

CASA Board of Directors Meeting
September 13, 2017, Edmonton, Alberta

In attendance:

CASA Board Members and Alternates:

Ahmed Idriss, Utilities	Jim Hackett, Utilities
Andrew Read, NGO Industrial	Keith Murray, Forestry
Ann Baran, NGO Rural	Leigh Allard, NGO Health
Bill Calder, NGO Urban	Martin Van Olst, Federal Government
Brian Ahearn, Petroleum Products	Peter Noble, Petroleum Products
Carolyn Kolebaba, Local Government-Rural	Rich Smith, Agriculture
Cheryl Baraniecki, Federal Government	Ruth Yanor, NGO Industrial
Claude Chamberland, Oil and Gas Large Producers	Stacey Schorr, Provincial Government-Energy
David Spink, NGO Urban	Wayne Ungstad, NGO Rural
Holly Johnson-Rattlesnake, Samson Cree Nation	Andre Asselin, CASA Executive Director

CASA Secretariat:

Matthew Dance, Katie Duffett, Cara McInnis, Karen Bielech, Kim Sanderson

Guests:

Marie-Claire St.-Jacques and Anuja Ramgoolam, Alberta Water Council
Karla Reesor, Alberta Airsheds Council
Kaylyn Buffalo, Samson Cree Nation
Merry Turtiak, Alberta Health
Sharon Willianen, Celeste Dempster, David Lyder, Randy Dobko, Alberta Environment and Parks

Presenters:

Andre Asselin, *Executive Director's Report* (Item 1.4); *Strategic Planning* (Item 2.3); *CASA/Alberta Airsheds Council Update* (Item 2.7)
Laura Blair, *Ambient Air Quality Objectives Committee Update* (Item 2.1)
Rhonda Lee Curran, *Non-Point Source Project Team* (Item 2.2); *Statement of Opportunity—ROVER III* (Item 2.4)
Sheila Lucas, *Statement of Opportunity—NOx Emissions from Upstream Oil and Gas* (Item 2.4)
Ruth Yanor and Marilea Pattison-Perry, *Performance Measures* (Item 2.5)
Fred Wrona and Bob Myrick, *Alberta's Air Quality and Deposition Monitoring Program* (Item 2.6)

Regrets:

Andre Corbould, Provincial Government-Environment	Rob Beleutz, Mining
Brian Gilliland, Forestry	Scott Wilson, NGO, Consumer
David Lawlor, Alternate Energy	Terry Rowat, Chemical Manufacturers
Dawn Friesen, Provincial Government-Health	
Mary Onukem, Aboriginal Government-Métis	

**Clean Air Strategic Alliance
Board of Directors Meeting
September 13, 2017**

Executive Summary

The CASA board welcomed Andre Asselin as the new executive director, serving both CASA and the Alberta Water Council. Andre will also serve a two-year term as CASA's secretary-treasurer.

The Ambient Air Quality Objectives Project Team was directed to address concerns raised about the role and process of the board in approving materials produced by the team. The board recognized that the process and mandate of this team differ from the usual CASA approach and asked the team to a) provide more clarity in its charter about the expected process, and b) ensure it includes a touchpoint with the board prior to any reports going to Alberta Environment and Parks (AEP).

The Non-Point Source Project Team reported that it is very close to completing its work but needs an additional two months to finalize its report. No additional funds are required. The board approved this amendment to the team's charter.

The board received and approved the 2016 report from the Performance Measures Committee, and also agreed to establish a new Strategic Planning Steering Committee to recommend a path forward at the December board meeting.

A substantial amount of time was dedicated to hearing two Statements of Opportunity (SOO) from AEP. CASA has capacity to begin one new project now, and can take on another one around the middle of 2018. The board agreed to launch a working group for the ROVER III project, focusing on measuring NO_x, VOCs and PM_{2.5} emissions from the on-road transportation sector, particularly diesel-fuelled trucks, to help achieve the CAAQS in Alberta. The second SOO proposed a project to manage NO_x emissions from the conventional upstream oil and gas sector. Although the board agreed in principle that this was an appropriate project for CASA, the scope needs to be revised. The secretariat will facilitate a collaborative discussion to revise the scope and present it at a future meeting. Other priority projects could emerge from the strategic planning process so a decision on the second piece of new work will be made in 2018 when that process is complete.

