

Minutes



Non-Point Source Technical Task Group, Meeting #1

Date: Friday, March 4, 2016
Place: CASA Edmonton Office

Time: 10:00 am – 3:30 pm

In attendance:

Name	Stakeholder group
Patrick Andersen	West Central Airshed Society/Alberta Airsheds Council (AAC)
Randy Angle	Alberta Environmental Network (AEN)
Ike Edeogu	Alberta Agriculture and Forestry (AAF)
Rhonda Lee Curran	Alberta Environment and Parks (AEP)
Mandeep Dhaliwal	Calgary Region Airshed Zone/AAC
Richard Melick	Alberta Environment and Parks (AEP)
Koray Onder	CAPP
Victoria Pianarosa	Parkland Fuel Corporation
David Spink	Prairie Acid Rain Coalition/Alberta Environmental Network (AEN)
Frauke Spurrell	Alberta Environment and Parks (AEP)
Martin Van Olst	Environment and Climate Change Canada
Amanda Stuparyk	Clean Air Strategic Alliance (CASA)
Keith Denman	Clean Air Strategic Alliance (CASA)

Regrets:

Name	Stakeholder group
Bob Myrick	AEMERA

Action Items:

Action Items	Who	Due
1.1: Amanda will update the Task Group Terms of Reference workplan document based on discussions and agreed upon group logistics and provide a revised draft including comments/edits back to the group for acceptance.	Amanda	March 18, 2016
1.2: Amanda will provide the information and login for the CASA website NPS secured area for the task group members to access and review the content of the NPS Resource Library.	Amanda	ASAP
1.3: Task group members will look for any non-point source information, resources or data and send to Amanda via email to post within the ‘NPS Resource Library’. <i>Members will include the link to the resource (or pdf document) and short description for posting.</i>	All task group members	Ongoing
1.4: Government will assess current data/information available from their modelling group and will provide the task group relevant summary reports on emission inventories and trends.	Richard	Meeting #2
1.5: Have a discussion with AEMERA on their abilities and capabilities to provide the task group ambient monitoring data within the CAAQS regions.	David	ASAP

1.6: Government will assess what information/data/reports may be available for the task groups' Task (1c) air quality modelling (including anything available for the US).	Frauke	Meeting #2
1.7: CAPP will see what may be available from other jurisdictions and US for air quality modeling studies.	Koray	Meeting #2
1.8: Amanda will complete the request to re-title the NPS Resource Library on the CASA website 'regions' to the 'airzone' titles to reflect CAAQS related terminology.	Amanda	ASAP
1.9: Task Group members will find any information on source apportionment studies and information from Health Canada's work in Calgary on PM 2.5 (i.e. CRAZ (Mandeep); WCAS (Patrick) will find information on the work done by EC in the Fort Air region.	Mandeep / Patrick	Meeting #2
1.10: Task group members will work on the Task Group ToR workplan in between meetings within the discussed deadlines: - initial edits and comments submitted to Amanda - review revised draft document and provide approval email confirmation or final edits/comments	Amanda	March 11, 2016 and March 25, 2016
1.11: Amanda will prepare a short summary document (and review with the task group co-chairs) to provide the project team an update of the task group first meeting.	Amanda/ Co-Chairs (Randy/Patrick)	ASAP by project team meeting
1.12: Amanda will create and send out a Doodle poll for task group members availability for the next task group meetings as discussed.	Amanda & Task group members	ASAP

1. Administrative and Welcome

The meeting began at 9:00 a.m. Amanda chaired this first meeting. Participants introduced themselves, their organizations and sectors and were welcomed to the meeting.

The meeting agenda and objectives were reviewed and accepted with no edits.

2. Task Group Dynamics

Keith provided an overview of CASA, the collaborative consensus process, CASA's *Guide to Managing Collaborative Processes* (MCP) and the basis of CASA's interest-based negotiation. Task group members had the opportunity to ask questions and discuss as required.

