Minutes

Non-Point Source Project Team, Meeting #1

Date: Wednesday, November 18, 2015 & Thursday, November 19, 2015
Time: 9:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.   9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Place: Red Deer Hotel & Conference Centre, Red Deer, AB

In attendance:

Name	Stakeholder group
Alison Miller	Imperial Oil Ltd. (CAPP/CIAC)
Andrew Read	Pembina Institute
Atta Atia	Alberta Agriculture and Forestry (AAF)
Bill Calder	Prairie Acid Rain Coalition/AEN
Bob Scotten	Alberta Airsheds Council (AAC) - West Central Airshed Society
David Lawlor (PM Day1)	Enmax
David Spink	Prairie Acid Rain Coalition/AEN
Jim Hackett (Day 2)	ATCO
Rhonda-Lee Curran	Alberta Environment and Parks (AEP)
Rob Hoffman (Day 1)	Canadian Fuels Association (CFA)
Ruth Yanor	Mewassin Community Council
Amanda Stuparyk	Clean Air Strategic Alliance (CASA)
Keith Denman	Clean Air Strategic Alliance (CASA)
Warren Greeves	Clean Air Strategic Alliance (CASA)

Regrets:

Name	Stakeholder group
Martin Van Olst	Environment Canada
Mandeep Dhaliwal	Alberta Airsheds Council (AAC) - Calgary Region Airshed Zone
Tasha Blumenthal	Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties (AAMDC)
Val Mellesmoen	AEMERA

Action Items:

Action Items	Who	Due
1.1: Amanda will pursue the development of the CASA website to set up a log-in-specific 'NPS Project Team' webpage for housing all project documents and resources; provide all team members login information.	Amanda	ASAP
1.2: Amanda will send an informational email to the NPS project team members after the meeting that will include a brief update on progress, decisions made and action items for work in-between meetings.	Amanda	ASAP
1.3: Based on the meeting discussions for the team's terms of reference and ground rules, Amanda will write up the draft documents for review and acceptance.	Amanda	Meeting #2

1.4: All Project Team members will look for any Alberta non-point source information, resources or data and send to Amanda via email to begin to build the 'Library of NPS Information". Members will include the link and short description for posting on the internal CASA website.	All project team members	By end of day December 11, 2015 for discussion at Meeting #2
1.5: All Project Team members will consider any and all technical expertise available within their organizations and discuss with associated personnel the availability to participate on the CASA task group for the NPS project.	All project team members	By end of day December 11, 2015 for discussion at Meeting #2
1.6: Pursue CASA communications assistance to start a social media (e.g. Twitter) discussion/conversation around NPS's and the work of the new CASA Project Team.	Amanda	Meeting #2
1.7: Discuss internal CASA Communications capabilities and potential to provide support for the NPS Objective #4.	Amanda	Meeting #2
1.8: Draft a list of the current project team membership and send out to the team for information and support for Action Item 1.9.	Amanda	ASAP
1.9: Each stakeholder group will bring forward (send as soon as possible) the name of their self-selected co-chair. (NGO, industry, government)	All project team members	Prior to meeting #2 - email names to Amanda.
1.10: The CASA secretariat will pursue follow-up and/or requests for the additional project team membership as discussed at the Meeting #1.	Amanda	Meeting #2
1.11: Send the team an updated meeting notice for a short conference call on December 14th that will update all team members of progress and outstanding work from Meeting #1.	Amanda	ASAP
1.12: Create and send out a Doodle poll for availability of all team members for the next three monthly team meetings in Q1 of 2016.	Amanda & All project team members to complete	ASAP

Day 1: November 18, 2015
Time: 9:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

1. Introduction

This 2-day meeting was the kick-off event for CASA's new Non-Point Source Project Team (NPS PT). Day 1 focused on providing the team with an orientation to CASA and CASA's processes, developing team ground rules, and draft Terms of Reference including preparing tools and solutions to address upcoming team challenges. Day 2 was directed at discussing details and implementation of the project charter, discussing the objectives including the 'what's and how's' and possible efficiencies. After reviewing team membership and the co-chair selection process they discussed next steps. The goal of this meeting was to provide an opportunity for team building, engage in orientation and training in collaborative processes and interest-based negotiation, apply this training to create tangible team products, build buy-in and ownership of the process, and set the stage for the continued success of the team.

The meeting began at 9:05 a.m. The CASA Secretariat (the secretariat) began by introducing themselves, with Keith indicating that Amanda would be the team's project manager with Warren acting as support from the secretariat. Participants introduced themselves, their organizations and sectors and were welcomed to the meeting. The meeting agenda and objectives were reviewed and accepted with no edits.