The board heard a presentation and engaged in discussion with Dr. Fred Wrona and Bob Myrick with AEP's Environmental Monitoring and Science Division (EMSD). In addition to its air monitoring and reporting activities, the EMSD is working to provide additional analysis and evaluation of air data and is developing a five-year Air Quality and Deposition Monitoring Plan. The board stressed the need for good stakeholder engagement as the plan is prepared and indicated its hope that CASA would be involved in a timely manner.

**Clean Air Strategic Alliance
Board of Directors Meeting
September 13, 2017**

Minutes

Peter Noble convened the meeting at 9:07 a.m. and reviewed safety aspects and logistics. Those present introduced themselves.

1 Administration

1.1 Approve Agenda

The chair reviewed the agenda which was approved as distributed.

1.2 Minutes and Action Items from June 14, 2017

The minutes from the June 14, 2017 meeting were approved by consensus and will be posted to the website. Andre Asselin directed the board to the summary in the briefing package for updates on the four action items from the last meeting.

1.3 New Representatives

Peter formally introduced Andre Asselin as CASA's new executive director. Andre will allocate 50% of his time to CASA and 50% to the Alberta Water Council (AWC). Stacey Schorr was welcomed to her first board meeting and she noted Alberta Energy's ongoing support for CASA and the important voice it provides to the Government of Alberta (GOA).

1.4 Executive Director's Report

Andre directed the board to his report in the briefing package and touched on the highlights. He thanked staff, contractors, executive members and the board for helping him get grounded in CASA during a very busy summer. He acknowledged Keith Denman for his professionalism and contributions, stressing Keith's commitment to CASA during his tenure. Amalgamation of CASA and the AWC is progressing and a full report will be presented to the board in December, summarizing cost savings, workplan and other administrative and operational items. CASA has received its core operations funding cheque and Andre thanked AEP staff for their support in moving things forward. In response to a question, he reminded the board that CASA and the AWC will remain separate legal entities. The two budgets will identify shared items and internal processes will ensure appropriate cost sharing. He expects the annual budget will be about \$750,000 for each organization, which should be sufficient to achieve respective mandates, but work will have to be very focused.

1.5 Change in Signing Officer, Board Secretary-Treasurer

The chair referenced the decision made electronically after the previous board meeting to approve Andre Asselin as signing officer and CASA secretary-treasurer.

2 Project Management and Strategic Planning

2.1 Ambient Air Quality Objectives (AQO) Project Team

Laura Blair presented background on the project and formation of the AQO project team noting that the CASA process is replacing the AEP multi-stakeholder committee that did this work

previously. She reviewed the draft terms of reference (TOR) and described the timelines and process for each of the three subgroups. One issue was subsequently identified, related to the process for approving the team's reports that will be used to inform AEP's decision on how to proceed. This team has taken a different path than what CASA normally follows, and plans to submit its reports directly to AEP as a means to expedite the process. The concern was that the work of all CASA teams should be approved by the board as these reports are considered CASA products and it would not be appropriate to submit a report directly to a stakeholder as a CASA product without prior board review and approval. The concern that this approach was too far outside the accepted CASA process did not emerge until after the board book was distributed. A two-page document with proposed text to address these concerns and define clear accountability between the team and the board was reviewed during the discussion.

CASA has a consensus model and if it needs to be changed, that can be done but, until then, the existing process should be followed. One component of the proposal for consideration is whether board approval of the team's materials could be done electronically rather than wait for the next board meeting. CASA has used this technique for other issues, but not for anything as significant as approving a team report. Further, if the team does not have consensus, the different views will be described but the board would not attempt to resolve any non-consensus items; it could approve a consensus or a non-consensus report. If the board feels it needs more discussion, work could occur offline or the item could be deferred to the next board meeting.

