

**CASA/AAC 2010  
Coordination Workshop  
Final Report**

Prepared by the  
Communications Committee  
for the  
Clean Air Strategic Alliance  
Board of Directors

**January 24, 2011**

## Acknowledgements

---

CASA acknowledges the financial and in-kind contributions of members of the Communications Committee and their respective organizations for support of the Coordination Workshop. Members of the committee were very committed to completing their task and the volunteer time and energy is very much appreciated. Thanks also to EPCOR Technologies for the hats and signal light timer.

## About CASA

---

The Clean Air Strategic Alliance (CASA) is a multi-stakeholder partnership composed of representatives selected by industry, government and nongovernment organizations. Every partner is committed to a comprehensive air quality management system for Alberta. All CASA groups and teams, including the board of directors, make decisions and recommendations by consensus. CASA supports three air quality goals:

1. protect the environment by preventing short- and long-term adverse effects on people, animals and the ecosystem,
2. optimize economic efficiency, and
3. promote pollution prevention and continuous improvement.

Clean Air Strategic Alliance  
10035 108 ST NW FLR 10  
EDMONTON AB T5J 3E1  
Ph (780) 427-9793  
Fax (780) 422-3127  
E-mail: [casa@casahome.org](mailto:casa@casahome.org)  
Web: <http://www.casahome.org>

ISBN 978-1-896250-75-5  
© 2011 Clean Air Strategic Alliance

## Contents

---

<b>1</b>	<b>BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>CASA AT A GLANCE .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>ALBERTA AIRSHEDS COUNCIL .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>ALBERTA WATER COUNCIL / WATER FOR LIFE .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>INTEGRATED MONITORING, EVALUATION AND REPORTING.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>FEDERAL ACTION ON AIR POLLUTION AND THE PROPOSED TRIPARTITE COMPREHENSIVE AIR MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>ALBERTA'S RENEWED CLEAN AIR STRATEGY .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>LAND-USE FRAMEWORK .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>AIR QUALITY ISSUES AND THE ERCB .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>PANEL DISCUSSION: WHAT DOES ALL THIS MEAN FOR CASA? .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>WRAP-UP.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>APPENDIX A:</b>	<b>MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>APPENDIX B:</b>	<b>COORDINATION WORKSHOP ATTENDEES .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>APPENDIX C:</b>	<b>WORKSHOP PACKAGE.....</b>	<b>17</b>

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

---

AAC	Alberta Airsheds Council
AQMS	Air Quality Management System
AWC	Alberta Water Council
BLIERs	Base-level Industrial Emissions Requirements
CAAQS	Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standards
CAMS	Comprehensive Air Management System
CAS	Clean Air Strategy
CASA	Clean Air Strategic Alliance
CCME	Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment
CEMS	Cumulative Effects Management System
CWS	Canada-wide Standard
ERCB	Energy Resources Conservation Board
GoA	Government of Alberta
IMERF	Integrated Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting Framework
LAR(P)	Lower Athabasca Region(al Plan)
LUF	Land-use Framework
NGO	Non Government Organization
NO2	Nitrogen dioxide
PM	Particulate Matter
RAC	Regional Advisory Committee
SO2	Sulphur dioxide
WFL	Water for Life
WPAC	Watershed Planning and Advisory Council
WSG	Watershed Stewardship Group

## **1 Background**

---

CASA has held four previous coordination workshops in the interest of promoting communication among project teams: in September 1996, June 2001, November 2004 and June 2007. In planning this fifth coordination workshop, entitled “Putting It All Together,” the Communications Committee reviewed the results, recommendations and suggestions for improvement from the previous four coordination workshops; finalized the purpose, format and date; informed CASA stakeholders, including project team members, board members, airshed zone members and numerous external stakeholders about the 2010 workshop and encouraged them to attend; and, through this document, is reporting back to the CASA board. Members of the Communications Committee are listed in Appendix A.

Given the number of initiatives underway in Alberta that relate to air quality, the Committee decided to invite participation by these other agencies and organizations in the interest of enhancing collaboration and sharing information. This report summarizes the proceedings of the fifth Coordination Workshop, held on September 29, 2010 in Calgary, Alberta.

A total of 106 stakeholders from CASA and other organizations, presenters, and staff attended the workshop (see Appendix B). All participants received a package with background information on each CASA team, working group and committee, and the board of directors (Appendix C). Presentations are summarized very briefly in this report, followed by comments made during discussion with the speakers. All MS PowerPoint presentations are available on the CASA website at [www.casahome.org](http://www.casahome.org) in the conference section. Readers of this short document are encouraged to visit the CASA website for more information.