2. CASA Overview

Amanda provided an overview of CASA and elements of a successful team. CASA is a non-profit organization that develops recommendations and strategies to assess and improve air quality in Alberta. CASA is made up of three components:

1. The Board:
    o Self-selected members from government, industry and non-government organizations
    o Oversees and provides strategic direction for CASA and the secretariat
    o Meets up to 4 times annually
2. The CASA Secretariat:
    o Small staff that oversees the day-to-day operations of CASA
    o Responsible to the Board
    o Are the process and facilitation experts
3. The Project Team:
    o Responsible to the Board and to the constituents they represent
    o All team members have roles and responsibilities which can be found in CASA's Guide to Managing Collaborative Processes (MCP) (page 19-25).

The team discussed building blocks for success including consensus, relationship building, discussion without prejudice, and communications with their constituencies. CASA's MCP is also a valuable resource for success as it outlines the collaborative consensus process and strategies for overcoming common challenges the team will face. *Each member of the team is responsible for contributing to the success of the project*. Team members should take advantage of the diversity of perspectives at the table to build a robust, creative package of recommendations that meets everyone's interests.

Benefits of the CASA processes at a high-level include:
    o Brings interests to the surface
    o Encourages innovative solutions to meet everyone's needs
    o Creates long-lasting, implementable solutions that are supported by all stakeholders

There are new members to CASA on this project team so discussion focused on how CASA's collaborative decision-making process and interest-based negotiation forms the foundation for project teams. Clarification was provided that a CASA recommendation is an agreed-upon plan of action that is presented to the CASA Board for approval, as a result of the CASA process. Board endorsed recommendations are tracked by the CASA internal committees for progress and implementation.

Some main roles and responsibilities for the secretariat through this process include:
    - Acting as a Facilitator (along with chairs):
        o Mission is to support the group to do its best thinking

- o Implements core functions
  - ▪ Encouraging participation
  - ▪ Promoting mutual understanding
  - ▪ Fostering innovative and inclusive solutions
  - ▪ Cultivating shared responsibilities
- Acting as the Project Manager:
  - o Creating collaborative relationships and developing partnerships
  - o Planning group processes
  - o Creating and sustaining a collaborative environment
  - o Guiding the group to consensus and desired outcomes
  - o Using a variety of approaches to shift people from positions to interests and to focus on collaborative interaction.

It was stressed that the team members are the most important tools for success. It comes from the diversity of people who come to the CASA table. The members were asked to consider that the work of a CASA project team is like a platypus. This amazing, unique, and strange animal is a mix-up of a combination of characteristics present in other animals, that just works (it is one of the older mammals on earth), just like the combination of everyone on this team. At the end of the day our package of recommendation in our final report, is likely to look like a platypus, but it's going to be full of great creative pieces that just make it work.

3. & 4. What is interest based negotiation (IBN)? IBN in Action.

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

To introduce the concept of interest based negotiation, the team participated in a short negotiation role play. The exercise was meant to demonstrate the difficulty of finding a win-win situation when people focus solely on their positions (especially when there is no opportunity for compromise, ex. neighbours arguing about whether to cut down a tree). When people focus on interests rather than positions, there are a wider variety of solutions that become available and the likelihood of reaching a win-win agreement increases significantly.

Through this discussion the team discussed two tools to help team members focus on interests rather than positions during meetings:

Tool: How to identify an interest?
- Ask the 3 Questions:
  1. What is your concern? (Identifies the issue)
  2. What is your solution? (Often expressed as a position)

3. How would that solution solve your issue? (Describes underlying interests)

Tool: What if someone is being positional?
- Ask questions! (rather than argue)
- Propose alternatives
- Put your own interests on the table
    - Ask: How does your solution meet my/everyone's interests?

The most important communication tool in an interest based discussion is *listening*. The most effective participants are those who are also active listeners. Part of listening means that the other person feels as though they are being listened to. This means making eye contact when appropriate, making gestures of acknowledgment, putting aside distractions such as cell phones and newspapers, and *asking open ended questions*. Rather than focusing on what you think or want to say, a good listener pays attention and tracks the other person's comments. A good listener also picks up on what is not being said. When someone feels as if they are being listened to they are more likely to focus on interests and trust others at the table. It is important to recognize the challenge of listening to someone else when you may disagree with what they are saying. Rather than argue, participants are encouraged to ask questions. You do not necessarily need to agree but it is the responsibility of every team member to try to understand each others' interests.

4. CASA's Guide to Managing Collaborative Processes (MCP)

Warren provided an overview of CASA's MCP and where the team is within the process. The MCP outlines 8 steps that action CASA's collaborative consensus process. Each step lays out associated actions and deliverables as well as strategies for overcoming common challenges. It will be a key resource for this team. By the end of the meeting #1 the team will have reached the end of *Step 3* (convening the team) and will be entering *Step 4* (issues, information, and interest). It should be noted that, while the sequence of steps appears linear, the process is iterative. Some members may feel more at home in some steps than others (like discussing interests and issue; preparing alternatives); being aware of these tendencies is helpful for members on a personal level in order to participate effectively.

