

Draft Minutes



Performance Measures Subcommittee meeting #56

Date: January 12, 2010

Time: 10.00 – 3.30

Place: CASA

In attendance:

Name	Stakeholder group
Kerra Chomlak	CASA
Bob Myrick	Alberta Environment
Ted Stoner	Canadian Petroleum Products Institute
Ruth Yanor	Mewassin Community Council
Jennifer Allan	CASA

Ruth Yanor chaired the meeting, which began at 10.05pm. Quorum was achieved.

Action Items:

Action items	Who	Due
53.3: Contact Health and Wellness to inquire if the SSN would be a more suitable indicator for performance measure 2c.	Jennifer	Carry Forward Ruth can give an update after today
54.3: Jennifer will contact the NRCB to determine if complaints information is easily available and if it would be an appropriate indicator.	Jennifer	Carry Forward Done.
54.4: Jennifer to investigate which CASA recommendations related to net-metering and if there is data readily available.	Jennifer	Carry Forward
54.7: The secretariat will contact the implementers as identified by the recommendations in the matrix.	Jennifer, Kerra	Ongoing Need new tact: get board members involved
55.1: Jennifer will follow-up with the implementers of R&A recommendation 12(b) for more information.	Jennifer	Next meeting Covered in next energy framework; keep tracking
56.1 Bob will check with Alberta Environment if the proposed PM & Ozone indicator aligns with the State of Environment Reporting.	Bob	Next meeting Done; AENV indicator proposed to PMO team & MK.
56.2: Jennifer will continue to follow up with the NRCB.	Jennifer	Next meeting Done
56.3: Jennifer will follow up with John Squarek about the flaring and venting indicator.	Jennifer	Next meeting Done
56.4: Jennifer will work with the AMSP Project Manager to obtain the chart	Jennifer	Next meeting Done

56.5: Kerra to investigate if co-located ecological and ambient monitoring is tied to an area of CASA action.	Kerra	Next meeting Done; yes we worked on ecological effects – workshop id'd a gap that air quality monitoring & biological receptors monitoring. We agreed we should drop the old indicator and wanted to double check if appropriate – board approved to drop in 2007.
---	-------	---

1) Administration

- a. Approval of the agenda: The agenda was approved by consensus
- b. Approval of the minutes from the previous meeting: Minutes of the meeting #54 were approved by consensus.
- c. Action items follow-up:

Action items	Who	Due
53.3: Contact Health and Wellness to inquire if the SSN would be a more suitable indicator for performance measure 2c.	Jennifer	Carry Forward
54.4: Jennifer to investigate which CASA recommendations related to net-metering and if there is data readily available.	Jennifer	Carry forward.
54.7: The secretariat will contact the implementers as identified by the recommendations in the matrix.	Jennifer, Kerra	Ongoing

- d. CASA Update:

2) New and revised indicators

The committee presented 5 new indicators to the Board in December for feedback. They were:

1. Add PM2.5 and ozone to performance measure 1a
2. Add odour complaints to performance measure 1b
3. Add operational flaring and venting associated with coalbed methane to performance measure 1b
4. Update performance measure 2 (ambient monitoring capacity) to reflect 2009 AMSP
5. Update performance measure 2 (ecological monitoring capacity) to reflect 2009 AMSP

At the board meeting, concerns were expressed with 1, 2 and 3. Those concerns are noted below.

1. PM 2.5 and ozone

As presented to the Board, the indicator read *percent hourly exceedences* which in Alberta would indicate 80 micrograms / m³. The 24 hour and Canada Wide Standards are both more stringent. This

was a concern for Board members. The results of an hourly indicator would show that there were no exceedences in Alberta, which is not useful information.

The committee discussed the intent of an indicator – which would be to measure the efficacy of the CASA PM and Ozone Framework. The framework uses the Canada Wide Standards and includes multiple levels where an ambient level can ‘trigger’ an action. The yellow level, prescribing a management plan must be developed, was triggered in Edmonton, Calgary and Red Deer recently. A more accurate measurement would be where Alberta’s ambient levels are compared to the PM & Ozone Framework. A few options brainstormed included:

- Number of Census Metropolitan Areas in the yellow zone
- Number of airshed zones with one station in the yellow zone
- Number of stations

The committee settled on:

The percentage of stations reporting an ambient PM and/or ozone level in the management plan action level of the PM and Ozone Framework, based on actual 3 years assessments, starting in 2001.

This indicator should be aligned with current State of the Environment reporting by AENV. One caveat with this indicator is that new stations are generally added where there may be a problem. This could lead to results that show an increased percentage of stations, which may not indicate an actual increase in ambient levels (we would just know about the ambient levels). The PM and Ozone Implementation Team may have ideas how best to monitor the effectiveness of the framework.