## **2 Introduction**

---

Tony Hudson, chair of the Communications Committee, and Cindy Christopher CASA’s Industry Vice President, convened the Coordination Workshop being sponsored by CASA and the Alberta Airsheds Council. Randy Angle, acting Executive Director, introduced Norm MacLeod who made brief remarks on CASA and his acceptance of the position of Executive Director to be formalized at the CASA board meeting on September 30<sup>th</sup>. Norm spoke briefly about his background and experience with other multi-stakeholder processes and looking forward to being part of CASA.

## **3 CASA at a Glance**

---

Randy Angle, CASA’s acting Executive Director, provided a short history of CASA, noting its origin with the original Clean Air Strategy for Alberta. CASA was established in 1994 and has always been a multi-stakeholder organization committed to consensus decision making. He described the structure of CASA and reviewed the process for establishing CASA teams. He also presented a list of the current teams and committees and provided a short overview of each one. A volunteer champion for each team was identified if workshop participants had additional questions.

## 4 Alberta Airsheds Council

---

Kristina Friesen, Executive Director of the Alberta Capital Airshed Alliance and co-chair of the Alberta Airsheds Council (AAC), recapped the roles airsheds are known for. These include monitoring, network assessments, ozone management plans and implementation, and preparing annual summaries of their air monitoring programs for the public and other audiences. Airshed zones also work together on activities and initiatives that are of common interests, such as emissions inventories, education and outreach, and building relationships through communications and collaboration. Many airsheds are on the front lines in sharing information and testing new programs. Kristina noted some of the external initiatives in the province that are creating new challenges for airsheds, including Alberta's Land-use Framework (LUF), the Cumulative Effects Management System (CEMS), and the Integrated Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting Framework (IMERF). Airsheds offer the possibility of reducing duplication of effort through collaboration, broader awareness, and enabling action and smarter ways to work together. Like CASA, airsheds are multi-stakeholder in nature and use a consensus-based process. Airsheds are closely linked to several CASA teams, including PM and Ozone and the Operations Steering Committee.

### Discussion

*Q: How many airsheds are there, how does one go about forming an airshed, and is there a website for more information?*

A: Eight airsheds have been endorsed by CASA and one remains to be endorsed. These nine airsheds are:

- Alberta Capital Airshed Alliance (yet to be endorsed by CASA)
- Calgary Region Airshed Zone
- Fort Air Partnership
- Lakeland Industry and Community Association
- Palliser Airshed Society
- Parkland Airshed Management Zone
- Peace Airshed Zone Association
- West Central Airshed Society
- Wood Buffalo Environmental Association

CASA maintains an airsheds web page at

<http://www.casahome.org/Partners/AirshedZones/AlbertaAirshedZones.aspx> which includes a map. Each airshed has its own website with a wealth of data and information for various audiences. The AAC website is at <http://albertairshedsCouncil.ca/>.

## 5 Alberta Water Council / Water for Life

---

André Asselin, a project manager with the Alberta Water Council (AWC), provided an overview of the Council, the *Water for Life* (WFL) strategy, WFL partnerships and CASA-AWC coordination. Like CASA, the AWC is a multi-stakeholder not-for-profit organization that makes decisions by consensus. The AWC champions the three outcomes of WFL, monitors and reports on implementation progress of the WFL strategy, and develops water policy recommendations. He also described the three WFL partnerships, which include Watershed Planning and Advisory Councils (WPACs) and Watershed Stewardship Groups

(WSGs) in addition to the Council. A key role of the AWC is to support and advance the work of the other two partners. Coordination between the AWC and CASA centers on processes and the multi-stakeholder nature of the two organizations; an example is the recently published Consensus Decision Making Toolkit.

### Discussion

*Q: What is the status of WFL and what is the Council's relationship with First Nations?*

A: The AWC has three teams working on areas within WFL: Words to Action; Water Conservation, Efficiency and Productivity; and Non-Point Source Pollution. A new team is expected to be formed at the October board meeting. With respect to First Nations, the board does have spots reserved for them and we are still negotiating to have those seats filled. The Council's implementation review process for WFL also looks for options for engaging First Nations.

*Q: How many WPACs are there?*

A: There are 10 at present and one more is being formed.