The team members were provided with the MCP Guide on a USB drive for their future reference and were informed they can request a hard copy of the guide from the secretariat at any time.

The CASA process involves numerous stakeholders and creates solutions that all sectors can live with. While we may not be able to provide a quick solution, we will be able to provide supported and sustainable solutions that address important air quality issues. Each CASA project team will have different objectives and deliverables. The CASA Odour Management Team focus was getting the right information and creating a Good Practices Guide, but there were no specific recommendations. In contrast the Electricity Framework Review Team negotiated hard numbers. The more specific the recommendations the harder the work is and the more negotiating that is required. Sometimes teams spin off smaller task groups that undertake pieces of work and bring it back to the project team. All this can be considered for this project team and how the team will complete the objectives that are listed in their project charter.

5. IBN in Action and NPS Team Terms of Reference (ToR)

Amanda began the discussion on the NPS Project Charter referring to the goals, vision, and work areas for the project team. An Operating Terms of Reference was provided by the NPS Working

Group within the charter. The terms of reference will set out how the team will work together. Some minor edits or modifications to the project charter may occur as the team begins their work and develops specific workplans, but any major changes would have to go back to the CASA Board for approval. The terms of reference are a product of the team. The discussion began with the team member roles and responsibilities and included:

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

Main areas of discussion included the following areas that will be drafted into the NPS ToR:

Team member protocols and procedures:

1. *Meetings (CASA):* The Project Manager (or support) will prepare a draft agenda and co-chairs will provide any input on a draft 2 weeks prior to meeting dates. The co-chair reviewed draft agenda and any meeting materials will be sent to the project team 1 week prior to each meeting.
3. *Meetings (Team members):* Members will come to each meeting having read the agenda, distributed materials and having kept themselves abreast of significant developments since the last meeting. Team members will give meetings high priority as a commitment, but also recognize that conflicts for peoples' time are unavoidable. Team members will strive to respond to information requests from the project manager including polls and approval of decisions/requests.
4. *Alternates and informing the project team:* Where a member is unable to attend a meeting, they should review the related material in advance and inform another team member of their perspectives on all key issues, and follow-up immediately after the meeting with the project manager and/or others in attendance.
4. *Communications with stakeholders:* Team members are expected to ensure information is shared with all those in their organization whose support will be needed to implement the team's recommendations (i.e. their constituencies). All involved should be aware of the principles of CASA collaboration.

There will be an area on the CASA website created (casahome.org) where members can go to find all current information and resources/documents. Login information will be sent to the team members.

Action Item 1.1: Amanda will pursue the development of the CASA website to create a member-specific 'NPS Project Team' webpage for housing all project documents and resources; all team members will receive login information.

Team members noted that any new people who join the team part-way through could be disruptive if they want to re-open decisions that have already been made. The secretariat will ensure that new

members are up-to-date on progress and decisions or approvals that have already occurred (with associated sector representatives).

Team members also requested the secretariat aim to provide the team with consistent messaging of team progress by developing short updates on a monthly basis as the teams work progresses and after each meeting in email format for the team member's reference.

Action Item 1.2: Amanda will send an informational email to the NPS project team members after the meeting that will include a brief update on progress, decisions made and action items for work in-between meetings.

Communications Protocols:
1. *Updates to the CASA board*: The team will provide regular updates to the Board especially as major milestones are reached at each board meeting as this topic is dynamic and the Board should be involved throughout the teams' work and be able to provide ongoing feedback.
2. *Media inquiries*: Media requests directed to the secretariat will be referred to the co-chairs. The secretariat can work with co-chairs and/or team members to develop key messages if desired. Members will not initiate media contact relating to this NPS work without checking in with the other team members.
   Additionally:
   a) Any communications with the media should reflect CASA's principle of non-attribution (i.e. The team discussed… vs This [Specific organization] said this…). CASA stakeholders are encouraged to elaborate on CASA views while making every reasonable effort to distinguish between the CASA view and their sector's view.
   b) Statements made on behalf of CASA or the team should reflect key messages.
   c) Members are encouraged to contact the secretariat for communications advice before speaking to the media.
   d) Use CASA's Media relations policy.
3. *External developments*: Keeping up with ongoing developments relevant to the Team's work. The team agreed to a standing agenda item at each meeting where members can share updates. Team members are highly encouraged to contact the project manager with updates between meetings.

Meeting Protocols:
1. *Quorum:* In order to achieve meeting quorum, a representative from each of industry, government, non-government, and airshed organization must be present and there must be at least 50% team member attendance.
2. *Location of team meetings*: Team meetings will alternate between Edmonton and Calgary with a ratio of 2:1. *This can be revisited if requested by team members.* Meetings will occur within the times of 10:00 am to 3:30 pm unless otherwise discussed as this timing allows travel time.
3. *Non-attribution*: Any concepts or ideas suggested by a team member will not be attributed to that individual or organization outside of the discussions.