Discussion

Board members provided the following comments on this matter:

- The executive committee could ask for electronic approval on an as-needed basis. It is important that we don't set up precedents and build another process in addition to what we have. If we want to expedite, we need to develop a process for that.
- We don't want to have teams dictating board governance. There has to be a board review of team work, but we don't need to specify the process.
- The ENGO caucus did not have a problem with the TOR as currently written. The original Statement of Opportunity (SOO) envisioned a committee that would be under the auspices of CASA but not a formal CASA project team. The SOO was clear that TOR would be followed and we are now looking at changing this. The concern is that this is a technical group involving all stakeholders and it will try to reach consensus. If it can't, it will still produce a report. If the board gets involved, it may delay the work and lead to circular discussions. The new wording acknowledges the need to move quickly. These reports are technical reports and I worry that they could become politicized. As soon as the board gets involved and there is no consensus, it puts another flag on non-consensus. That added flag could have political implications, and that's not where this committee should be going. The proposed re-wording was not circulated until just now so caucuses should discuss it before a decision is made.
- Teams that are struck by CASA report to CASA and there needs to be some accountability between the team and the board. This team is replacing an AEP process. The board is not looking to debate technical merits; it can respect if the committee disagrees and the reports can still go on to AEP. There just needs to be a "touch" by the board as this will be seen as a CASA product.
- We should be true to the CASA process.

- If reports come to the board there is no reason to use an electronic process. It should be used as little as possible for simple yes or no things, and more complex matters should be dealt with at a board meeting. We know we need to be nimble. This project came to CASA for good reasons, and we should not avoid doing things differently if they will make us more nimble. Finally, the products will be used at AEP's discretion for consultation before final decisions are made; they won't be endorsed or implemented by stakeholders. If the team does not have consensus, materials can still be passed onto AEP and they can decide how to handle them.
- This is not about implementation. For AQOs, stakeholders implement what the government direction is. It's important to note the difference in this case—even if there is consensus by the team, it doesn't necessarily mean stakeholders will implement.
- Not all team reports are approved by the board; e.g., the NPS technical reports are public and did not come to the board. They are purely informational. Concerns should have been flagged when the AQO SOO came to us. If GOA is happy with the proposed changes, that's their position, but that's not what they brought to us.
- If a report is solely for information, that's one thing, but if the goal is to have consensus recommendations, the board should discuss it. What role do we see for CASA with respect to air policy—input or consensus recommendations? We need to be clear on this and I'm not sure we are.
- We are proposing that the AQO team process add a touch with the board; we don't need to change and review or edit the report and we want to get products quickly to GOA. We are asking for a change from the original GOA request in the SOO.
- GOA: The GOA's interest is to ensure this work gets done in a fairly expeditious manner as there is pressure to develop the AQOs. We expect the team to bring forward several recommendations on substances and we know this differs from the usual CASA process. When the previous multi-stakeholder working group came up with recommendations, they went out for public consultation, and we took input and adjusted if needed.
- GOA: The GOA supports having a touch with the board.
- The board can review material as it is developed—we don't have to wait for the 20th recommendation to deal with the first one or two. If this is a CASA-commissioned entity, we need to follow the CASA process and if we can do it expeditiously, we should.
- If we defer to December, the group could proceed with its work. We want to avoid a policy level discussion at the board and not detract from the value of the technical products. If we can clarify what we mean by a board "touch" that would help.
- We can ask for a different kind of review with a short timeline and a requirement for reviewers to justify their comments. We have dealt with non-consensus before and the GOA has the ultimate authority to make the decision.
- If we agree today that the board should be involved in this process, then we can work offline to sort it out. In the original TOR, there was no board touch at all. Do we agree that the board needs to be involved?
- The board will be involved by having the team provide reports on what it's doing. That is the minimum level. Would a light touch be that the team gives the board notice that it might not reach consensus or does it have to be more than that?
- The board would not try to resolve non-consensus issues; AEP would address those. If the committee can't agree, that is okay although if there are very large differences of opinion, a bigger discussion might be needed. We don't want to unravel their work.

- The process should be to communicate findings to the board. At least some board members don't feel they have the expertise to assess technical aspects anyway.
- We fail in our responsibility as a board if we don't review the material and that would create a bad precedent.
- The project timelines line up with board meetings. The technical expertise on the subgroups is very valuable and that work can stand. But if work is done under the CASA banner, it's important for the board to understand what is going out the door. It could be as simple as an update to keep us informed.
- The outstanding issue is whether the CASA process should be used for this project; that is, should the board be involved and how.

No concerns were identified regarding the overall content of the team's work. It was noted that each substance will be considered individually because that is the way the health literature treats them. There will be separate reports on individual substances as the work is finished. Board members informally agreed to discuss this matter further over lunch and revisit this item at the end of the meeting.

