



Ambient Monitoring Strategic Planning Team Meeting #18

Date: Wednesday, July 19, 2006
Time: 9:30 – 3:30
Place: CASA – 10th Floor Board Room

10035 108 ST NW FLR 10
 EDMONTON AB T5J 3E1
 CANADA

Ph (780) 427-9793
 Fax (780) 422-3127
 Email casa@casahome.org
 Web www.casahome.org

In attendance:

Name	Organization
Rob Bioletti	Alberta Environment
Matthew Dance	CASA
Findlay MacDermid	Residents for Accountability in Power Industry Development
Bob Myrick	Alberta Environment
Ken Omotani	TransAlta Utilities
Roxanne Pettipas	ConocoPhillips Canada / Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers
Kim Sanderson	CASA
James Vaughan	Alberta Energy and Utilities Board
B.J. Vickery	Lafarge Canada Inc / Alberta Chamber of Resources
Kevin Warren	PAMZ, PASZA, PAS, WCAS
Brian Weins	Environment Canada

Regrets:

Name	Organization
Karina Bodo	Alberta Health
David McCoy	Husky Oil / Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers
Myra Moore	Fort Air Partnership
Keith Murray	Alberta Forest Products Association
Mike Pawlicki	Lafarge Canada Inc.
George Pfaff	Petro-Canada Edmonton Refinery / Canadian Petroleum Products Institute
Chris Severson-Baker	Pembina Institute
Brad Watson	Lafarge North America

Action Items:

Task	Who	When
9.2: Load the data to the web site and provide the working group with access information.	Matthew Dance	In progress
14.1: Forward the parameters that are included in the SO2 and NOx forecasts to Matthew and the team.	Bob Myrick	When ready
18.1: Consult with Chris Severson-Baker about having an NGO co-chair for this team and who should take on this duty, and advise Matt.	Findlay MacDermid	
18.2: Consult with AENV to determine before the next meeting who will serve as the government co-chair.	Bob Myrick	
18.3: Organize a co-chair's meeting prior to the next team meeting to discuss chairing duties.	Matthew Dance	
18.4: Talk to individuals in the health sector and convey the team's messages to them and encourage them to develop better	Matthew Dance	

Task	Who	When
lines of communication around this project.		
18.5: Invite the Calgary Health Region to join the team and advise that they would need to work with other health regions to provide an integrated perspective.	Matthew Dance	
18.6: Confirm with Alberta Agriculture, Food and Rural Development and CASA industry representatives to determine if they are satisfied with the current situation and if they would like to join the team. It may also be prudent to contact the NRCB.	Matthew Dance	
18.7: Update the guidance tools section, incorporating feedback from the workshop, and will add information on case studies.	Rob Bioletti	
18.8: Compile a short document that cross-references workshop questions to sections of the report where these questions are addressed, or to other documents as appropriate.	Matthew Dance	
18.9: Draft a letter to CHR, for signature by the co-chairs, and will circulate the draft to the team for comment.	Ken Omotani	
18.10: Set up the small groups, forward any information pertinent to their topic, and poll for dates for at least one teleconference for each group in August.	Matthew Dance	
18.11: Contact Myra and Karina to get them into one of the small groups.	Matthew Dance	
18.12: Poll for dates for a full team meeting in mid-September.	Matthew Dance	

Roxanne Pettipas convened the meeting at 9:45 am.

1. ADMINISTRATION

a. Introductions

Introductions were made around the table.

b. Approve agenda and meeting purpose

Roxanne reviewed the agenda and meeting purpose. An agenda item was added regarding a new co-chair. The revised agenda was approved.

c. Approve minutes

The minutes from the May 29, 2006 meeting were approved as tabled.

d. Review action items

Task	Status
9.2: Matthew to load the data to the web site and provide the working group with access information.	Ongoing. Matt proposed posting documents on a group web page where people could share information and comments. The group was supportive of this approach. Matt will obtain further information.
14.1: Bob to forward the parameters that are included in the SO ₂ and NO _x forecasts to Matthew and the team.	Ongoing.
17.1: Matthew and Ken will ask Mike Kelly and Donna Tingley to present	Done

Task	Status
the Opening and Welcome comments	
17.2: Roxanne and Dave to present on the background of the ambient plan	Done
17.3: Ken, Brian, Chris and Kevin to present the Overview – proposed Ambient Monitoring Strategic Plan for Alberta	Done
17.4: Rob, Bob and Myra to present the Overview – Assessing Ambient Air Quality Monitoring Sites	Done
17.5: Matthew to ensure the CASA facilitators are up to speed on the workshop.	Done
17.6: Team members to provide the presentations to Matt by Friday noon.	Done
17.7: Matthew and Ken to ensure that the appropriate equipment and food is available at the workshop	Done
17.8: Matthew to poll for meeting dates on June 12, 13, 14.	Done, but June dates did not work, so had July meeting.

e. New co-chair

Currently there is one chair for the team, from the industry sector, with duties being shared between Roxanne and Ken. Dave Graham has retired from AENV and the new co-chair could be from government again or from the NGO sector, or the team could choose to have three co-chairs (one from each sector). Matt reviewed the duties of the co-chairs. The team agreed that AENV needs to be fully engaged and taking a leadership role on the team. Following a brief caucus by the government members, Bob Myrick advised that AENV will serve as interim government co-chair. Bob will consult internally about whether someone else from AENV, possibly from the regulatory side, would be more suited for this role.