Amanda asked the team to list meeting characteristics they had experienced in the past that contributed to a bad meeting. The worst meetings team members have been to included:
- Lack of structure. No up-front objectives. Unfocused – not getting anywhere.
- Need for leadership of the meeting – ensuring that they do what they said to do.
- Unclear expectations. Distracted team members. People don't listen

- Multiple conversations at once – lack of respect. Being talked down to.
- People jump to conclusions and don't try to understand what's going on.
- Lots of emotional venting but no meat gets covered due to time issues. Overly strict time keeping.
- Key decision makers not there and having to do things or have discussions multiple times
- People are positional right out of the gate and people who agree then block at the last minute = Destructive representation
- Diatribes, monologues, silence. Inappropriate language
- Chair who doesn't manage meetings
- Participants are unprepared
- Climate control – temperature
- No consideration for people with special need or allergies
- No humour and never getting out of your chair

The team was asked to list meeting behaviours they had experienced in the past that contributed to a good meeting. The team developed a comprehensive listing for how they will successfully work together going forward. These form the basis for the team's ground rules.

Action Item 1.3: Based on the meeting discussion for the team's terms of reference and ground rules, Amanda will write up draft documents for review and acceptance.

Draft Ground Rules:
- Participation in good faith. This includes saying what you can't do and acknowledging limitations
- If you have a concern, speak up!
- Focus on interests, not positions
- Keep comments on topic
- Respect the values and interests of others
- Listen to learn
- Contribute to an environment where people feel safe to be creative and take risks
- Honour commitments and be punctual
- Come prepared to meetings
- Set objectives for each meeting; receive meeting materials in a timely manner
- Maintain consistent representation and communications with sector so interest of the sector are brought forward
- No distracting side conversations
- Icebreakers are helpful to build the team dynamic

Discussion without prejudice: In a genuine effort to maintain creativity and ensure open and honest dialogue, all discussions will be "without prejudice" i.e. Team members will not be viewed as having committed to a particular solution being discussed prior to reaching agreement on a complete package of recommendations. All team members are responsible for creating an environment where the team can talk about possibilities, explore issues, and take risks without fear.

6. Process Planning and Upcoming Challenges

There are certain challenges that the team will likely face in the near future. Keith led the team through an exercise to prepare strategies for four different challenges they may potentially face. In the future, the team will be able to use the strategies discussed to help overcome some of these challenges.

Challenge #1: Your project team has elected to use a small subgroup to accomplish a task quickly. The subgroup would be responsible for completing the task and reporting their results to the project team for their consideration and incorporation into the ongoing work of the team. There is a call for volunteers to join the subgroup - 12 people volunteer, but the team was hoping to keep the subgroup at 6-8 people.

Strategies for Overcoming Challenge:
- The team should establish clear deliverables, objectives, expectations, expertise requirements, timelines, time commitment, and report back requirements for the subgroup (i.e. a terms of reference). This will help potential participants to better understand the membership needs of the subgroup.
- The team should establish guidelines for interim reporting and information flow between the subgroup and the team. The subgroup is responsible to the team; the team provides oversight.
- Be honest about too many people. Use caucuses to nominate representatives. Team could consider options to split the task group members and tasks allocated to complete the work.
- Representatives need to be able to commit to the needs identified in the subgroup's terms of reference (including time commitments).
- Membership should be guided by the range of interests that need to be represented rather than hard numbers and should avoid duplication of interests.
- The team should keep in mind that, even if they do not sit on the task group, team members will have influence through regular updates and feedback, and the team has the final decision-making authority.

Challenge #2: Several months ago, at considerable expense, your project team contracted a consultant to write a report that the team will use as the foundational background piece for generating recommendations. After receiving the report, several members of the team are adamant that the information in the report is incorrect and can't be trusted. There is no budget to redo the report.

Strategies for Overcoming Challenge:
- Strategies for dealing with the report:
  o Try to understand why the report is being rejected (don't like the results vs. poor quality). Discussion if the report met the terms of reference? If pieces of the report can be used?
    ▪ In this way, can use the report to help reveal interests and create agreement about where the team needs to go next.
  o Document concerns and attach to the report as an addendum.
  o Request additional funds to conduct further work.
  o Reassess the methodology used to develop.
- Prevention strategies:
  o Develop a clear terms of reference. Use the consensus process to create an RFP.
  o From the outset, clearly outline the purpose of the report and type of report.
  o If a Technical report: How will this information be used? Be sure this is outlined.
    ▪ Peer review can help manage uncertainty around technical reports.

- Asking consultant to provide recommendations on how the information will be used?
    o Choose consultant using the consensus process. Create hiring criteria for team buy-in.
    o Make sure the consultant understands the team's needs.
    o Understand that sometimes all members may not like the answer that we get.
    o Identify from the outset who has ownership of the final report (consultant or team?).
    o Put together a small group to work with consultant on a regular basis.
    o Have consultant relay preliminary results to catch any issues early.
        - Build in progress reports.
        - Build in milestone presentations as opportunities for feedback.
            • Have invoices associated with milestones.
        - Make sure the team understands their obligation to engage with interim reports and provide feedback when required.
    o Include report revisions in the budget for cost and time.

