

CASA Board of Directors Meeting

April 13, 2021, Zoom Conferencing

In attendance:

CASA Board Directors and Alternates:

Alison Miller, Petroleum Products
Amber Link, Rural Municipalities of Alberta
Ann Baran, NGO Rural
Bill Calder, NGO Urban
Craig Werner, Forestry
David Lawlor, Alternate Energy
David Spink, NGO Urban
Don McCrimmon, Oil and Gas Large Producers
Holly Johnson-Rattlesnake, Samson Cree Nation
Humphrey Banack, Agriculture

Jim Hackett, Utilities
Leigh Allard, NGO Health
Martin Van Olst, Federal Government
Randy Angle, NGO Rural
Rich Smith, Agriculture
Rob Beleutz, Mining
Rob Hoffman, Petroleum Products
Ruth Yanor, NGO Industrial
Andre Asselin, CASA Executive Director

CASA Staff:

Alec Carrigy, Katie Duffett, Lauren Hall, Anuja Hoddinott

Guests:

Bob Myrick, Alberta Environment and Parks
Cam Lane, Alberta Environment and Parks
Dana Mackie, Alberta Environment and Parks
Hamid Namsechi, Alberta Environment and Parks
Karen Ritchie, Alberta Environment and Parks
Karla Reesor, Alberta Airsheds Council
Marilea Pattison-Perry, Alberta Environment and Parks
Randy Dobko, Alberta Environment and Parks
Sharon Willianen, Alberta Environment and Parks
Sheila Lucas, Alberta Environment and Parks

Regrets:

Bev Yee, Provincial Government – Environment
James Baldwin, Chemical Manufacturers
Mary Onukem, Métis Settlements General
Council

**Clean Air Strategic Alliance
Board of Directors Meeting
April 13, 2021**

Executive Summary

The board approved the final report and communications plan for the 2018 Electricity Framework Review Project Team and disbanded the team.

There was discussion of timelines and process associated with the Consumer Transportation, COVID, and Air Quality (CTCAQ) Working Group. It was decided that once the working group finalizes their draft terms of reference (ToR), a three-week turnaround for review and offline approval will be provided to the board. After the ToR is complete, there will be a formal one-week call for members.

The board will likely discuss the potential dust management project and the Human Health and Air Quality Ad Hoc Group statement of opportunity at the September meeting.

There was discussion as to whether CASA will continue to host meetings virtually or in-person as more Albertans are vaccinated. The board generally agreed on a flexible and adaptive approach depending on the specific needs of a project or group, but further discussion will take place at future meetings.

The next CASA board meeting will be on September 14, 2021.

**Clean Air Strategic Alliance
Board of Directors Meeting
April 13, 2021
Zoom Conferencing**

Meeting Summary

Andre Asselin convened the business meeting at 9:30 a.m.

1 Administration

1.1 Convene Business Meeting and Approve Agenda

Participants were welcomed to CASA’s one hundred and third general business meeting. Andre noted that he would chair the meeting. It was acknowledged that the meeting was taking place on the traditional lands of Treaty 6, Treaty 7, and Treaty 8 First Nations, the Métis peoples and the Inuit. The meeting was confirmed to have quorum. An overview of Zoom meeting etiquette was provided.

Andre noted a minor change to the agenda; items 1.2 and 1.3 should include a review of actions and a decision to approve the minutes from the March 2021 project selection meeting.

Decision: The agenda was approved by consensus with the minor change noted.

1.2 Review Actions from Previous Meetings

Andre reviewed the actions stemming from the December 10, 2020 meeting as well as the March 11, 2021 project selection meeting. An update on the actions was provided in the meeting package.

There was no discussion on this item and no decision was required.

1.3 Approve Previous Meeting Summaries

Clarifying edits were submitted and incorporated into a revised version of the meeting summaries which were included in the package.

Discussion:

- For the discussion relating to the CTCAQ project on page 50 of the package, can we replace the word “the” with “a” in the question so that it reads, “should there be a more significant budget item if the public is a target”. I recall that the conversation was about having the public being a target of the project but not the only one.
 - Agreed, there was a discussion of a larger audience for the messages beyond just the public.
- There were no further comments. There were no blocks to the proposed change.

Decision: The board approved the revised summaries of the December 10, 2020 without changes and the March 11, 2021 meeting with the noted change by consensus and the summaries will be posted to the website.

2 Electricity Framework Review Project Team

The Electricity Framework Review (EFR) has been a central part of CASA's work since the original framework was approved by CASA in 2003. The original framework called for a regular five-year review of the framework; this project was the third five-year review. The project team was established in 2018 and has completed its tasks and provided its final report for consideration and approval by the board.