*Q: You mentioned that WPACs have a director and alternate on the AWC board. Have other sectors on the board ever expressed any concerns about WPACs themselves being multi-stakeholder organizations and thus some organizations could possibly be seen as having double representation?*

A: WPACs are a unique group on the Council and are currently in the NGO category. They have an important role and I would have to investigate to see if any other sectors have expressed a concern about the point you raise.

*Q: Is there a relationship between the geographic areas covered by WPACs and airsheds?*

A: I don't believe they are linked in any formal way.

*Q: How do air quality issues come to the attention of the AWC? Is it the responsibility of stakeholders to note that air pollution may be affecting water quality?*

A: That issue is part of the work of the Non-Point Source team. As the AWC identifies issues associated with non-point sources, stakeholders would need to determine if an air component is contributing to water concerns. It might be that another group needs to join the team or present information, for example. In essence, this happens at the team level.

Comment: WPACs try within their area to identify all the key players who need to be involved.

*Q: How is the WPAC representative on the AWC board selected?*

Comment: WPACs meet four times a year. They have a plan for rotating the representative on the board for the three-year term.

## 6 Integrated Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting

---

Albert Poulette with Alberta Environment provided an update on the Integrated Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting Framework (IMERF). The Cumulative Effects Management System (CEMS) is the context for the IMERF. Among other things, the CEMS is results-based and it focuses greater resources and efforts on higher-risk environmental impacts. It also considers health, economic and social values and is adaptive, with mechanisms built in to allow flexibility and assure outcomes are achieved.

The vision for IMERF is “A monitoring, evaluation and reporting system to support decisions and assure GoA outcomes using a shared environmental data and information asset.” The draft framework has been reviewed internally and externally and is now ready for more in-depth external engagement. The IMERF has the following components: planning, monitoring, evaluation, reporting, governance and assurance; these components were briefly described and a progress report provided for each one. Albert provided his contact information in the presentation and encouraged anyone with questions to contact him.

### Discussion

*Q: Who is the leader in CEMS in North America or elsewhere and to what extent did their work affect Alberta’s approach?*

A: We did look at other jurisdictions, including Australia, but Alberta is really a leader in this work. People are coming to look at our approach. Others have a good understanding of the theory but have not taken it as far yet.

*Q: How will evaluation be done and priorities determined?*

A: There are different aspects of evaluation and we considered various approaches. We’ve chosen to look at performance evaluation and how to drive change, but a second part is the causal network. What are the causes and impacts and how do we monitor and evaluate them? This will probably be the biggest aspect. We also want to know the science behind it and how you create the scientific authority and will be doing some work on this aspect.

*Q: Several players in addition to government play a role in monitoring. When will the other players start to get involved and how?*

A: This is one of the challenges we’re working on now. First we need to take the framework out and make it better with input from others, and second, we need to get the regional and sub-regional plans involved and make IMER real in the regions.

*Comment: CASA’s Operations Steering Committee is considering holding a visioning workshop for the CASA Data Warehouse in 2011. This would be a good opportunity for IMERF to work with organizations responsible for reporting and to explore options.*

A: Yes, there are various individual databases with monitoring and reporting information, and the key will be to figure out to link them so they can “talk to each other.”

## 7 Federal Action on Air Pollution and the Proposed Tripartite Comprehensive Air Management System

---

Kerri Timoffee with Environment Canada described some actions taken by the federal government on air quality and provided a brief overview of the Comprehensive Air Management System (CAMS) now being developed. In recent years, the federal government has taken action on acid rain and smog. The federal role has focused on transboundary issues and domestic issues such as new vehicles; engines and fuels; national transportation issues such as rail, consumer and commercial products; and industrial sectors. They have also worked collaboratively with the provinces and territories on monitoring and reporting, science, and research, and through the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME) to develop Canada-wide Standards (CWS).

The proposed CAMS is a comprehensive, collaborative approach that addresses emissions from all sources. It was developed by a tri-partite committee and will be going to the CCME for consideration. It has three main interrelated elements:

- Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS). CAMS recommends that these replace the current CWS for PM and ozone. CAAQS will also be developed for NO<sub>2</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub>.
- Air Zone Management/Regional Airsheds. CAMS proposes that the provinces and territories create air zones, prioritize local action and implement management strategies. It also proposes that ambient air quality trigger levels be set in relation to the CAAQS. Alberta and part of Saskatchewan are in the proposed prairie air zone.
- Base-level Industrial Emissions Requirements (BLIERs). These may be quantitative or qualitative performance requirements defined for an individual source or piece of equipment, for a facility, a specific process or fuel type, or any combination of these.