Challenge #3: Your team is working to reach agreement on an important recommendation and the group engages in an interest-based discussion to explore how the proposal affects everyone's needs. Various members express concerns with the recommendation and offer up amendments. Rather than join the discussion, one team member simply continues to restate their position, disregarding the concerns of other parties, and referencing their constituency's unwavering support for the original recommendation.

Strategies for Overcoming Challenge:
- Use questions to try to get more information. What is behind that continued restatement of the position? Ask the IBN questions.
- Look for common ground. Understand why and note if it is a 'no-go' or non-consensus issue.
- Refer to ground rules.
- Take it offline. Project manager can provide individual coaching.
- Co-chairs can provide individual mentoring.
- Other team members can use their skills and good relationships to help the member move from positions to interests.
- Use co-chairs to help understand if the position is coming from the individual or from the organization.
- Use associated caucus as a resource. Is this person an effective representative?

Challenge #4: Your team has been working diligently for several months to gather information, develop options, and craft recommendations, and you are getting close to completing your final report. At your next meeting, a team member announces that they've heard an announcement from the Minister that significantly changes the context in which several of your recommendations were written. Someone suggests, with exasperation, that the team might as well scrap all the recommendations. Everyone around the table looks defeated.

Strategies for Overcoming Challenge:
- Don't panic! Confirm the rumours while continuing work in the face of uncertainty.
- As a team evaluate the impact of the announcement.
    o Look for any positive impacts of the announcement.

- o Try to understand why the decision was made and how this will change the process.
  - o Create a summary which can be brought to the Board for advice.
- Recognize and deal with the emotional impact of the announcement.
- Be flexible. Rework recommendations.
- Use an iterative process to regain ground.
- Realize that all the work completed to date is STILL valuable.
- Team members should bring relevant policy initiatives to the team's attention ASAP (this should be effective as each meeting will have roundtable updates). Keep internal communications open to avoid surprises and being caught off guard.

The team members discussed how the members can work together to overcome decision making challenges and drafted guidance for the team's terms of reference to reflect this.

Effective Decision Making:
- The Team will make substantive decisions based on a consensus of the team members, where consensus is defined as all parties can agree to the decision as a whole and can **live with** the final package. The team is encouraged to engage in positive affirmation to explicitly acknowledge major consensus agreements/decisions.
- Consensus may mean there is agreement on a package of solutions, some of which would not be agreed to if the solutions stood alone.
- Consensus may include agreement on a document that describes different perspectives on an issue.
- Team members should clearly indicate when they are/are not in agreement with a proposal. When they are not in agreement with a proposal, they should suggest alternatives.
- The Team will strive to make decisions based on a consensus of the team members, but where this is not possible (i.e. there is an impasse):
  - o The parties to the disagreement will make their best effort to resolve the disagreement through interest-based discussions.
  - o If the disagreement remains unresolved, each party to the disagreement will describe, in writing, the issue from their perspective, how they propose the issue be addressed, and how and why their proposal addresses the issue, including how it addresses the suite of interests represented at the table.
  - o If the issue is not resolved through the interest-based discussions described above, the issue will be referred to the CASA Board of Directors.

7. Meeting #1 Day 1 Wrap-up
Amanda provided a summary of Day 1 and introduction to the next day 2. The team members agreed the day's objectives were successfully completed.

The meeting adjourned at 4:25 pm.

Minutes

1. Introduction

The meeting began at 9:00 a.m. Amanda led the introductions and team members were welcomed to Day 2. Amanda provided an overview of the agenda and objectives for Day 2. The members agreed to both with no edits.

2. History of the NPS file at CASA

Bill Calder provided a presentation outlining the history of the Non-Point Source (NPS) work at CASA; there are some team members that were involved with the NPS Working Group and Workshop. Highlights of the presentation include:
- Outgrowth of CASA interest in vehicles after earlier Vehicle Emissions Team (VET) work
- CASA 2009 Ambient Monitoring Strategic Plan saw NPS as significant as well
- Work to date - June 2013 Statement of NPS Opportunity developed – Board determined issue was too broad
- October 2013 Workshop to understand NPS, assess action options and engage public and stakeholders
- March 2014 discussion of the CASA Board; initiate working group to develop Charter
- September 2014 Board approves draft project charter in principle – project team delayed to secure funding
- September 2015 Board approves convening project team; proceed with scoping Objective 1

Some additional considerations for this NPS project team include:
- Ambitious 22 month project
  ◦ First three objectives are sequential, but can some parts be done in tandem?
- Cost uncertainty with Objective 1
  ◦ What major NPS data gaps? How critical to fill them and at what cost?
- Membership on team may need to change as work proceeds and CASA's optimal focus emerges
  ◦ After Objective 2 noted in project charter, but could come at other times?