Overview of CASA, CASA procedures and the MCP Guide

CASA is made up of three components:

- Board:
 - Self-selected members from government, industry and non-government organizations
 - Oversees and provides strategic direction for CASA
 - Meets 4 times annually
- CASA Secretariat:
 - Oversees the day-to-day operations of CASA
 - Responsible to the Board
 - Are the process experts
- Teams (and task groups):
 - Responsible to the Board and to the constituents they represent

- All members have roles and responsibilities which can be found in CASA's Guide to Managing Collaborative Processes (MCP) (page 19-25).

CASA uses a collaborative, consensus process to work together and make decisions. This means that participants focus on interests rather than positions and strive to reach consensus - where consensus is defined as all parties can agree to the decision as a whole and can live with the final package. This process is described in detail in CASA's *Guide to Managing Collaborative Processes* which is available from the CASA website and provided to the task group members via email.

CASA's MCP is also a valuable resource for success as it outlines the collaborative consensus process and strategies for overcoming common challenges the group will face. *Each member of the group is responsible for contributing to the success of the project.* Members should take advantage of the diversity of perspectives at the table to build a robust, creative package of recommendations that meets everyone's interests.

Benefits of the CASA processes at a high-level include:

- Brings interests to the surface
- Encourages innovative solutions to meet everyone's needs
- Creates long-lasting, implementable solutions that are supported by all stakeholders

There are experienced and new members to CASA on this task group so discussion focused on how CASA's collaborative decision-making process and interest-based negotiation forms the foundation for the project teams and task groups. Board endorsed recommendations are tracked by the CASA internal committees for progress and implementation.

Keith provided an overview of negotiation practices including positional and interest-based negotiation. CASA uses an interest-based approach to negotiation. As such, an important part of the process is identifying interests and helping participants move from positions to interests. A position is often expressed in the form of a pre-formed solution or an opening demand. It is usually only ideal from one party's perspective and cannot be provided for by alternate means. An interest is the needs, hopes, fears, concerns and desires that underlie a position. Interests provide the currencies for a fruitful discussion and creating a win-win solution. Interests can be substantive (concerns around air issues), procedural (concerns around timing of implementation), or psychological (the need for respect).

Roles and Responsibilities for the Task Group Members & Ground rules/Operating Terms of Reference
A Terms of Reference (ToR) focusing on the tasks and deliverables was drafted by the Project Team and needs to be reviewed by the Task Group. The goal is to discuss and provide any edits/comments on the draft and agree to the work. The group also discussed roles and responsibilities, building blocks for success including consensus, relationship building, discussion without prejudice, and communications within their constituencies and the project team. The group agreed to Ground Rules for meeting together.

Action Item 1.1: Amanda will update the Task Group Terms of Reference workplan document based on discussions and agreed upon group logistics and provide a revised draft including comments/edits back to the group for acceptance.

Some clarification was provided on the group's meeting minutes. These will be a high-level summary of the meetings including decisions made (non-attributed) that are drafted by Amanda and

then provided to the group for review (usually 1 week before next meeting). They are considered draft until they are approved by the attending members of the next meeting. Final meeting minutes will be made publically available by posting on the CASA website (casahome.org).

The task group discussed the location of meetings and wanted a 1:1 ratio between Edmonton and Calgary. Amanda noted meetings in Edmonton will be at the CASA office but will require hosting for the Calgary meetings. Members of the task group will need to actively pursue meeting rooms and hosting for the meetings in Calgary.