The project team's goal was to ensure the *Emissions Management Framework for Alberta's Electricity Sector* reflects current circumstances. The project was completed in two phases:

- Phase 1 (short-term tasks), due in December 2018, and
- Phase 2 (long-term tasks), originally due in Q3 2019 and extended to Q2 2021.

Co-chairs Jim Hackett and Randy Dobko provided an overview of the work the project team completed towards the tasks outlined in the project charter. Eight consensus recommendations were made and one non-consensus recommendation for which a perspectives document was developed.

A substantial recommendation from the project was that a working group of people who have participated in EFRs should be struck to undertake a holistic review of the tasks traditionally included in the project charter for five-year reviews. The task review should include an assessment of the recommendations for five-year reviews from the 2003 framework, exclude irrelevant tasks, and include new tasks that are relevant.

This recommendation was driven primarily by the changes to the electricity sector that have taken place since 2003, such as the phase-out of coal and the emergence of new decarbonization technologies. The project team felt that the framework was still relevant but recommends that the working group be set out as early as 2022 to determine what could be looked at, should another five-year review take place.

Discussion:

- **Q:** There have been many changes to the electricity sector over the last few years and those changes were coming for a long time, but the EFR project teams still haven't been able to address one of the fundamental issues: what are the appropriate emissions standards for gas-fired units? This was yet again a non-consensus recommendation. It is good to hear recognition from Alberta Environment and Parks (AEP) that some decisions are needed to avoid making continuous non-consensus recommendations on this topic. For context, the initial framework's gas-fired limits had a mistake. There was supposed to be improvement on the 1992 CCME limits for co-generation combined cycle systems but those limits are still applied almost 30 years later. Gas-fired units are a significant contributor to NO_x in the province. It's likely some information and recommendations

will come out related to this issue from the CAAQS project. But the question remains: how can the perpetual cycle of not updating the limits of gas-fired units end, given that continuing to work this issue through CASA has not led to any solution?

A: It has been a challenge to elevate this non-consensus issue to elected officials for their consideration, however AEP staff continue to raise the NO_x issue as there is recognition that something needs to be done despite not reaching consensus. There are some challenges: elected officials have limited bandwidth and need to be socialized on the issue; there is competition for time on the air file with climate change; and NO_x standards for gas turbines is only one piece of a spectrum that needs to be addressed. For bringing the issue forward to elected officials, it is preferable to look at all items systemically so we can present a holistic review that addresses the entire issue as opposed to one-off changes.

- Should there be an expectation of a different outcome if the next review takes place next year or the year after? Is there value in revisiting this and all aspects of this in 2022? The EFR report has all the issues laid out – conversations would be repeated if the project started too soon. Is there a conversation about evaluating what the project is and when it should start?
- Conversations on this started in 2010 and we haven't had a different result since then. It was outlined that the issue hasn't gone away, and the provincial government has tried to bring forward the issues internally as appropriate. Whether there is a need for another specific review, that would be up to stakeholders to decide.
- There may be merit in determining whether this is worth starting again if the same results have been seen since 2010. Ahead of the next project team there would be a conversation as to what the next tasks would be. That group could have the conversation as to whether it is worth continuing the project.
 - That will be the purpose of the working group that is proposed to start in 2022.
- This is a pressing issue and shouldn't be put off for several years, but government needs to be driving the issues.
- A non-consensus recommendation is helpful as it allows the provincial government to elevate concerns internally.
- There is something to be said about waiting more than a year. The interaction of this issue with climate policies and the price of carbon continuing to rise, hopefully this issue will become more apparent in a couple years. There is a lot of change happening, but there is change in the climate space that could have knock-on effects for this project.
- The issue with NO_x emissions with respect to gas fired units relates strongly to the CAAQS team's work. As part of the work, the project team is likely going to be looking at how emissions are currently managed from all sectors, sources of NO_x emissions, and evaluating emissions with respect to BATEA. The CAAQS project and associated recommendations will likely result in some recommendations in updating emission control requirements and emission management approaches. The NGO sector will likely flag this issue as possible areas to reduce NO_x

emissions. There may be some relevant recommendations that could feed in to the next EFR.

- The discussion as to whether to move forward with the next EFR and when that would happen will take place at a future meeting.
- Andre thanked the team for their hard work in developing the report and recommendations and the board congratulated the team.

Decision: The board approved the Draft 2018 Electricity Framework Review Final Report.

Decision: The board approved the communications plan (Appendix VI of the draft Final Report).

