



Minutes

Complaints Task Group, Meeting #11

Date: September 17, 2014
Time: 9am – 3:30pm
Place: CASA office, Edmonton

In attendance:

Name	Stakeholder group
Ron Axelson	Intensive Livestock Working Group
Ann Baran	Southern Alberta Group for the Environment
Mike Bisaga	Lakeland Industrial Community Association
Roxane Bretzlaff	CAPP (CNRL)
Keith Denman	Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development
Joseph Hnatiuk	Canadian Society of Environmental Biologists
Carolyn Kolebaba (by phone)	Alberta Association of Municipal Districts & Counties
Jim Lapp	City of Edmonton/SWANA
Tanya Moskal-Hébert	Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development
Ludmilla Rodriguez	Alberta Health Services
Dalene Wilkins	Alberta Energy Regulator
Lori Wertz (11am-12pm)	Yellow Dog Communications Ltd.
Celeste Dempster	CASA

Action Items:

Action Items	Who	Due
8.1: At the appropriate time, members will review the protocols related to 'repeat callers'.	All	As time permits.
10.1: Keith will provide Celeste the names of the CIC staff who are available to provide input to the consultant's work.	Keith	ASAP.
11.1: Task group members identified at meeting #11 will solicit groups to participate in the decision tree pilot testing.	Various	October 3, 2104.
11.2: Lori will prepare a short write-up of pilot testing requirements that can be used to support Action Item 11.1.	Lori	ASAP.
11.3: Celeste will update the document 'Booklet Worksheet – Potential topics to be covered' based on discussion at meeting #11.	Celeste	Meeting #12.
11.4: All members should review the updated document 'Booklet Worksheet – Potential topics to be covered' and come prepared to discuss at meeting #12.	All	Meeting #12.
11.5: Tanya will identify information from the background report that relates to each of the topics identified under Data Collection at meeting #11.	Tanya	Meeting #12.
11.6: Celeste will complete the OMT pilot testing proposal template and send to the task group for review.	Celeste	ASAP.
11.7: Celeste will prepare a presentation for the OMT on the plan for pilot testing the decision tree.	Celeste	October 2, 2014.

1. Administrative Items

Tanya chaired the meeting which began at 9:05am. Participants introduced themselves and were welcomed to the meeting. Quorum was achieved.

The agenda and meeting objectives were approved.

The minutes from meeting #10 were reviewed and approved, with the clarification of some missing text. The action items from meeting #10 were reviewed as follows:

Action Items	Who	Status
8.1: At the appropriate time, members will review the protocols related to 'repeat callers'.	All	Carry forward.
10.1: Keith will provide Celeste the names of the CIC staff who are available to provide input to the consultant's work.	Keith	Carry forward.
10.2: Celeste will email the OMT with the successful candidate and provide one week for the OMT to comment on the selection.	Celeste	Complete.
10.3: Once the OMT has had the opportunity to comment on the successful candidate, Celeste will notify the consultant.	Celeste	Complete.
10.4: Celeste will arrange a kick-off meeting with the consultant.	Celeste	Complete.
10.5: Celeste will poll for dates for meeting #12 (October), meeting #13 (November) and meeting #14 (December).	Celeste	Complete.

2. CASA Update

Celeste provided an update on the Odour Management Team (OMT):

- The team met on August 28th where they received updates on task group work and continued discussions on assembling and rolling out the Good Practice Guide.
- They will meet next on October 2nd.

Celeste also provided an update on the work of the task groups:

Health Task Group:

- The task group is focused on two pieces of work:
 - Stream 1 - A backgrounder about odour and health:
 - The task group is currently working to finalize the backgrounder.
 - Stream 2 - Tool(s) for individuals to track the health-related impacts of odour
 - The task group has developed a prototype and is conducting pilot testing to ensure clarity and ease of use.
- The task group will meet next on October 3rd.

Odour Assessment Task Group:

- The task group is working with a consultant to prepare an inventory and analysis of odour assessment tools. They provided an overview of the draft report to the Odour Management Team on August 28th.
- The task group will meet next on October 1st.

Prevention/Mitigation:

- The task group is working with a consultant to prepare an inventory and analysis of odour prevention and mitigation tools.

Enforcement/Role of Regulation Task Group:

- The task group is working with a consultant to collate and review regulatory approaches.