Following the presentation, a discussion occurred around the CAAQS report (September 2015) and the team's future work. The team will need to assess both initially and continuously any economic efficiencies for completing this project; noting funding available is $130K versus the $213K budgeted in the charter. Discussion highlights included:
- This project work is based around the CAAQS non-achievement and management levels. This is a political driver for the new government. It is more economically efficient to base reductions on a broader base.
- The overall consideration for the project team's work will need to often reevaluate and consider "**the art of the possible**" and practicality, to reasonably look at what we are able to accomplish. How much data is needed before we can start the work to assess and develop options that will have a real impact on NPS air emissions?

- The first objective for the project team is going to be very technical and include a lot of quantitative data. The team will need to discuss the requirements they will need in order to conduct these reviews and assess all data.
- There must be consideration for the quality of the data sources ensuring high-quality data and understanding of the methodology/measurement on how the data was/is collected (i.e. what equipment used and the location of the stations).
- There was a discussion among the team members that although we are asked to limit the scope of work to the "Orange and Red" management zones it will be helpful to also look at the criteria within the "Green" zones to see what sources are not polluting or are being managed (and how), in addition to reviewing the dynamics between the zones.
- There was discussion around the characterization, relative contributions and prioritization of the NPS's that will allow the team to move to the other objectives of the project. There should be consideration for identification of all of both point source and non-point source emissions (who is producing what emissions) and categorizations for urban and rural emissions; this is to ensure the team will all have the same knowledge base and understanding in order to make decisions. We see the CAAQS levels increasing, we can go forward to look towards some "no regrets, best practices options".
    - It is likely that characterization of all the sources can be done (not for urban).
    - There should be work by CRAZ looking at data on what NPS's are in the Calgary Region (most of their emissions are NPSs); also should be a report for a cross-jurisdiction review done by the Capital Region.
- A comparison between Edmonton and Calgary would be helpful as different industries are situated in the different areas.
- Members reinforced this Objective #1 and further work does not have to reinvent the variety of management options or solutions that are currently being used; there must be a thorough look at what is already being done through a jurisdictional review (members were asked to consider where some of this information is).
- It was stated that the application of the CAAQS has lost its original intent which was the design, development and implementation of management actions to reduce NPS air emissions. This project team will be helpful to look for opportunities to get back into the green management levels.

3. Review and Discuss the NPS Project Charter
Amanda gave an overview presentation to review highlights of the project charter including:
- At CASA the project charter is used in a couple ways: it is used to obtain support and approval from CASA's Board for the project team; it defines the scope of the project and provides a starting point for discussion and further analysis by the Project Team; and it communicates the project scope to stakeholders.
- The NPS Working Group prepared the project charter that was approved by CASA Board in September 2014. The WG did not deal with specific details or issues but rather worked to design a process which would allow a larger group (i.e. this team) to engage in a focused discussion about non-point source air emissions in Alberta.
    - The team has been directed to remain focused on creating useful, useable products.
- The NPS project scope is:

- o The work of the NPS Project Team will be limited to: Primary Particulate Matter (PM2.5) and precursors of secondary PM2.5 and O3 (SOx, NOx, VOCs, and ammonia).
- The NPS project goal is:
  - o To help address Non-Point Source air emissions in Alberta contributing to air zone PM2.5 and O3 "red" and "orange" management levels as per the Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standards Framework.
- The project charter outlines 4 main objectives for the team to complete within its timeline.
- The team is responsible to the CASA Board for deliverables of: 1) a Final Report with key findings, methodology, outcomes of each objective and strategy, 2) a List of recommended management actions and advice for implementation, and, 3) Communication tools developed to support Objective 4.
- To meet the 22-month timeline the team may consider various options including consultants and using small task groups.
  - o A task group is responsible for completing a piece of work that will subsequently be reviewed by the team and incorporated into the overall work of the team. This could help the team complete their work in a timely manner by making efficient use of resources. A task group reports to and coordinates with the team on a regular basis. The team provides oversight for all task groups and holds the final-decision making authority on the work of the task group.
- To complete all the work listed in the charter the working group estimated $213K would be required, using a large amount on technical consultant fees to review and compile info from existing inventories, monitoring data, and modeling (includes gap identification, filling some gaps as feasible), and, hosting costs for 2 communications workshops and for planning/strategy development.
  - o The Team will need to reassess and re-evaluate budget on an ongoing basis to look for efficiencies.

Clarification was provided to the team about funding. At CASA, there are two types of funding:
- Internal funding
  - o These funds are provided by CASA. They cover meetings expenses (catering) and stakeholder honoraria. These funds are allocated through the CASA operations.
- External funding
  - o If a team chooses to undertake work requiring funds (hiring a consultant), these funds must be raised externally. In the past CASA has acquired external funding through grants, but funds are usually raised through team membership. The NPS project received a sizable amount of funding from CASA through reallocating excess project funds from other areas.