The ENGO caucus subsequently advised that it would agree to a revised process where the board is involved with approving the subgroup reports prior to them going to AEP for a decision on the AQO, recognizing that this is a different approach than CASA usually takes. As the charter is developed, additional clarity should be provided on the process. The caucus does not see a need to use electronic voting and thinks the board should be involved in the usual way.

The project team was directed to draft a charter, reflecting and addressing the process concerns raised by board members in this discussion. The charter will include a section describing the team's approach and what the board's role will be with respect to the team's reports. In particular, the team will propose text that defines an appropriate role for the Board given their accountability for all work produced by CASA. The draft charter will be presented to the board at the December meeting. In the meantime, the team will continue its work and is expected to have its first report ready by March 2018.

2.2 Non-Point Source (NPS) Project Team

Rhonda Lee Curran reviewed the original project schedule and the amended schedule for the NPS team. The team is in the final stages and is finalizing its report but needs two more months to complete its work. No additional funding is requested. She described in detail the adjusted timeline to finalize the report and the detailed budget breakdown will go to the board in December.

Decision: The board agreed by consensus to extend the timelines and amend the project charter for the Non-Point Source Project Team.

2.3 Strategic Planning

Andre Asselin provided background on strategic planning at CASA. Three-year strategic plans have guided the direction of the organization; the previous plan ended in 2016 and development of a new plan was delayed at that time for various reasons. He reviewed recent history, current challenges and opportunities, all of which have created some uncertainty. The executive

committee has discussed the current situation and how to move forward. The proposal is to strike a small steering committee (SC) of three to six members to look at what is going on inside and outside CASA and recommend a path forward for presentation to the board in December. The strategic planning work would begin early in 2018 with the goal of completion by June 2018.

Discussion

Board members noted the following points in discussing this item:

- Will we be able to take an integrated look at both air and water? I would have some concerns around capacity.
 - Andre Asselin (AA): The strategic plan will identify priorities and what can be done with existing capacity. There shouldn't be a big problem with a multi-media approach. The eventual goal is to have CASA and AWC project managers provide some cross pollination and collaboration. The executive director will be an active member of the SC and can provide a link to the AWC executive. AWC will be doing a strategic plan in the next year too.
- Could this work not be done by the executive committee rather than a new group?
 - AA: Executive members thought there was a need for wider involvement but they could certainly participate. We need to look at everything we are doing and whether we are doing it effectively. We expect there will be two or three meetings before December and some reading. Face to face meetings are best, but we could arrange teleconferences if a member could not be there in person.
- A lot of provincial and federal legislation is pending between now and the end of 2017 so we don't want to be premature. We need to keep on top of what governments are doing.
 - AA: The SC can look at these aspects and advise if the plan should be deferred. The SC will not develop new goals, etc. but rather a plan. If the board agrees with the proposed process, the secretariat will follow up with a call for members.

Decision: The board agreed by consensus to strike a strategic planning committee to review relevant information and recommend to the board an approach to CASA's next multi-year strategic planning, which should occur in 2018.

2.4 Statements of Opportunity

The board received two SOOs from AEP: 1) the ROVER III project (on-road vehicle emissions testing study and path forward for highest emitters), and 2) Managing NOx Emissions from the Conventional Upstream Oil and Gas Sector. Both SOOs were presented, with questions for clarification, then the board considered if they could be approved as potential CASA work.

Rover III Project

Rhonda Lee Curran presented the ROVER III SOO, which was informed by the NPS project and the importance of managing both point and non-point sources. She described the major NOx emission sources and noted that the proposed project would help manage NOx as well as VOCs and PM_{2.5} from the on-road transportation sector, especially diesel-fuelled trucks. This work would not be done for compliance purposes but to gather data to effectively target management actions. She described the resources needed in terms of expertise and information, stakeholders, and funding (rough estimate of \$100,000). This is expected to be about a 12-month project with sequential objectives. The location would depend on what the working group decides, to get the

“biggest bang for the buck.” The proposal is to focus on both light-duty and heavy-duty trucks but to test emissions from any vehicle (i.e. not exclude passenger cars).

Discussion

Q: Is this primarily an urban project?

A: We will look at what is the best location to get the data we need. If trucks only use one route in rural locations we could look at it but a gravel road would not be ideal. The expectation is that we would focus on highways and the urban environment as the CAAQS results focus on urban areas.

Q: Environment and Climate Change Canada has guidelines for heavy-duty vehicles. Will the focus be on emissions forecasts, anti-tampering, etc.? What might the final recommendations be?