Roles and Responsibilities of Members

1. Clearly articulating the interests of the stakeholders you represent
2. Establish effective communication with decision makers in the organizations/groups you represent. Liaise with your stakeholders to share what we're doing, and bring their feedback to the group.
3. Seeking to understand the interests of other parties - Asking lots of questions rather than making statements in an effort to persuade others that your point of view is the correct one
4. Working constructively with other group members even if you do not agree with them or share their perspective
5. Striving to find solutions that address the interests of all parties, not just your own
6. Where it is not possible to agree to a proposal, offering an explanation and alternative that would address the deficiency while also addressing the other interests at stake

Meeting Logistics

- **Task Group Meetings:** members will come to each meeting having read the agenda and all materials distributed and having kept themselves abreast of developments since the last meeting.
- **Alternates** and informing the group: Where a member is unable to attend a meeting, they should review the related material in advance and inform another group member of their perspectives on all key issues, and follow-up immediately after the meeting with the project manager and/or others in attendance.
- **Quorum:** In order to achieve meeting quorum, a representative from each of industry, government, non-government, and airshed organizations must be present.
- **Location of group meetings?** Group meetings will alternate between Edmonton and Calgary with a ratio of 1:1. *This can be revisited if requested by members.*
- **Non-attribution:** Any concepts or ideas suggested by a group member will not be attributed to that individual or organization outside of the discussions.

Communications

- **Communications with stakeholders:** Group members are expected to ensure information is shared with all those in their organization whose support will be needed to implement the group's recommendations (i.e. their constituencies). All involved should be aware of the principles of CASA collaboration.
- **Communications and updates to the Project Team:** The task group will provide regular updates to the team and present as major milestones are reached at every team meeting. Task group members should share the responsibility to present and discuss the task group work, and work with the secretariat to prepare materials.

Decision-Making and Consensus

1. The Task Group will make substantive decisions based on a consensus of the members, where consensus is defined as all parties can agree to the decision as a whole and can **live with** the final package. The task group frequently will engage in positive affirmation to explicitly acknowledge major consensus agreements/decisions.
2. Consensus may mean there is agreement on a package of solutions, some of which would not be agreed to if the solutions stood alone.
3. Consensus may include agreement on a document that describes different perspectives on an issue.
4. Members should clearly indicate when they are / are not in agreement with a proposal. When they are not in agreement with a proposal, they should suggest alternatives. ‘
5. Task groups will strive for consensus. If consensus cannot be reached, the procedure for dealing with the block/impasse will apply:
 - The task group will strive to reach agreement with the parties who can't reach agreement should work together to propose alternate solutions
 - Those at impasse are responsible for documenting the perspectives and options to bridge differences
 - The task group should bring the issue to the Project Team who will then assess the impasse and strive to reach an agreement

Ground Rules

Task group members were asked to list meeting behaviours they had experienced in the past that contributed to a bad meeting and they included meetings where:

- Close to a decision and then everyone backs off. No one commits at the end of the day.
- The meeting that should have been an e-mail.
- Someone walked out of a meeting due to disorganization.
- No one knew where the meeting was.
- Unclear who was the lead and whether the meeting was still on.
- Lack of clarity as to who is in charge.

The Task Group agreed to the following ground rules that will be used to guide how the group will work together going forward:

- Focus on interests, not positions
- Respect the values and interests of others
- Listen to learn and speak up if you have a concern
- Honour commitments and come prepared to meetings and keep comments on topic
- Contribute to an environment where people feel safe to be creative and take risks
- Discussion without prejudice

Co-Chairs

Amanda outlined the roles for co-chair(s) of a task group as assisting in the planning of and in reviewing the minutes and products of the meetings. It helps the Secretariat to have co-chairs to assist with some of the work and planning (as the groups are technical in nature). The task group discussed time commitment and that it would be helpful to have the secretariat chair meetings in order for the members including the co-chair to focus on the work that is being worked on. It was noted that the co-chairs often end up doing presentations and representing the group for updates to the project team.

Task group members agreed to the volunteered co-chairs: Randy Angle and Patrick Andersen.