In September 2015, the CASA Board emphasized that Objective 1 of the Project Charter should be of 'high-priority' for the Project team when they commence, noting that efficiencies may be identified due to the in-house capacity of many of the stakeholders.

The team was led through an exercise for each of the NPS objectives to brainstorm ideas, requirements, or questions that each may have in order to complete the work. Amanda will compile this information for each objective and provide this draft to the team to assist in the development of workplans for the next meeting.

4. Group Discussion on Objective #1 - Data and Information

The team agreed that the objectives fit well together as a progressive work package and this initial brainstorm will help the team begin their planning and workplan development. The team will need to build a common understanding which should include various technical aspects as well as an understanding of NPS air emissions in the province. These will include questions that need to be answered and the information that needs to be gathered.

The NPS Project Charter lists Objective #1 as: Compile and review information and agree on a common understanding of non-point sources in Alberta *(includes sub-objectives 1.1-1.4).*

The team discussed this objective and considered the following questions: What do we know today? Where is this information available? How much is enough? What do we want to know? How do we get it? And how do we build a shared understanding of the team?

Ultimately the members agreed there is substantial expertise on this project team (including various stakeholder contacts) that should enable them to complete a good portion of this work. It was noted that although technical expertise will be required, the team felt they would not require funds to hire consultants at this initial stage but will reassess once the work starts. It would be beneficial to have a technical subgroup look at the information so the team can be provided specific guidance from those technical experts, on what the gaps may be (and if we need a consultant). We can't all just look at everything – this has to be a coordinated and strategic effort making it more tangible for the project team. A task group consists of a smaller group of 6-10 people that report back to the project team; project team members could part of the task group if have technical expertise. We would be looking for people with technical skills set that would look at objective 1 and the library of information the team organizes.

The team agreed to:
1. Assemble the library of information and resources/data for NPS in Alberta (noting that out of province or cross-jurisdictional information will be required for further objectives and can be collected and compiled)
2. Do some work to understand the data better (assess it) and have some discussion or education to ensure that all team members have common understanding and baseline knowledge (i.e. an educational piece for the project team) of NPS in Alberta
3. Discuss the workplan for a smaller technical task group that would assess what is missing and potential to get it.

Highlights of the discussion included:
- Members had a data source discussion that noted various areas or people that may be contacted to obtain further information resources for the team members to work with (see action item below).
- The team does want to look at all areas/regions to have a comprehensive review but the focus of the charter still remains the areas of the province that are in red or orange level in the CAAQS determination.

- Further discussion is required for what level of emissions inventory is being requested, as this will determine specific requests and amount of time to compile the information whether total or relative contributions.
- The team will need to detail their methodology/references and establish NPS definitions.
- Individual sources and the method used to estimate it should be detailed/compiled as well as any emissions factors for this work (with a look at the level of uncertainty and level of accuracy around the data/estimates); not all precursors are created equal and in some cases emissions have fluctuated only due to changing emission factors – this information should be known.
- VOCs are categorized under biogenic/anthropogenic, it is very hard to measure contribution.

Action Item 1.4: All Project Team members will look for any Alberta non-point source information, resources or data and send to Amanda via email to begin to build the 'Library of NPS Information". Members will include the link and short description for posting on the internal CASA website.

On an ongoing basis for all Project Team members to send any updated information, initiatives, releases, reports in regard to Best Practices, recommendations or management actions for NPS to Amanda to share with the Team on the CASA website resources section.

Action Item 1.5: All Project Team members will consider any and all technical expertise available within their organizations and discuss with associated personnel the availability to participate on the CASA task group for the NPS project. Names for potential task group members will be sent to Amanda prior to next meeting.

5. Group Discussion on Objectives #2, #3, #4

The team discussed the remaining objectives to address the following questions, knowing areas may change as the work progresses. What does our work/work schedule look like over the next six months? Where are there any efficiencies for meeting the objectives? What resources might be required? Where will they come from?

Objective #2: Identify non-point source opportunities in Alberta, where CASA's multi-stakeholder approach could add the most value *(includes sub-objectives 2.1-2.5).* Highlights for this objective:
- Members considered this objective work to occur only when all the goals under objective 1 are complete. The team can further scope where they can start work on the objective prior to 1 being done.
- In addition to the 'library of information' and work to complete objective 1, to assist with this objective it would be helpful to have some best practices for VOC's (industry will pursue identifying sources); an idea if there are any actions in place that address PM2.5 currently; any action plans currently underway in Edmonton and Red Deer; prioritization of the pollutants (for example by a human health component); the methods used to control the pollutants and identification of authorities that can manage or regulate (would look like a pollutant/regulation of pollutant matrix); and sources that are expected to grow in the future (should be of higher priority).

The team members should be able to then identify priority action areas and areas where CASA could add the most value (higher or lower priority/impacts), and look at the gaps (avoiding duplication of other ongoing work initiatives).