Action 18.1: Findlay will consult with Chris Severson-Baker about having an NGO co-chair for this team and who should take on this duty, and advise Matt.

Action 18.2: Bob Myrick will consult with AENV to determine before the next meeting who will serve as the government co-chair.

Action 18.3: Matt will organize a co-chair’s meeting prior to the next team meeting to discuss chairing duties.

2. WORKSHOP DEBRIEF

a. Members provided their feedback on how the workshop went. Everyone generally thought it went well, especially considering how much work was done at the end and the fact that the team’s work continued to evolve after the draft report was circulated. The venue was very good and the breakout groups were well facilitated. The team agreed it was a good decision to proceed with the workshop despite the apprehension, and that momentum needs to be maintained. Members offered the following, more specific, comments:

- There was good representation from a broad range of people at the workshop. Breakout groups provided candid feedback on a variety of issues. However, the broader perspective makes the work of the team more challenging, as it will extend the process and create more work. There did seem to be some confusion as to whether the AMSP pertains to air monitoring and/or air quality management. The workshop helped to get people back on track in terms of what the team is looking at and what it’s trying to do.
- One problem was that participants seemed to be expecting something other than what the team delivered. We could have communicated the purpose of the AMSP better.

- There also seemed to be concerns about where this work is going as some participants wanted more information on what happens after the AMSP.
- Some of the confusion is due to the fact we aren't done. Participants seemed to appreciate the opportunity to provide input before the plan is finished. More and better communications are needed between the team and those who would be affected by the team's decisions; e.g., health sector. The team needs to ensure that sector representatives accurately reflect what members of that sector who aren't at the table want to see.
- Key issues for some NGOs are how the precautionary principle will be incorporated into the plan, and how ecological effects monitoring will be noted. The team agreed that it supports the collection of ecological effects data but this is outside the scope of the AMSP. Laura Blair in AENV is compiling a list of ecological effects monitoring work being done; this is in response to a recommendation from a CASA team, and could be cited in the AMSP.

b. Workshop feedback

The team reviewed the one-page high-level summary, which appears in section 1.3 of the workshop notes, and how to respond.

Intent of the AMSP

Members felt that the principles are addressed in the report, but perhaps are not explicit enough. The team did consider the several principles mentioned by workshop participants and made certain assumptions in preparing the report. Members agreed that the report could make these principles more explicit and they could perhaps be added to the glossary. The report also needs to more clearly state that this is an air monitoring plan, not an air quality management plan. Members thought it would be valuable to include reference to other associated processes and documents that address some of the concerns raised at the workshop, such as the role of the Operations Steering Committee, the purpose of the Air Monitoring Directive, etc. This could be an illustration or flow chart that directs readers to other processes or documents so the AMSP doesn't have to be all things to all people. A paragraph should be added at the beginning of the report that clearly says what the AMSP is (and possibly what it is not).

With respect to broader consultation, the team did invite a wide range of groups to join initially and many declined. It is essential for members of the team to take responsibility for consulting with their sector's stakeholders; more active engagement would help address some of the concerns raised at the workshop and in subsequent correspondence. Members also felt the workshop itself provided an opportunity for broader consultation. This issue seems to be a particular concern for the health sector, and the team is aware of some of the sensitivities between the health regions and Alberta Health and Wellness. Members agreed that one option is for members of this sector to reach agreement among themselves and have their representative bring those views to the table. Another option is to have a representative from the health regions on the team. This person would need to consult with other health regions and bring that perspective to the team.

Action 18.4: Matthew will talk to individuals in the health sector and convey the team's messages to them and encourage them to develop better lines of communication around this project.

Action 18.5: Matthew will invite the Calgary Health Region to join the team and advise that they would need to work with other health regions to provide an integrated perspective.

Action 18.6: Matthew will confirm with Alberta Agriculture, Food and Rural Development and CASA industry representatives to determine if they are satisfied with the current situation and if they would like to join the team. It may also be prudent to contact the NRCB.

Others suggested representation related to First Nations and the Transportation sector. CASA does not yet have a First Nations representative, but when this person is identified, he or she will be apprised of the work of this team. Alberta Infrastructure and Transportation has expressed little interest in CASA activities. The team agreed that the next draft of the report would be circulated to a wider audience with the opportunity to provide feedback.