3. History of the NPS File at CASA and Project Team Work

Amanda provided a presentation outlining the history of the Non-Point Source work at CASA. And provided the group an overview of the project team work to date. Highlights of the presentation included:

- The NPS project scope is: The work of the NPS Project Team will be limited to: Primary Particulate Matter (PM2.5) and precursors of secondary PM2.5 and O3 (SOx, NOx, VOCs, and ammonia).
- This project work is based around the CAAQS non-achievement and management levels.
- The NPS project goal is: To help address Non-Point Source air emissions in Alberta contributing to air zone PM2.5 and O3 "red" and "orange" management levels as per the Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standards Framework.
- The NPS Project Charter outlines 4 objectives for the team to complete within its timeline.
- The project team is responsible to the CASA Board for deliverables: 1) a Final Report with key findings, methodology, outcomes of each objective and strategy, 2) a List of recommended management actions and advice for implementation, and, 3) Communication tools developed to support Objective 4.
- To meet the 22-month timeline the team may consider various options including consultants and using small task groups. The Team and Task Group should look for parallel work. The first three objectives are sequential, although the team will be looking for areas where work/some parts can be done in tandem.
 - ❖ The task group is responsible for completing a piece of work that will subsequently be reviewed by the team and incorporated into the overall work of the team. This will help the team complete their work in a timely manner by making efficient use of resources. A task group reports to and coordinates with the team on a regular basis. The team provides oversight and holds the final-decision making authority on the work of the task group.
- There was noted cost uncertainty with Objective 1. The task group has been formed to try to help minimize the initial cost estimates based on the technical expertise of the members available.
- The Task group's focus is Objective #1 and has been outlined/detailed in the ToR.

Both the project team and task group have concerns with the timelines and ability to commit time to the work. All recognize that this may be a challenge – if there are places where this group needs to push back it should do so and ask the project team for support or suggestions.

Commitment is likely a minimum of six to eight meetings (full-day meetings). The task group also thought this would include some work in between meetings and potential for some teleconference meetings. As much as possible materials will be sent out to task group members ahead of time so that meetings can be as productive as possible to make decisions/consensus agreements.

So far the Project Team has begun to develop their common understanding of NPS in Alberta and air zones and have begun building the library of data or resources referred to as the NPS Resource Library. They did this work for their work but also in anticipation of this Task Group work. The Project Team is adding things but they are relying on the task group to review and assess and pull information out of it as needed. The effort has focused on the gathering of information. Intention is not to double up on the work. Amanda will try to provide periodic updates/listing of new documents in the library to the task group as she does with the project team.

Amanda will provide all task group members the password login and instructions to access the library on this internal part of the CASA website. All task group members are asked to review the

library and be ready to discuss at next meeting. They will also provide any additional documents that can be added to the library to Amanda.

Action Item 1.2: Amanda will provide the information and login for the CASA website NPS secured area for the task group members to access and review the content of the NPS Resource Library.

Action Item 1.3: Task group members will look for any non-point source information, resources or data and send to Amanda via email to post within the ‘NPS Resource Library’. *Members will include the link to the resource (or pdf document) and short description for posting.*

4. Review and Discuss Implementation of Workplan/ToR

The task group had a productive initial discussion about the ToR workplan, including adding some details around the tasks and context for the task group work. This discussion will continue at meeting #2. Amanda led the task group to review the content of the drafted Terms of Reference workplan from the project team. The goal is to ensure any comments or edits or questions for the team are provided by the task group. The team wants to hear back from the task group at their next meeting on March 30th. The task group will try to have at a minimum a draft document to provide them.