### Discussion

*Q: Your slides refer to both “air zones” and “airsheds.” The terminology could get confusing.*

A: CAMS is based on the Alberta model but there was some discomfort with CAMS using the term “airshed.” But we wanted to recognize that airsheds are an essential part of CAMS.

*Q: Why were these particular boundaries chosen? The prairie zone covers a very large area.*

A: Mountains separate the western and prairie zones. Airsheds are intended to be collaborative; the science of sources and receptors needs to be considered in managing emissions so this was a large part of the basis for the boundaries.

*Q: How will the federal government help the provinces in setting up and delineating the air zones/airsheds?*

A: CAMS is a proposal right now and is going to the CCME for discussion. We have yet to talk about who will actually do what.

*Comment: The LUF has identified seven land use areas and there are also a number of regional WPACs in the province. We have work to do provincially to get better alignment of these areas.*



*Q: How are triggers set? The time frame is important in setting triggers and whether this might affect modeling and monitoring.*

A: Triggers will be set so they are the same across the country based on the best data we have. Further work will be done on this. We are looking at different standards for ambient times and triggers.

*Q: Can the CCME accept or refuse the CAMS when it goes to them for consideration? What does “consideration” mean?*

A: CAMS is a multi-stakeholder proposal. It will be a decision by governments as to whether they want to implement it and what will be done next. There are many possibilities and each province has different priorities, so we can't say at this time.

*Q: Will the air zone approach help areas that might have hot spots? Hot spots are often local issues that can get lost in a bigger geographical area.*

A: The provinces will have to decide how they want to take this forward.

## **8 Alberta's Renewed Clean Air Strategy**

---

Martina Krieger with Alberta Environment reviewed the history of Alberta's Clean Air Strategy (CAS), noting that the original 1991 strategy helped reduce point source emissions and created CASA and the airshed zones. In 2007, the GoA asked CASA to develop recommendations for the GoA to consider in renewing the CAS. The CASA board approved 14 recommendations in spring 2009. A cross-ministry working group was then formed to review the recommendations and actions and to develop a draft CAS and action plan. A key area to be addressed is the impact and management of non-point sources. The draft CAS has three outcomes:

- The health of Albertans is supported by effective air quality management.
- Air quality is managed to maintain, protect and sustain healthy ecosystems.
- Air quality management sustains and supports economic prosperity.

Key to the CAS is an enhanced Air Quality Management System (AQMS) that will apply across the GoA. The CAS Action Plan proposes to enhance eight specific areas in the AQMS through the following four directions:

- Airshed planning and management of non-point sources
- Shared responsibility and partnerships
- Integrated monitoring, evaluation and reporting
- Knowledge enhancement

Martina provided examples of potential actions under each direction. The intent is to hold targeted stakeholder engagement sessions across Alberta in January 2011 and revise the strategy and action plan by March. Cabinet review, approval and release are expected to occur between May and September 2011.

### Discussion

*Q: Under the direction “shared responsibility and partnerships,” what does education refer to? Is this the formal or informal education system, GoA departments?*

A: We are talking about all possibilities.

*Q: Will the CAS include incentives for education and behavioral change?*

A: Under economic instruments, we could look at a range of possibilities but the work is focused largely on education.

*Q: Who will be involved in the stakeholder engagement in January?*

A: We want to involve air experts from academia, aboriginal groups, industry, various associations and CASA stakeholders.

*Q: I am interested in the well-being of children. There was a comment that GoA would be doing some rationalization of its monitoring programs, which often means cutbacks. I also take issue when as a driver, I'm traveling at the speed limit and a company truck passes at 130 km/hour; companies need to take responsibility for this.*

A: Yes we all need to take responsibility for our actions. Rationalizing monitoring programs doesn't mean we are cutting back. We need to ensure we have an efficient and effective system to meet our regional outcomes.

## **9 Land-use Framework**

---

Crystal Damer, Executive Director with the Alberta Land Use Secretariat, reviewed the history and origin of the LUF and the priority actions it contains. The immediate priorities were to:

- Develop legislation to support the LUF (the *Alberta Land Stewardship Act*)
- Launch the Lower Athabasca and South Saskatchewan Regional Plans
- Complete the metropolitan plans for the Capital and Calgary sub-regions.

The LUF lays out seven regions that are aligned with municipal boundaries, and it also described the process for doing the regional plans. The regional plans will be enshrined in legislation with associated regulations. They will have economic, environmental and social outcomes and will be broad plans for land and natural resources for both public and private land. They will determine specific tradeoffs, define the cumulative effects management approach for the region, and identify targets and thresholds.