A: We are looking to get data on the existing in-use vehicle fleet, not new vehicles; e.g., are particular model years or types of vehicles of most concern? We want to characterize the existing fleet to help target management actions.

Q: Regional plans indicate what emissions come from different sources. Will the project look at content of the regional plans?

A: Yes. In some places, the relative contributions from vehicles are higher due to fewer industrial sources in the area but vehicles are an important emission source across the province.

Q: Are there any plans to expand the focus to other trucks or vehicles beyond diesel-fuelled trucks?

A: The project is not limited to diesel-fuelled trucks. They were highlighted as the focus because their total emissions contribution is higher.

Q: In what season would ROVER operate?

A: Technology is limited when it rains, and in the summer we could get more vehicles from other provinces. The timing would be determined during development of the Project Charter.

Board members noted that the ROVER project is a good opportunity to showcase CASA and to fulfill one of the recommendations on NPS.

Decision: The board agreed by consensus to approve the ROVER III statement of opportunity as potential work.

Managing NOx Emissions from the Conventional Upstream Oil and Gas Sector

Sheila Lucas presented the SOO on Managing NOx Emissions from Conventional Upstream Oil and Gas Sector. Preliminary estimates show that, in a business as usual scenario, Alberta will have air zones in the orange and red management levels in terms of the NO₂ CAAQS. A large portion of Alberta’s NOx emissions come from the conventional oil and gas sector and she described a range of activities that would be considered as upstream and conventional. There was particular consideration for work that could be done in one year and that would have potential

co-benefits to reduce other pollutants like PM_{2.5} and ozone. The intention of the SOO is to collaborate to develop options to reduce NO_x emissions. The expectation is that in-kind resources would be used and no additional funding would be required.

Discussion

Q: Do you envision looking at existing sources as well as potential new sources (e.g., equipment) and what NO_x standards should be for that equipment? I like the idea of looking across sectors.

A: The scope can be further defined by the working group, but we want to look at this sector. Some information is available now but we need to better understand the type of equipment that is in place and being installed, and identify reduction solutions. Unlike other sectors that fall under EPEA approvals, there is no way to get this information.

Q: Is the main focus then on non-EPEA approval holders?

A: EPEA approved facilities are in scope but special consideration is given to non-EPEA approval holders. The working group could further clarify the scope.

Q: What will the end result be? We don't want to see facilities shut down because they can't afford to lower their emissions.

A: We want to inform policy options to reduce NO_x to help Alberta achieve the CAAQS. This is one approach. The intent is not to shut down facilities.

The board then discussed this SOO in more detail:

- CAPP members noted three areas of concern: 1) Under multi-sector air pollutant regulations, are some BLIERS that specifically address emissions from this sector. They come into effect in 2021 and will yield a 40% reduction in NO_x emissions by 2025. As such, CAPP sees this SOO as duplication of effort. We should wait to see the impact of these regulations. 2) CAPP does not view this as a real multi-stakeholder project as essentially just one section of one sector would be at the table. That would be the first CASA team with just one industry member. 3) The end game is compliance with the NO₂ and other CAAQS and this SOO seems to imply that this will be achieved only by looking at this sub-sector; an answer is proposed without clearly laying out the question. CAPP members would favour a broader look at the problem; e.g., take a fresh look at data and do the modelling to look at overall NO_x emissions in Alberta and where there is non-compliance. CAPP is not convinced the proposed approach will achieve NO_x reductions, especially in urban areas. If this SOO is chosen, the scope should be reviewed carefully to get better data, look at where the problem is in terms of monitoring station locations, impact of BLIERS, etc.
- Yes, we are looking at just one slice of the NO_x emissions pie, but if the modelling and monitoring indicate that new NO₂ CAAQS will put most or all of the air zones in the orange or red management level, we need to decide where our efforts go. We have limited capacity and resources and want the biggest bang we can get. A lot will likely improve with BLIERS, but they are a minimum. Where we do have air quality under pressure, we all recognize that we will have to go beyond BLIERS and, in some cases, a lot more than what BLIERS requires. BLIERS aims to get 40% but maybe we should be

looking at 50%. I would support this SOO with some of the issues raised by CAPP to be addressed in the project charter.