Action item 56.1: Bob will check with Alberta Environment if the proposed PM & Ozone indicator aligns with the State of Environment Reporting.

2. Odour complaints

The purpose of this indicator was to measure the effectiveness of the Confined Feeding Operations recommendations. Unlike other economic sectors (e.g. electricity) or pollutants (e.g. ozone) ambient or emissions data is not routinely collected for CFOs. The board cautioned the committee that the economic troubles facing the industry could skew the data. Also, some board members stated that many have ‘given up’ making complaints. Therefore, a drop in the number of complaints may not be due to air quality around CFOs.

The NRCB advised that complaint data is aggregated and extra information would have to be collected to filter for complaints related to CFOs.

Action item 56.2: Jennifer will continue to follow up with the NRCB.

3. Operational flaring and venting associated with coalbed methane

The board wondered if this was a useful indicator given the small amount of flaring and venting associated with coalbed methane in Alberta.

Action item 56.3: Jennifer will follow up with John Squarek about the flaring and venting indicator.

4. Update performance measure 2 to reflect 2009 AMSP

Performance measure 2 has three components measuring the capacity of ambient monitoring, ecological monitoring and human health monitoring. The ambient monitoring indicator is currently

how many stations and/or parameters recommended in the previous AMSP have been installed. A map and chart are often used to show which monitors and/or parameters correspond to the AMSP recommendations.

A similar chart exists for the 2009 AMSP so this indicator should not be difficult to work out. This calculation would be the baseline.

Action item 56.4: Jennifer will work with the AMSP Project Manager to obtain the chart.

5. Update ecological monitoring to reflect 2009 AMSP

There are two data points reported for ecological monitoring: the number of eco-regions with ecological monitoring and the number of co-located ambient and ecological monitoring stations.

The idea of eco-regions is no longer in the 2009 AMSP. The only ecological monitoring recommendation in the 2009 AMSP relates to acid deposition monitoring. To update this measure, the indicator would be:

Percentage of sites measuring acid deposition as recommended in the 2009 AMSP.

The second indicator, co-located sites, did not seem to be tied to the old AMSP. The committee questioned the value of an indicator not tied to CASA action or policy recommendation. If no tie to CASA action is evident, the committee would recommend to the board that this indicator be dropped.

Action item 56.5: Kerra to investigate if co-located ecological and ambient monitoring is tied to an area of CASA action.

Overall, the committee agreed to change the first indicator and drop the second.

3) Business plan measurement and evaluation

Kerra presented the business plan monitoring and evaluation component and asked the committee if they felt there was a link between the monitoring and evaluation plan and CASA's performance measures. The committee did not feel there was a strong link. Both support CASA's vision and mission. The M&E plan leverages the stakeholder survey. Overall, monitoring and evaluation of a business plan looks at whether, and how effectively, the business plan was implemented. It's a matter of stewardship for the organization and it's business plan. The purpose of CASA's performance measures is to assess the effectiveness of the organization in air quality management. It's more of a report card on CASA and implementers over a longer period of time. These are two different purposes so there shouldn't be a strong link between them.

The committee was interested in hearing updates on the results of the monitoring and evaluation plan.

4) 2006 Recommendations

The committee went through the recommendations approved by the CASA board in 2006. There were two teams that presented final reports to the CASA board: The Airshed Zones Workshop Organizing Committee and the Electrical Efficiency and Conservation Project Team. All the recommendations from the Airshed Zones Workshop Organizing Committee were deemed to be operational.

The recommendations from the Electrical Efficiency and Conservation Project Team (EEC) were more difficult to determine. The first recommendation specifies that the GoA develop an overarching Energy Conservation and Efficiency Framework. Subsequent recommendations outline components for the framework at a high level. Items such as partnerships, identifying ministries and funding mechanisms (recommendation 3) and establishing baselines, goals and review dates (recommendation 4) were, in the committee's view, too high level to be measured. Such items are generally included in many policies and would not add information about EEC's recommendations specifically. Therefore, the only substantive recommendations from the EEC team were recommendation 1 (develop a framework) and recommendation 2 a (4 outcomes to be included in the framework). The question for the evaluators is if these outcomes were in the framework, not the effectiveness of the framework. The recommendations only state that a framework should be created and 4 outcomes should be included, thus limiting the scope of the review.

5) Review 2010 workplan

The committee agreed to wait until the June board meeting to present the new indicators. In the meantime, calculations can start on the other indicators.

The next team meeting will be in April to discuss the results from the calculations and feedback on the new indicators.

Meeting was adjourned at 2.35.