Terms of reference will be developed for each of the seven regional plans and a Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) will be formed to provide advice to the GoA in the development of each plan. The Lower Athabasca Regional Plan (LARP) will be the first plan completed and has already gone through two phases of consultation. Using the RAC's advice and feedback from phase 2 consultations, the GoA will draft the regional plan. Phase 3 consultations on the draft plan will be held in 2011, with the goal of having the final LARP completed and approved by Cabinet in fall 2011. The South Saskatchewan RAC aims to provide its advice to the GoA by December 2010. Work will begin on the next plan – the North Saskatchewan Regional Plan – in early 2011. The website at [www.landuse.alberta.ca](http://www.landuse.alberta.ca) contains a wealth of information about the overall process and the specific plans.

### Discussion

*Q: What is on the table for conservation?*

A: The Lower Athabasca RAC has made recommendations for enhancing conservation areas. There is a commitment to conserve, but we need to clarify what the management intentions are.

*Q: How are stakeholders selected for the RACs?*

A: There is a nomination process. The GoA asks key stakeholders in each region to nominate individuals and a list goes to Cabinet where the final selection is made.

*Q: How were the boundaries determined? For example, I know of an area that is part of the North Saskatchewan watershed but is included in the Red Deer regional planning area.*

A: I would have to follow up on that question.

*Q: How is the LUF being coordinated with CASA, the AWC and others?*

A: The Land Use Secretariat is the coordinating group and relies on the regional planning team to bring forward issues that bear on each regional plan. Stakeholders and the public should also bring forward issues during the consultations.

*Q: Carbon capture and storage is a big issue in Alberta. How does this fit in the regional planning process, since the LUF deals with surface issues?*

A: That hasn't come up much in the LARP so there won't be anything in the RAC's advice if it wasn't raised. But it's a good point and we should consider sub-surface issues.

*Q: The eight outcomes for the LAR are generic. Will these all come up in the plan?*

A: The first regional plan will be a bit of a guinea pig. Some regional plans may have unique aspects to consider or add, and we can do that, but we also think there will be lot of commonalities.

## **10 Air Quality Issues and the ERCB**

---

Michael Brown with the Energy Resources Conservation Board (ERCB) provided background on the ERCB and its role in relation to air quality. The ERCB mandate is to regulate the safe, responsible and efficient development of energy resources to move them to market, taking into consideration: protection of public safety, environmental protection and energy resource conservation. The Board regulates producing oil and gas wells, pipelines, gas processing, oil sands, batteries, compressor stations, and coal mines. The presentation also described key energy industry regulatory interfaces, including with GoA departments, federal agencies, and the public.

Of the 48 common objections the ERCB hears to energy developments, four relate to air quality: dust, emissions, flaring, and odour. The ERCB has no regulatory jurisdiction over dust or roads. Considerable progress has been made in the last ten years to reduce emissions from flare stacks in Alberta, much of this as a result of CASA recommendations and the ERCB's implementation of them. About 95% of solution gas is now being conserved, which may be the best that can be achieved. Other areas that could be pursued now include:

- Venting –especially related to crude bitumen and heavy oil

- Odours – ERCB Directive 60 addresses odours related to H<sub>2</sub>S. It may be appropriate to expand beyond H<sub>2</sub>S odours and also to consider if we need consistency of odour requirements among various industries.
- Air monitoring – The ERCB has two mobile air monitoring units plus infrared cameras that can be used to detect leaks and fugitive emissions at oil and gas facilities.

### Discussion

*Q: The “public interest” component of the mandate may not mean what we think it does sometimes. For example, how many people monitor on weekends and after hours? This is a big problem in some areas. Also, there was a major study on cattle a few years back but studies should also be done on cereal grains. Grains can be affected at different stages by certain substances. As well, inspectors should use unmarked vehicles when they go out to a site so there is no advance warning.*

A: Other regulators might be doing studies on cereal grains, but I don't know. Perhaps there could be better coordination. We do have staff on call outside of regular work hours, so if there is an issue, staff are available through our field centres.

*Q: One slide said there was 99.6% compliance around the province in 2009. Is this of the 200 or so tests the ERCB did? Does this make it statistically valid across the 276,000 facilities?*

A: We did 1000 inspections, and found four out of compliance. We need to also consider the demand for inspections.

## **11 Panel Discussion: What does all this mean for CASA?**

---

The panel discussion featured Cindy Christopher, CASA's Industry Vice President; Bev Yee, Assistant Deputy Minister with Alberta Environment; and Myles Kitagawa, CASA's NGO Vice President. Each speaker summarized their impressions of the day's discussion and provided their own comments on what it might mean for CASA.