The team has asked the task group to undertake 4 main tasks that will ultimately have the task group making a recommendation of NPS’s of focus to the project team in 3-months. The Task Group Deliverables include a Final Report of the Technical Task Group outlining Methodology, Assumptions, Findings, Recommendations, and Gaps/ Uncertainties and a Final Presentation to the NPS Project Team. A highlight of the discussions and any edits or clarifications for the preamble and project team objectives include:

- The synthesis of data and review is based on both the 24-hour and annual limits noting that some of the exceedances are in smaller centers and will have only one or the other.
- The emphasis is the CAAQS and not the CWS (Canada Wide Standards) even though there are some references from the project charter and the CWS. The project charter predates the first CAAQS reporting period. We need to be careful about the terminology.
- There was a discussion among the members that although we are asked to limit the scope of work to the “Orange and Red” management zones it will be helpful to also look at the criteria within the “Green” zones to see what sources are not polluting or are being managed (and how), in addition to reviewing the dynamics between the zones.
- There was discussion around the characterization, relative contributions and prioritization of the NPSs that will allow the team to move to the other objectives of the project. There should be consideration for identification of all of both point source and non-point source emissions (who is producing what emissions) and categorizations for urban and rural emissions; this is to ensure the team will all have the same knowledge base and understanding in order to make decisions. If we see ambient concentrations increasing toward the CAAQS, we can go forward to look towards some “no regrets, best practices options”.
- The task group will try to include industrial non-point sources as much as possible (incl. tailings ponds, large vehicles, etc.). However there may need to be some clarification from the project team as the work progresses. Sources that are not directly regulated are a different piece of work than those that are.
- The focus appears to be on the inventory rather than on the identification of the priority substances to be addressed in the eventual recommendations for managing the emissions. Can we suggest changes to this? Feedback from this group.

- The bulk of the task groups work is contained within Task (1) a through d of the ToR. The remaining Tasks (2-4) are more additional details/requests or are commentary on how to do the work.

The task group's discussion of the workplan tasks focused on Task (1) Data synthesis (a) emission inventories.

- Will be adding the Peace Air Zone to the task group review ToR. This will assist in ensuring a fulsome discussion and identification of potential NPS of concern.
- The task group discussed trends and the available data coverage at the provincial level but may not have them for specific regions. There is also a lot of information and data but not very specific for the entire province for all emissions. Forecasts vary based on different needs and different regions. The information would need to be reviewed.
 - Data - could we go back to a base year of 1995. The further back you go the less detail.
 - To drill down on a regional level may be difficult. We do have a clear picture about the province, but the move to a regional level may be good based on available information and assumptions. E.g. there is good information about the Oil Sands Inventory. A good estimate may be all we are going to get.
 - Speciation data will be reviewed where available.
 - Modelling has looked at 2000 to 2010, 2025, 2040 in the Wood Buffalo region. They had a reasonably good set of data.

The task group agreed to start looking at the trending information that is available from the government air modelling group from 2000. The task group notes that they will need to work with the currently available information as it is currently the best available.

- The focus is on where we can make a difference in the future that will bring improvements in air quality. Overall trends, esp. upwards, is significant. E.g. NOx predictions are showing that the off road emissions are where the problem is coming rather than on road. If we look after about 2000 which is where we have the CWS in place at the stations. We will have to look at the best available information on where the future emissions are going and what we think is going to happen.
- The focus is on primary PM VOCs NOx SO₂, and Ammonia. The data will try to omit the things that we are not working at. There should be information on both point and non-point sources and in some cases the data is broken down by industrial and non-industrial.

Action Item 1.4: Government will assess current data/information available from their modelling group and will provide the task group relevant summary reports on emission inventories and trends.

The task group had a discussion of the workplan tasks focused on Task (1) Data synthesis (b) ambient monitoring data.

- AEMERA (is on the task group but not present) should be the keeper of the ambient data and need to be contacted first for the 'ask'. The CAAQS report doesn't have the trends detail but that could be pulled for the areas where we want to look at. The stations that have been used in determining the CWS and CAAQS levels. This should not be a very big undertaking. The Government (AEP) and/or AEMERA would be the sources of this information.

- The trends would be significant – if ambient levels are going up and there are significant NPSs in the area we would need to know that.

Action Item 1.5: Have a discussion with AEMERA on their abilities and capabilities to provide the task group ambient monitoring data within the CAAQS regions.