Decision: The board approved disbanding the 2018 Electricity Framework Review Project Team.

3 Moving the CTCAQ Working Group and Project Team Along Nimbly

There has been an interest from the CASA board in moving projects along quickly where it is appropriate to do so. The purpose of this agenda item was to have a conversation about the timelines and processes to move the recently approved CTCAQ Working Group quickly.

The board was asked to provide guidance on the following questions:

1. How much time do board members need to review the final draft ToR prior to being asked to approve them?
2. Given there have been two opportunities (ad hoc group and working group) to self-identify to participate in this work, how much time do board members need to call for members once the terms of reference are approved?
3. Given the deliverables are likely to be key messages developed by the team, how much time do board members need for sector engagement of the final product? Could this be shortened if monthly written updates were provided?
4. Shall we plan to launch the Dust Management Working Group with a four to six week call for members immediately following the September 14 meeting?

The floor was also opened to other questions or considerations as required.

Discussion:

- For some sectors, two weeks might be enough to review the draft terms of reference, but for others with many participants in their sectors, three weeks might be appropriate.
 - Two weeks would be enough time for the NGO sector.
 - Three weeks would be needed for government to apprise other departments of the provincial government outside of AEP.
 - Three weeks for industry is enough.
- In the time that sectors are reviewing ToR, it may also be worth using that time to ask sectors to consider their membership on the team, rather than add time after the review is over.

- The NGO caucus typically uses a delegate selection process to determine who to send to CASA teams. For consistency's sake and to provide a transparent process, the NGO sector would like to see the usual CASA process for call for members rather than making any changes. This would provide an opportunity for others who normally aren't involved to have the chance to apply to be a part of the team.
- A week after the ToR is approved would be enough time for the call for members for the NGO sector.
- Should there be monthly updates for board members on the team's progress? That may allow the board to review deliverables quicker and easier if they are up to speed on the project.
 - Would CASA staff have the capacity to develop the updates?
 - Yes, the updates would maybe be a couple bullet points.
- Now once the team is nearing completion of its tasks, say in the summer, would three weeks be enough time for sectors to review the main deliverable, which is expected to be key messages that we've learned from this work ?
 - Government is comfortable with that. Timely communication and updates would be required. If there are unforeseen challenges at the project team table, the timeline would need to be reassessed.
 - Industry suggested that approvals over the summer might need more time if there are absences with vacation time but generally three weeks would work.
 - We should not prejudge the outcome, and don't want to commit until we get closer
- Regarding the discussion about starting the dust management project at our previous meeting, was the decision not that CASA staff would work with AEP on the project scope and the board would discuss at the next meeting? It wasn't that the project would launch immediately after the next board meeting.
 - At the last meeting, the board discussed the idea of starting the dust working group and call for members as the CTCAQ Project Team's work was ending. Any suggestions made for the third and fourth questions (listed above) are subject to change depending on the progress of this working group
 - Keeping the project in the parking lot should be enough. There is a lot of uncertainty around capacity in the future and how the CTCAQ project will progress, especially given it hasn't started yet.
 - The dust group should be discussed and reviewed at the September board meeting, we shouldn't make the decision to launch it now.
 - Maybe longer call for members period for the dust management project could be shortened?
 - The call for members period was extended because CASA is specifically looking for members outside the board membership. Extra time would be needed for engagement so that these groups understand what they are committing to as being a part of the project.
 - Government will have to re-evaluate capacity in the fall. Other sectors likely will need to do the same.
- Andre summarized the conversation so far: once the CTCAQ Working Group finalizes the draft ToR, a three-week turnaround for review will be provided to the board. At the same time, Andre will note that members will be sought for the project team. There will

be a one-week call for members to self-identify on the project team. The dust management team will be re-evaluated at the board meeting in September.

Decision: Once the CTCAQ Working Group finalizes the draft terms of reference, a three-week turnaround for review and approval will be provided to the board.

Decision: When the draft terms of the CTCAQ Working Group are distributed to the board, Andre will include a note that members will be sought for the upcoming project team. After the terms of reference are approved, there will also be a formal one-week call for members.

Decision: The dust management SoO will be re-evaluated at the board meeting in September.