### **Cindy Christopher**

The day has been very informative and energizing. It helped us to look outside of what CASA is doing to better understand and improve what we do within CASA, and was timely as CASA moves ahead with its own strategic planning. There is clearly a very large amount of work underway in a number of areas, and I think CASA needs to be more engaged. The following points were some that struck me today:

- Work is still needed with airsheds to ensure clarity of roles.
- There is a lot of overlap with AWC on air-water interfaces.
- Alberta Environment's work on IMERF is critical to our work, and we may want to consider how CASA's multi-stakeholder consensus process could add value to that initiative. We want to avoid dueling scientists and data and come up with the facts while still recognizing the value of diverse perspectives.
- Regarding the national CAMS, a lot of the good work done in Alberta is being explored, but we will need to work together.
- In the renewed Clean Air Strategy, it was good to hear about committing to work on outcomes rather than prescribing processes to mitigate.

- The place-based approach in the LUF is sensible, but we still need to figure out how to manage between watersheds and airsheds. There are opportunities to collaborate.
- The ERCB presentation raised a number of questions about how to prioritize what we are going to work on. If we can get CEMS and IMERF right, that will help.

### **Bev Yee**

Many diverse perspectives came forward today, but there were also a lot of common issues. Much discussion focused on how to move forward in a coherent way to achieve the outcomes we've agreed to. I heard three themes:

- Collaboration and partnerships. This is fundamental to all our air work and obviously from the participation today, a lot of people from many sectors have an interest in air issues. But we still need to work out what kind of partnerships we need at a regional level.
- Integration. While this workshop focused on air, it's about more than air. Integration is needed across many areas: air, land, water, biodiversity; relationships between AWC and CASA, CASA and the airsheds; across environmental, economic and social considerations; and across all the big initiatives: LUF, CEMS, CAS, CAMS, etc. We have to figure out how to do integrative monitoring in a way that makes sense. It is very critical and is the foundation for CEMS. We should challenge ourselves to ensure we monitor the right things to achieve our outcomes.
- The notion of being comprehensive. CEMS is about being comprehensive and looking at all the things that could affect air quality including both point and non-point sources. We also need to look at all the things coming at us.

So what does this mean for CASA? It's an opportunity to think harder about three of the points in the slide we saw about what CASA does and the role CASA can play in each area:

- Being strategic. We do strategic air quality planning. What does it mean to be strategic? Is it about trying to do all the integration, or figuring out how to be comprehensive and which niches to fill, or to embrace CEMS?
- For Alberta. There is Alberta the province, there are the seven LUF regions, the airsheds, and the air zones in CAMS. Is CASA about the provincial or regional or airshed interest, or all of them?
- Shared responsibility. This aspect has been focused on moving Alberta Environment to manage in a CEM approach and has challenged our thinking about shared responsibility. How do we collaborate and form partnerships? We need to think hard about how this should look.

### **Myles Kitagawa**

We need to build some common reality and I think I see opportunities for CASA to help do this. I see two components: 1) we have to recognize that other partners and views exist, and 2) the people we want to help have to value our offer and be certain CASA can provide this help. So we need to determine:

- Where the domains of activities overlap efficiently so there is an opportunity to work well together.
- Where are the boundaries between our activities that must be respected.

I also heard several areas of overlap and potential opportunities for CASA contributions:

- AWC. As we discover how air might affect water, this could be an area to explore collaborative opportunities.
- IMERF. How do we create scientific authority vs. dueling experts and build a better system together.
- CAMS. There are opportunities for CASA to help set trigger levels for air quality management and to determine air zone boundaries.
- CAS. We need effective forums to identify activities to be conducted under the principles of shared responsibility and partnerships.
- ERCB. A number of new issues were identified that deserve increased attention.

It's up to CASA to communicate to these agencies that we could help them and show why CASA should be viewed as a partner in their work. For me, CASA has five essential intangible features that could be very valuable to our partners:

- CASA provides opportunities to work collaboratively with a variety of sectors.
- CASA groups gather information jointly; that is, collectively we decide what information we need to make good decisions and who we trust to get it.
- CASA has a culture of standing, recognizing there are barriers to participation and some stakeholders need help to participate effectively.
- CASA has confidence that the recommendations it makes will be taken seriously by the GoA.
- CASA participants have shared ownership of the product and all participating stakeholders are equally accountable for the recommendations that CASA produces. Each person's job is to work to get the best recommendations they can and then make them succeed.