Objective #3: Identify and recommend management actions, which could include policy change, to address the highest value non-point source air emission opportunities in Alberta *(includes with sub-objectives 3.1-3.4).* Highlights for this objective:
- The members agreed it would be difficult to start this objective before 1 and 2 are complete. At this point the team will assess team membership and ensure we have the right people to work on the objective.
- While this may be difficult to do and will need further planning, before we start landing on any management actions or options, we should talk to (or incorporate feedback from) the people who will be looking at the management solutions and/or implementing them. We may have missed something, or we think something would be easy to implement and it is not.

Objective #4: Develop and implement a strategy and action plan for communicating the work of the project team with stakeholders and the public *(includes sub-objectives 4.1-4.4).* Highlights for this objective:
- The initial budgeted amount in the project charter included 2 workshops at $25K, the team discussed whether efficiencies can be found for this work. The team will need to further scope out their intent and objectives. They discussed the difference between educating people on this area, which might be outside this scope of work, or if the scope should be focused on why we are doing this work.
- Other team members could participate in the communications, i.e. the airsheds are closer to the ground and may be better positioned to connect with managers.
- Should be initiated after preliminary discussions have been had by the team. Actions to pursue further discussion and development of a draft workplan include:
    - Assess opportunities to obtain initial feedback and communications; Prime the pump – i.e. a twitter feed & connect with airsheds or others for piggybacking
    - Creation of a one-page summary of meetings (CASA's work)
    - Assess the opportunities for the involvement of CASA's part-time communications staff if available.

Action Item 1.6: Amanda will pursue CASA communications assistance to start a social media (Twitter) discussion/conversation around NPS's and the work of the new CASA Project Team.

Action Item 1.7: Amanda will discuss internal CASA Communications capabilities and potential to provide support for the NPS Objective #4.

6. Team Membership

The team reviewed current membership - the goal of this exercise being to check that interested parties are being engaged at the right level and in the most efficient manner, and to fill any gaps that might be identified. Membership will be reviewed periodically.

Amanda reviewed the roles and responsibilities for project team members and co-chairs. Each CASA team has three co-chairs, one from each of the three stakeholders groups (government, industry, NGO). The present team members requested the co-chair discussions and selection occur in between

meetings as all members were not present for all groups. They agreed to send the selected co-chair name to Amanda ASAP before next meeting.

Action Item 1.8: Amanda will draft a list of the current project team membership and send to the team for information and support for Action Item 1.9.

Action Item 1.9: Each stakeholder group will bring forward (or send to Amanda as soon as possible) the name of their self-selected co-chair.

The team discussed current membership and requested follow-up for a member of the AUMA (or alternatively City of Edmonton and City of Calgary), an Alberta Beef Producers specific request, and the AMA. It was noted that AEMERA will try to be involved as they are able and the team does have a member from AAMDC.

- Urban municipalities were discussed. AUMA is very important to have on the team as recommendations will likely relate to some urban NPS.
    - o If not through the AUMA, then at least the larger urban areas should be pursued.
- Transportation representation was discussed and if now would be the time to fully engage. It was confirmed that Alberta Transportation was asked and they preferred to stay on as a supporter to the GOA caucus. It was noted that AMA should be pursued. The NPS working group had a member that assisted with the development of the project charter and the team asked if that person could be asked if they would like to participate on the team.
    - o Pursue AMA involvement on the NPS Project Team.
- There was a request that another member that was part of the Working Group be part of the team. The Alberta Beef Producers has asked about the project team.
    - o Pursue the representative request from the Alberta Beef Producers.
- Health representation was addressed. It was noted that the provincial government has Health as part of their cross ministry support team and will be kept involved throughout the process. CASA should confirm that the federal counterpart is doing the same with Health Canada.

Action Item 1.10: The CASA Secretariat will pursue follow-up and/or requests for the additional project team membership as discussed at the Meeting #1.

7. Next Meeting

Amanda relayed to the team that anticipated attendance for Meeting #2 in December was less than desired since these initial meetings are critical to have all team members actively participating. The team agreed to postpone the December meeting and requested the secretariat create a doodle poll for the next 3 meeting in early 2016. In order to maintain momentum and meet work deadlines, the team agreed to meet monthly (beginning in January). In the meantime members discussed the work that can be done electronically and requested a quick conference call to update their progress on December 14th. The team members committed to assist in compiling the 'library of NPS information', have discussions with potential technical task group members, try to draft a terms of reference for the technical task group, and review the draft Terms of Reference and Ground Rules for the team.

Action Item 1.11: Amanda will send the team an updated meeting notice for a short conference call on December 14th that will update all team members of progress and outstanding work from Meeting #1.

Action Item 1.12: Amanda will create and send out the Doodle poll for availability of all team members for the next three monthly team meetings in Q1 of 2016.

8. Meeting #1 Summary and Wrap-up

The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.