4 Information Reports and Opportunity for Questions

4.1 Executive Director's Report

Discussion:

- It is hard to have in-depth conversations with remote meetings. I hope that is not our path forward after the pandemic is over.
- CASA has heard at the project team meeting level that some people like to meet remotely but there is support for board meetings to occur meet in-person. The path forward on in-person vs. virtual meetings will need to be discussed by the board and also by project teams once the opportunity for in-person meetings arises. There will not be a cookie-cutter approach.
- There was some discussion of the pros and cons of remote versus in-person meetings. The board felt that an adaptive and flexible approach would be appropriate (i.e., some in-person and some remote meetings, depending on the project and its specific needs).
- There was recognition of the difficulty of hosting remote meetings and board members acknowledged CASA's staffs good work to continue to push work forward during the pandemic.
- The performance measures strategy is due to be updated.
 - Unfortunately, that piece of work is a bit behind. The staff member that was leading that work has since left CASA and the position will not be backfilled. The board approved a process in June 2020 to update the performance measures and staff will be looking into moving that work forward again.

4.2 ROVER III Project Team

There was no discussion on this item.

4.3 Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standards Achievement Project Team

There was no discussion on this item.

4.4 Impacts of Reduced Transportation on Air Quality in Alberta due to the Public Health Emergency Associated with COVID-19 Working Group

There was no discussion on this item.

4.5 Government of Alberta Air Update

GoA added that there may be updates from departments beyond AEP (e.g., Alberta Health) in future iterations of the document.

Discussion:

- The NGO sector does not want to lose sight of the Human Health and Air Quality Ad Hoc Group. group.
 - GoA and specifically Alberta Health have had capacity issues associated with the pandemic. Those requests are tracked internally and are not lost.
 - This topic should be pursued as it will help set priorities for where the province needs to focus some air quality management efforts. It may also tie in with other projects (e.g., CAAQS). It would be ideal if the SoO were completed so there could be discussion among the CASA board.
 - Within GoA, there is a cross ministry coordinating committee. It's too early to say when capacity will free up from Alberta Health. GoA will commit to having an update in advance of the board meeting in September.

Action: GoA will report back to the Human Health and Air Quality ad hoc group as to the capacity and assessment of potential work to further inform the statement of opportunity proposal for CASA consideration prior September Board meeting.

- For the acid deposition management framework, there are some ongoing projects looking at acid deposition. It would be nice to see the new framework and critical load maps that AEP has developed.
 - The provincial acid deposition management framework needs to be updated and that there is some urgency to start some projects to assess acidifying emissions. AEP is trying to align their framework with the new ECCC framework, in order to avoid exposing our industry to conflicting dual regulatory and reporting requirements. AEP is still working on the critical loads report and are appreciative of the discussion with those who provided input to the airshed sciences team on the draft report.

4.6 Other Sector Updates

Andre asked whether there were any other updates from sectors to share.

Discussion:

- There is a lot of work on coal to gas conversions coming in 2021 and 2022. When fuel is switched from coal to gas, emissions of NO_x and PM are reduced significantly. A schedule is included in the EFR report on those conversions for those who are interested.
- The Alberta Airsheds Council recently issued the 2019 Alberta Airsheds Air Quality Report. They welcome any feedback on the report and are working on the 2020 version of the report. The report can be accessed at <https://www.albertairshedsCouncil.ca/>.
- Wood Buffalo Environmental Association have some new instrumentation to measure NO₂, and it was found that the old instruments were overestimating NO₂ levels. Assuming the new instrumentation is practical, NO₂ levels will be reported to drop a bit, not because actual levels have changed, but because there are now more precise measurements. There will be some challenges comparing current data to old data for trending. It is always useful to recognize that measurements may not be fully precise in all cases and to discuss issues and assumptions related to precision of data as appropriate.

5 New/Other Business

No new or other business was identified.

Andre provided a few reminders:

- The formal release of the AAQO project materials is April 14, 2021. Please remember to share these documents widely and let CASA know if there are any questions they can help with.
- Participants should keep an eye out for electronic approvals for the pandemic air quality working group terms of reference and subsequent project team call for members.
- CASA and AWC is hosting a regulatory transformation webinar with the GoA on May 3, 2021. Anuja sent out electronic invitations and board members can RSVP or reach out to Anuja.
- A survey regarding whether members would be interested in taking part in Indigenous relations training in the fall will be sent out.

Evaluation forms for the meeting will be distributed after the meeting.

Andre thanked the staff, team members, and board members for their contributions to the organization and congratulated the EFR Project Team for its great work and completion of their project.

The next meeting is scheduled to occur on September 14, 2021. Andre noted that meeting could be in-person, but a formal decision will be made closer to the meeting date.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:01 p.m.

The following action item arose from the meeting:

Action: GoA will report back to the Human Health and Air Quality ad hoc group as to the capacity and assessment of potential work to further inform the statement of opportunity proposal for CASA consideration prior September Board meeting.