## **12 Wrap-Up**

---

George Murphy advised participants that the new Consensus Decision-Making Toolkit is now available. This was part of the Martha Kostuch Legacy Project and arose from the workshop held in December 2009 in memory of Martha. The toolkit is published by CASA and the AWC and is available from both organizations.

Tony Hudson thanked the organizing committee for their work in planning and delivering the workshop. He also acknowledged the CASA secretariat for their support. Brian Waddell thanked Tony for his role in keeping the day on track.

## **13 Conclusions and Recommendations**

---

This fifth CASA coordination workshop was generally considered to have met its objectives, filling a need beyond CASA's need for project team coordination. Of the 106 participants, 53 completed the evaluation form. Of those, 80% said the workshop was helpful in increasing understanding of CASA and what it does. Almost half agreed it increased understanding of CASA and how other initiatives affect the way CASA works.

Some respondents felt there wasn't enough time allowed for discussions across the board about how the initiatives would affect CASA, and that breakout sessions would have been welcome.

Many felt networking and getting information from a variety of related initiatives was the best part of the workshop.

With the exception of one respondent who didn't answer, all evaluations were in favour of holding future CASA workshops, and 77% of them said those workshops should follow a similar format.

In addition, the 2009 Ambient Air Monitoring Strategy for Alberta final report included a recommendation that CASA members be polled in conjunction with the Coordination Workshop (see appendix D).

To that end, the Communications Committee recommends to the CAS board that CASA:

**1. Host future Coordination Workshops**

A Coordination Workshop should be held approximately every two years, with the next one in 2012. As well:

- a. Consideration should be given to repeating a similar type of workshop.
- b. The content provided must be considered in context to provide valuable information about emerging government initiatives
- c. The amount of interaction/breakout time should be increased for the next workshop

## **Appendix A: Members of the Communications Committee**

---

Tony Hudson, chair	The Lung Association, Alberta & NWT
Ann Baran	Southern Alberta Group for the Environment
Ogho Ikhalo	Alberta Environment
Karen Karbasheski	Alberta Energy
Deb Steele	The Lung Association, Alberta & NWT
Rachel Turner	Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers (CAPP)
Brian Waddell	Alberta Environment
Ruth Yanor	Mewassin Community Council
Jean Moses	CASA Secretariat

### *Corresponding Members*

Bob Curran	Energy Resources Conservation Board
Tom Neufeld	Energy Resources Conservation Board
Gloria Trimble	Environment Canada (corresponding member)



## **Appendix B: Coordination Workshop Attendees**

---

<b><u>Name</u></b>	<b><u>Organization</u></b>
Paul Adams	Calgary Region Airshed Zone
Lyndon Aginas	Yellowhead Tribal Council
Colin Allison	
Randy Angle	CASA
Andre Asselin	Alberta Water Council
Bernie Aumiller	ATCO Power, Sheerness Generating Station
Peter Baltais	Imperial Oil Ltd.
Ann Baran	Southern Alberta Group for the Environment
Sara Barss	TransCanada
LauraLee Billings	Alberta Environment
Mike Bisaga	Alberta Airsheds Council
Ken Blackwood	Bow Valley Clean Air society
Jill Bloor	Calgary Region Airshed Zone
Brenda Brindle	Agriculture & Rural Development, Environmental Stewardship
Division	
Glynis Carling	Imperial Oil Resources
Leili Chepelkevitch	Paramount Resources
Cindy Christopher	Imperial Oil
Tim Chute	ATCO Power, Sheerness Generating Station
Roy Clough	Cheminfo Services Ltd.
Jennifer Coulson	Northwest Ethical Investments
Gary Cross	Focus Corporation
Crystal Damer	Land Use Secretariat
Laurie J Danielson	Northeast Capital Industrial Association
Janet Dietrich	Agri-Environmental Partnership of Alberta
Cailee Elis	Penn West Energy
Sam Fasullo	Firemaster Oilfield Services
Jillian Flett	Alberta Environment
Sumita Fons	Husky Energy
Kristina Friesen	Alberta Airsheds Council
Russ Golonowski	Palliser Airshed Society, Alberta Airsheds Council
Neil Guay	AltaGas Ltd.
Jim Hackett	ATCO Power Canada Ltd.
Steve Harrington	Energy Resources Conservation Board
Linda Harvey	City of Calgary
Gustavo Hernandez	CASA
Andrew Higgins	Canadian Natural Resources Ltd.
Tony Hudson	Alberta Lung Association, AB & NWT
Ahmed Idriss	Capital Power
Linda Jabs	CASA
Robyn-Leigh Jacobsen	CASA
Noemie Jenni	Battle River Watershed Alliance
Myles Kitagawa	Toxics Watch Society of Alberta
Eleanor Kneffel	Beaver River Watershed Alliance