- AEP has a number of levers it can use to reduce NOx with EPEA holders, but not with non-EPEA holders, which is why this SOO came to CASA.
- Projections are that many regions will exceed CAAQS but we are looking at stringent regulations on large engines in the sector and this is where most NOx emissions come from. Given the one-year timeline for this SOO and reliance on existing in-house experts, it's hard to see how this group could come up with something else. This is not the best use of CASA resources and the multi-stakeholder process.
- We are talking about a NOx reduction framework and one is already in place for the electricity sector. It seems we need more clarity on scope to ensure there is no duplication.
- Waiting is not an option. Part of the charter could focus on coordination with other initiatives to ensure efficient use and application of all the approaches.
- This is an opportunity for all stakeholders to look at this sector and see what can be done to reduce emissions and if we can enhance existing measures to get more reductions.
- Clearly more refinement of the scope is needed but if this work does not occur in CASA, it could be done elsewhere with less opportunity for multi-stakeholder participation.
- The idea from AEP was to bring this SOO to the CASA board for discussion and the working group could refine the scope with attention to ideas presented today and subsequently. AEP is open to this discussion and has interests to bring to the table too. This project would help achieve the CAAQS and we are not interested in duplicating work. We want to do it collaboratively and nimbly. If the scope did change to require hiring a consultant or extra funds for other work, we would have to come back to the board as the current SOO does not account for that.

Decision: Recognizing that the scope of the project needs to be reworked, the board agreed by consensus that the SOO on Managing NOx Emissions from Conventional Upstream Oil and Gas Sector is appropriate potential work for CASA.

The board then moved into a discussion on sequencing future work. CASA has capacity to start a new project now, and should be able to take on another one by next summer. However, additional new priorities could emerge from strategic planning.

- The scales are different. ROVER is a relatively light project that would be easier to do and resource, while the NOx project is more substantial.
- The NOx project would likely give us more rewards although it is more complex.
- GOA is prepared to support both projects, but it seems more work is needed on the NOx project. We want to ensure we can deliver something in the timeframe needed.
- If we want timely deliverables showing how we will address potential NO₂ exceedances, ROVER has more potential. It is likely to take at least two years to see results from the other project.
- We also don't want to jeopardize any other recommendations that come from the NPS team if we take on ROVER now. That is not expected to be an issue.

Decision: The board agreed by consensus to a) launch a working group for the ROVER III project that will come back to the board with a draft charter at the December meeting; and b)

ask the secretariat to facilitate a collaborative discussion on a new scope for the NOx emissions SOO that can be presented again to the board at a future meeting.

2.5 Performance Measures Committee

Ruth Yanor and Marilea Pattison Perry presented the 2016 report from the Performance Measures (PM) Committee. 2016 was the second year in which the revised PMs were used. Ruth presented a high-level summary of the PM results, directing board members to details in the full report. The Committee suggested assessment of PM 3b be deferred to next year. Marilea presented results of performance indicators related to air quality, noting overall trends.

Discussion

The following points emerged in the board discussion:

- The board had requested the addition of PM 3b awhile ago, but there are now four years of data to get through. Strategically, is this still something we want to track?
- This is not our role and this should not be continued.. How will it inform us to make improvements?
- Are these recommendations for others to do something? If so, do we want CASA to be accountable for the actions or inaction by others?
 - There was a desire to determine what happened to recommendations that were not just substantive and related to air quality, but also those that were more related to process or engagement. It might be useful to assess it once as it could affect the types of recommendations teams make. Then we can decide whether to keep it based on the results.

The board agreed that PM 3b would be assessed next year and then the board can decide whether to keep it.

Decision: The board agreed by consensus to approve the 2016 Performance Measures Committee report.

2.6 Environmental Monitoring and Science Presentation

Dr. Fred Wrona, head of the Environmental Monitoring and Science Division (EMSD) in AEP, presented a brief overview of the current air monitoring system and why air quality is monitored. He described his roles and responsibilities as chief scientist, noting that data and reporting are key parts of his mandate. Bob Myrick, also with EMSD, looked in more detail at how air quality is monitored and the different technical approaches, including non-routine monitoring. He noted the work of existing airsheds and the fact that Alberta still has a substantial area not covered by airsheds. The EMSD is also working to provide additional analysis and evaluation of air data. The presentation concluded with information on development of the five-year Air Quality and Deposition Monitoring Plan to adapt the air quality and deposition monitoring networks design. The aim is to have a clearly defined scientific purpose for the monitoring that is done and an indication of what needs to be done each year. The intent is to finalize the plan in the summer of 2018. Copies of the presentation slides were circulated along with a draft annotated table of contents for the five-year Air Quality and Deposition Monitoring Plan.

