end of day April 15. The team will provide comments by April 21.

5. Budget and Timelines

Jennifer had previously circulated a draft budget and timelines for the team. Kerra advised that she has signed an agreement for the first part of the grant from AENV, for \$50,000. AENV's grant committee will sit again in June and decide on the second part of the grant for \$300,000. Bettina advised that she is working to resolve this matter and reconfirm AENV's commitment.

The team discussed this matter, noting the following comments:

- Consultants are working now for the team on good faith that they will have a contract and be paid. The team could choose to defer its consultations until the funds are received, but that would add a number of months to the project. Calder Bateman has put in considerable time already. A decision is needed very soon since ads will start to be placed shortly for the town hall meetings.
- AENV brought the statement of opportunity to CASA and will lose credibility if they can't address the funding matter.
- If the money is not released to CASA until June, CASA would need something in writing from the consultants to indicate their willingness to continue working without being paid for several months.

Action 9.3: Kerra and Bettina will develop a plan to address the funding situation and report back to the team by April 15.

6. Future Meetings

The next meeting will be April 28 in Calgary and will involve S2S. The team agreed to meet the second Tuesday of each month, starting June 10.

Action 9.4: Jennifer will poll for a meeting date in May (May 20, 21 or 22).

The meeting adjourned at 3.35 pm.