The task group had a high-level discussion of the workplan tasks Task (1) Data synthesis (c-d).

- The group noted that information may already be in the NPS Resource Library. The task group committed to reviewing the library and making note of additional resources required.
- There have been three model runs since 2007 in the LARP region (EC/Kellerhals/Fox and 2 by ENVIRON).

Action Item 1.6: Government (Frauke) will assess what information/data/reports may be available for (c) air quality modelling (including anything available for the US).

Action Item 1.7: CAPP (Koray) will see what may be available from other jurisdictions and US for air quality modeling studies.

Action Item 1.8: Amanda will complete the request to re-title the NPS Resource Library on the CASA website ‘regions’ to the proper ‘air zone’ titles to reflect CAAQS related terminology.

The task group had an additional discussion on source apportionment and speciation. Noting they are not mentioned or listed in the work areas for the task group. They acknowledge there has been some of this done but this might be a gap for some of the regions. It would be appropriate to add this in the task group work (1) as a synthesis of what we know about PM_{2.5} composition through winter and summer seasons. Some stations are doing composition (there are 4 in WBEA, 1 in Calgary, 1 in Edmonton; Red Deer hasn't been collecting the data yet). There are 10 or 12 NAPS stations in the whole country that collect this information. It could ultimately be a conclusion of the task group for more work in this area.

The task group agreed to add receptor modelling source apportionment to the work under Task (1) in the ToR workplan.

Action Item 1.9: Task Group members will see if they can find any data for source apportionment studies (i.e. CRAZ (Mandeep) will try to find information from Health Canada's work in Calgary on PM 2.5; WCAS (Patrick) will see if he can find the work by EC in the Fort Air region).

The task group discussed next steps and will review the revised (draft if not finalized by email) ToR workplan and the remaining Tasks at the next meeting. The group agreed they can provide any comments/edits on the draft ToR to Amanda by email as work in between meetings. The group will try to approval the draft ToR by email if there are no outstanding substantive comments/edits.

Action Item 1.10: Amanda and task group members will meet the deadlines noted for a revised Task Group ToR workplan. Task group members' initial edits/comments by March 11th. Amanda will resend combined revised version back to task group by March 18th. Task group members to provide any minor comments and/or approval of document to Amanda by March 25th.

5. Update to the Project Team

The task group had a high level discussion around what the project team should know about this meeting and task group work including any considerations (i.e. budget) that need to be addressed.

The group wanted to have some product before they present to the project team. In the meantime Amanda can provide an update to the team at their meeting as they need to be kept up-to-date on the work. The group requested Amanda draft a meeting summary document (with the co-chairs) to be shared with the team including:

- there was a fulsome discussion on Task (1) of the ToR and resources/data is going to be compiled for the group for the next meeting
- the understanding of the task being less about inventories and more about relative contributions, and
- what the task group did at their first meeting and plans for the next meeting dates.

Action Item 1.11: Amanda will prepare a short summary document (and review with the task group co-chairs) to provide the project team an update of the task group first meeting.

6. Meeting Wrap-up

Action items and the work in between the meetings were confirmed. The group felt they should meet more frequently than monthly especially at the start of the work and discussed meeting locations.

- Meeting #2 will take place in Calgary (Calgary members were asked to check for meeting space the 1st week of April – date to be confirmed when poll closes). The ratio of Edmonton to Calgary meetings can be reviewed as required.
- Meetings will occur on a 3-week basis to start until beginning of June. The task group will need to be information and work in between the project team meetings as well.

Action Item 1.12: Amanda will create and send out the Doodle poll for availability of all team members for the next task group meetings as discussed.

Objectives for the next meeting are to:

- Review and discuss the Resource Library content
- Review and discuss revised Task Group ToR workplan
- Review information resources/data collected since last meeting
- Discuss outstanding information and how to get the work done.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.