Implementation and Application

Members generally felt these points are in the plan already, to some extent, and will be fleshed out as the AMSP and the implementation plan are developed.

Decision Tree and Guidance Tools

The team thought that many of these comments likely arose because the AMSP is not yet done. As the report is fine-tuned, they will be addressed. Some of the content in the workshop presentation on this topic provides further details and can be incorporated into the report.

Action 18.7: Rob will update the guidance tools section, incorporating feedback from the workshop, and will add information on case studies.

The team thought that a number of the answers to questions about monitoring that were raised at the workshop are already in the AMSP. The team has committed to reporting back to workshop participants on how their comments were addressed, and a table that cross-references the questions to the appropriate section of the report, or to other specific documents such as the AMD, would be helpful.

Action 18.8: Matthew will compile a short document that cross-references workshop questions to sections of the report where these questions are addressed, or to other documents as appropriate.

Funding

Until now, the team didn't want to get into costs in detail, but it was pointed out costs could be less than expected. The team could look at existing monitoring and how much it costs, and compare with the desired monitoring and its costs. Some information could be easily obtained from airsheds' annual reports and AENV has a pretty good idea of the ratio of spending between different sectors, and this might be close enough (e.g., \$30-million worth of monitoring is being done and industry pays \$20-million of this). The implementation plan will include funding and the CASA board will expect funding aspects to be addressed by the team.

Additional Comments

With respect to a comment about the relationship between this plan and airsheds, members see the AMSP and airshed plans as separate things, but requiring collaboration and mutual agreement about what should be done.

Letter from the Calgary Health Region

The team briefly discussed the letter from Lisa Strosher of the CHR. Many of her comments were also considered during the discussion of the above items.

Action 18.9: Ken Omotani will draft a letter to CHR, for signature by the co-chairs, and will circulate the draft to the team for comment.

3. NEXT STEPS

The team reviewed the next steps laid out on page 8 of the workshop report, and agreed to set a firm target of having a revised draft report ready by December 15, 2006. The revised draft should contain information in the following four key areas, with additional details for each area indicated below:

1. Implementation (e.g., “X” monitors, here’s where they go [dots on the map], and how much will it cost)
2. Funding for the monitoring being proposed
3. System management (mechanism for revisiting the plan, who does data management for the network, role of OSC, etc.)
4. Data and information management

Implementation:

- Cost
- [Prioritized] dots on the map – what to monitor, where
- Gap analysis (what we have now and its cost, vs what we want and what it will cost)
- Roles and responsibilities – who (AENV vs zones) and what

Funding:

- 2-3 paragraphs on current funding – who pays for what now [may be some overlap between this and cost above]
- Philosophy behind the funding approach (e.g., funding formulas)
- Regulatory process that influences or guides how funding is currently done
- Propose recommendations for future funding

System Management:

- Process – how things work, e.g., OSC, zones, links to other processes
- Role for multi-stakeholder group
- How the review process will be undertaken

Data and Information Management:

- Existing data management
- Data warehouse
- QA/QC – note at a high level the importance of QA/QC, but direct to the AMD for more information
- Types of information
- Roles and responsibilities of airshed zones (including information dissemination)
- Air quality information clearinghouse (links to information published by other partners – Environment Canada, zones, etc.)
- Information dissemination – turning the information into a format that is understandable and usable by a wider audience (e.g., as part of weather reports)

The team agreed to blend Implementation and Funding, and formed three small groups to work on these areas:

Group	Members
Data and Information Management (DIM)	Matthew, Brian , Bob, Roxanne, James
Implementation and Funding (IF)	Matthew, Rob, Findlay, Kevin, Ken ,
System Management (SM)	Matthew, Bob, BJ

Bold = group lead

Work plan

- Mid-September team meeting (week of Sept 11) to check in and ensure that groups are going in the right direction
- Team meeting, second week of October (9-13) for small groups to present summary of their work to the team.
- Have all draft material ready for Kim by Nov. 17
- Hold another team meeting around end of November to review the full draft
- Final full draft by Dec. 15

If a team member cannot attend a meeting in this time frame, he or she needs to ensure that someone else in their group is up to speed and can attend and contribute effectively to the discussion. If any new groups join the team in the next month or so, they must get up to speed right away. Members who did not attend this meeting should be contacted and asked to join one of the small groups to ensure they are actively engaged.

The team agreed to this proposed plan.

Action 18.10: Matthew will set up the small groups, forward any information pertinent to their topic, and poll for dates for at least one teleconference for each group in August.

Action 18.11: Matthew will contact Myra and Karina to get them into one of the small groups.

Action 18.12: Matthew will poll for dates for a full team meeting in mid-September.

5. CASA UPDATES

Members were reminded of the CASA Science Symposium September 27-29 in Lake Louise and encouraged to register if they have not done so already.

The meeting adjourned at 2:20 pm.