Martina Krieger	Alberta Environment
Shane Lamden	NOVA Chemicals Corporation
Yolanta Leszczynski	Fort Air Partnership/Shell Canada
Willy Lightning	Samson Cree Nation
Norm MacLeod	CASA
Nathan Maycher	ConocoPhillips Canada
Ken McGregor	Imperial Oil Ltd.
Sharon McKinnon	Crop Sector Working Group
Barbara McNeil	Barbara McNeil & Assoc.
Chris Meloche	Husky Energy
Mike Mellross	City of Edmonton
Lance Miller	Devon Canada Corporation
Russell Morrison	Encana Corporation
Jean Moses	CASA
Tanya Moskal-Hébert	Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development
George Murphy	Alberta Environment
Nick Mushey	Bow Valley Clean Air Society
Bob Myrick	Alberta Environment
Stephanie Neilson	Advantage Oil & Gas
Cole Nelson	Rocky View County
Brigitte Noren	Alberta Health Services
Corinne Parker	AHS Health Protection
Roxanne Pettipas	ConocoPhillips Canada
Zoe Pfeiffer	National Energy Board
Krista Phillips	Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers
Kathryn Podgurny	Suncor Energy Inc.
Shirley Pohl	TAQA North
Robert Pole	Alberta Environment
Albert Poulette	Alberta Environment
Lynn Que	Alberta Health Services - Calgary Zone
Maude Ramsay	Devon Canada
Robin Reese	Integrated Environments Ltd.
Ken Robertson	City of Calgary
Ludmilla Rodriguez	Alberta Health Services
Kim Sanderson	CASA
Dale Sandford	MEGlobal Canada Inc.
Anita Sartori	Canadian Natural Resources Ltd.
Magdalena Scarlat	Environment Canada
Al Schulz	Chemistry Industry Association of Canada
Bob Scotten	West Central Airshed Society/Palliser Airshed Zone
Terry Sly	Alberta Water Council
Lisa Solomchuk	Shell Canada
Jeff Surtees	Trout Unlimited Canada
Don Szarko	Alberta Motor Association
Marilyn Thomas	United Church Women
Dea Thompson	Energy Resources Conservation Board
Kerri Timoffee	Environment Canada
Carmen Toker	Maxxam Analytics
Jim Turner	Natural Resources Conservation Board

Wayne Ungstad	Ponoka Fish and Game
Opel Vuzi	Health Canada
Brian Waddell	Alberta Environment
Darcy Walberg	Agrium
Kevin Warren	Parkland Airshed Management Zone
Brad Watson	Lafarge Canada Ltd/CRAZ
Brian Wiens	Environment Canada
Chad Willms	Rocky View County
Doug Wong	Alberta Environment
Gwen Wood	Energy Resources Conservation Board
Ruth Yanor	Mewassin Community Council
Bev Yee	Alberta Environment
Leslie Yellowface	O'Chiese First Nations
Stacy Yellowface	O'Chiese First Nations

## **Appendix C: Workshop Package**

---

The entire workshop package is posted on the CASA website at <http://casahome.org/Learning/2010CoordinationWorkshop.aspx>.

## **Appendix D: Ambient Monitoring Strategic Plan Recommendation**

### **Recommendation 6: Monitoring input from CASA project teams**

The AMSP Project Team recommends that the CASA Board and Secretariat initiate the following actions related to monitoring and data issues:

1. in the Terms of Reference for Project Teams, as appropriate, require as a specific task the identification of any network related monitoring and or data needs as related to any of their recommendations;
2. that Project Teams be formally requested, on an annual basis, to provide any network monitoring or data issues, needs or concerns that have arisen from their work to be recorded by the Secretariat and sent to the Multi-Stakeholder Implementation Committee (or subsequent equivalent or AENV). These should also be retained as reference material for use by the next AMSP Project Team; and
3. that CASA members be formally polled as part of the CASA coordination workshop regarding their level of satisfaction with, and recommendations for, the ambient monitoring network (it is recommended that this be done in conjunction with the establishment of the AMSP Project Team undertaking the update of the Strategic Plan (recommendation 4)).