The board then engaged in discussion with the two speakers:

Q: Compliance with CAAQS under the national system relies on data from the National Air Pollution Surveillance System (NAPS). Will NAPS stations be under the Air Monitoring Directive and if so how many will we have in Alberta?

Bob Myrick (BM): With NAPS, we have a memorandum of understanding with Environment and Climate Change Canada whereby they provide equipment and we provide data back to them. The NAPS stations in Alberta are primarily in urban areas. About 15 of our 60 stations are part of NAPS. We use data from them as well as from all the airshed stations that meet specified criteria. Only if a station is located inside a fenceline do we not use that data. Reporting is based on all stations.

Q: My issue is how the planning is being done. The earlier CASA process to do the Air Monitoring Strategic Plan (AMSP) was very good; stakeholders talked about how, where and when to monitor. One recommendation that everyone supported was that another team would form in five years to review and update the AMSP. In the interim, we had AEMERA and now we have the EMSD. There is a real need to engage stakeholders at this table to help build the monitoring plan.

BM: The first one was done through CASA and was a good process but it took too long to do. In the CASA process, you feel like people are lobbying and sometimes the person who speaks loudest holds sway. We had a lot of ambitious recommendations that the government of the day had no plans to implement. This time we want to do a plan that will be implemented.

Fred Wrona (FW): We are still thinking about how to do this. It's not intended to be an EMSD plan, nor will it be. We are required to ensure appropriate stakeholder discussion and input to the integrated system. With this exercise, we want to ensure it's not just a strategic direction but also very pragmatic, and that we have an implementation plan that says "here's what we'll monitor and for what purpose" so we can justify where our resources are going. For this plan to work, we do need to have stakeholder input as part of the process. We will take this input back on how to improve our process and ensure we have timely and appropriate engagement. We are building new scientific capacity in Alberta but funding is tight so we also want to look at innovative funding models.

Q: Where do you see the proper level of engagement with CASA occurring?

FW: There should be points in the process in various areas where CASA and airsheds could be part of the development; e.g., a special set of sessions on how to improve public reporting in Alberta. We don't have timelines for all the pieces yet but we do need to look at a five-year plan regarding priorities and key questions that an air monitoring network needs to address, among other things. We hear that CASA wants to be involved at an early stage; we are not planning to table ideas and ask for comment. We are running an adaptive program that has to deal with current and emerging issues and we see enhancing it on an ongoing basis.

Q: My concerns relate to the gap in airshed coverage, the requirement to have three years of data to determine ozone exceedances and lack of follow up if there is an issue.

FW: We recognize we have some issues. Do we need a study to look at what went wrong in certain situations and how do we deal after the fact with mitigation, reporting, etc.? There is also the issue of timeliness; e.g., is releasing a report in 2017 that is based on 2013 data the best we can do to inform the public? We have to do a better job of getting information to the public. We have a lot of data going in that we can't access and that needs to be addressed too.

Q: What is driving the timeline to have the plan done by summer 2018?

FW: We know there is a need to have a system for the province. We set ambitious timelines to get the process going and some areas may take longer. We would rather have aggressive timelines to work toward. The sooner we can inform various processes the better, but we don't set timelines at the expense of getting it right.

The chair thanked Fred and Bob for their presentation and noted that CASA welcomes the commitment to look at the timeline and hopefully involve CASA earlier. The December board meeting might be one opportunity to talk about the substance in the draft report with information provided in advance to the board to enable useful feedback.

2.7 Alberta Airsheds Council (AAC) Update

Andre Asselin provided a short update. He met with Karla Reesor and Gary Redmond to review the history and evolution of airsheds. At this time, there is still a lot of uncertainty regarding the role of airsheds and the relationship with CASA. In light of CASA's pending strategic planning work, this discussion will be put on hold until the strategic planning work is completed.

3 New/Other Business

3.1 New/Other Business

No new or other business was identified.

3.2 Evaluation Forms

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

The next CASA board meeting will be December 13, 2017 in Calgary.

The meeting adjourned at 2:53 p.m.