Celeste provided an update on CASA activities:

- The next Board meeting will be on September 18th in Edmonton. The Board will be provided with a written update on the Odour Management Team and task group activities.
- The Board has asked the Secretariat to form a working group to scope work under non-point source air emissions and to develop a project charter for the Board’s consideration at their September meeting.
- CASA has a new Acting Executive Director, Wendy Boje.

3. Vision for the ‘ISO Style’ Booklet

The task group discussed their vision for the ‘ISO Style’ booklet as well as for the three sections in the booklet that have been identified: data collection, initial response, and investigation response.

The task group found the term ‘ISO Style’ confusing, so hereafter the product will be referenced to only as the ‘Booklet’. *The task group will choose a more appropriate name* once they have finalized the topics that will be covered under each section.

Overall Vision for the ‘Booklet’:

<i>Content</i>	<i>Style</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – About a process, not resolution of an odour issue (managing expectations) – Focuses on the front-end process rather than solving odour issues – Information could be used to design a process – All information you need is in one place – Focus on what to do (vs what not to do) – Helping to fill ‘gaps’ – Combination of “quick sheets” (simple – for those with minimal experience) and contextual information (additional information for those who already have some experience) – Should help solve a problem 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Readable, useful – Written for non-experts – Uses written material and diagrams – Information should be quick and easy

After fleshing out their overall vision for the ‘Booklet’, the task group discussed their vision for each of the three sections:

Initial Response Time:

<i>Vision</i>	<i>Additional Explanatory Notes</i>
<p>This section assumes that the caller has already been directed to the right place and is now speaking to the appropriate person.</p> <p>The section will provide guidance around timing with respect to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Timelines around <u>when</u> a response should occur - reflecting the time sensitive nature of odour (ex. an emergency) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Response triggers are <u>time</u> sensitive due to the nature of odour – This section is about the ‘when’ and triage – Caller satisfaction (being heard) and timelines – Perhaps some overlap with ‘Who are you going to call’ work as responders could need understanding of overall timelines?

<p>2. Timelines around <u>caller satisfaction</u> (ex. call back process)</p> <p>This section of the ‘Booklet’ should focus on <u>pathways</u>.</p>	
---	--

Data Collection:

<i>Vision</i>	<i>Additional Explanatory Notes</i>
<p>This section assumes that the caller has already been directed to the right place and is now speaking to the appropriate person.</p> <p>This section is the longer, more complex questionnaire that will be used to investigate the complaint (NOT to direct the person to the right place to call – see above assumption).</p> <p>The <u>intent</u> of this section is to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fill in gaps (For those who don’t have a process) 2. For those that do have a process, to improve data collection (consistency) <p>This section deals with technical information and will be presented as a specific tool like a <u>checklist</u> or a form.</p>	<p>– Should be concise (not too long)</p>

Investigation Response:

<i>Vision</i>	<i>Additional Explanatory Notes</i>
<p>This section focuses on <u>process</u> rather than outcomes (i.e. mitigation, resolution of an odour issue).</p> <p>The section will <u>provide guidance</u> to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Organizations that wish to develop a response process 2. Organizations that wish to improve their complaint response process 	<p>– <u>Triggers</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Different types of responses <p>– Coordination between agencies and local players</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Clarification of responsibilities (ex. who makes the follow-up call)

The task group also noted that:

- There is an order to the sections
 - ‘Who are you going to call?’ is the foundational piece
 - Once the caller is speaking to the correct person, the three above sections follow
- There must be flow between the sections
- There are links between sections
- Managing expectations is important
- Training is an overlapping item

4. Discuss Ongoing Consultant Work

Lori, consultant from Yellow Dog Communications, joined the task group to discuss the Decision Tree that she will be developing for the work under 'Who are you going to call?'. Lori asked the task group questions she had developed during her initial review of available written material and the task group had the opportunity to provide input into the development of the decision tree as follows:

- What do you do now to get people to the right place?
 - Have phoned the company directly before. They were unaware and it created frustration.
 - The Coordination of Information Centre (CIC) serves five different departments and the operator can easily open the form for any of these departments.
 - The main concern is people who phone all the other numbers, helping those operators to direct calls.
 - Municipalities receive a high proportion of calls.
 - Making links so that it doesn't matter who is called initially, people get to the right place quickly.
- Many groups are being targeted. How do you plan to disseminate this information?
 - The OMT will be handling the roll-out plan for the Good Practice Guide but we are expected to provide advice. We would appreciate any thoughts or suggestions you might have related to roll-out.
- How much information should be collected?
 - Ask specific questions in order to get the information required to properly direct a caller and to be able to create a record of the call.
 - Caller needs to feel heard, not feel like they are being shuttled.
 - Some callers just want to vent.
 - Not all calls should go to the CIC.
 - Industry likes to get calls directly.
 - Source should be the starting point.
- Odour descriptors are often associated with specific odours related to a specific industry.
 - The descriptors that callers use varies widely. Need to use very simple descriptors.
 - If don't know source, go to descriptors of the source
 - Don't duplicate process (referring to long questionnaire collected for complainants registry a complaint), quickly direct them
 - Do they know where the odour is coming from? Have they contacted the source directly?
 - Focus on making "intelligent referrals", minimizing "bouncing around", gather enough information to make a referral
 - But also need an option if people are not comfortable calling industry directly – refer to a body
 - This is about creating a roadmap/process
- Will call operators be familiar with local industries?
 - *Depends, but you should assume that they aren't familiar*
 - Odour may not actually be related to an industry and can't do anything about it, ex. Lake that emits sulfur
 - The CIC is aware of hot spots
 - One of the advantages of 'phoning local' is that they are more likely to be familiar with the local situation
 - Also depends if there is one or many industries in the area
- Once the operator has asked all the questions, how do they know where to direct the call?

- There are established, existing processes. Ex. For agricultural, phone the NRCB.
- Some may deal with it 'in-house'
- The source is not always clear cut Ex. City of Edmonton
- If no source, need location and odour description
- When people phone somewhere else, need to get them to the right place quickly
- Need to keep in mind differences between urban and rural
- Need a sense of process and continuity
- *The task group agreed that the CIC will be the backstop in the decision tree.*
- There is often sensitivity around personal contact information.
 - *Yes, you should include messaging about how the information will be used and how personal information will be handled.*
- What odour intensity scale would you like to use?
 - Use plain language words rather than a number.
 - Example NRCB form
 - Provide a simple one line explanation
 - Yes, there are specific odours associated with specific industries that have odour descriptors.
 - Example, composting odour wheel, Hinton Pulp form
 - Need to find the balance between gathering information and being annoying.
 - We're asking the operator to make a judgement call.

The task group and Lori also discussed the plan for pilot testing the decision tree. The goal of this tool is:

- To provide telephone operators with:
 - A decision tree that allows operators to direct the caller to the most appropriate agency/group as efficiently as possible.
 - Language to elicit appropriate information from callers that will allow the operator to direct the call (i.e. to help a non-expert in odour speak to another non-expert in odour about a technical subject).

The task group plans to test the decision tree with actual telephone operators to ensure that the tool meets the goal noted above. The task group will use this feedback to makes any adjustments to the tool.

In order to participate in the pilot testing, participants must:

- Be willing to use the decision tree for 2 weeks and complete a feedback form, and
- Be likely to receive an odour-related complaint during the pilot testing period.

The task group plans to include operators from different groups, based on their network of contacts, with varying capacities to respond to odour complaints. The task group identified the following groups to participate in pilot testing the decision tree (the name of the member responsible for contacting that group is in brackets):

- Coordination of Information Centre (Keith)
- City of Edmonton (Jim)
- Hinton Pulp (Celeste will contact Jennifer Fowler)
- Wood Buffalo Environmental Association (Mike)
- ESRD, possibly regional person? (Keith, Dalene)
- Rural municipality (Ann, Carolyn)

Action Item 11.1: Task group members identified at meeting #11 will solicit groups to participate in the decision tree pilot testing.

Action Item 11.2: Lori will prepare a short write-up of pilot testing requirements that can be used to support Action Item 11.1.

Lori will coordinate pilot testing and prepare the feedback form. At meeting #12, the task group will finalize the pilot testing plan. Pilot testing will take place in the first two weeks of November 2014.

5. Review Worksheet – Potential Topics to be Covered in ‘ISO Style’ Booklet

The task group reviewed the list of potential topics that could be included in each of the three sections that were brainstormed originally at meeting #9 as outlined in the worksheet provided. The task group determined what topics would be covered under data collection and had initial discussions on initial response time and investigation response as outlined in Appendix A.

The task group aims to complete this exercise at meeting #12.

Once the task group has completed this exercise, they will use information from the background report as the starting point to develop content for the ‘Booklet’.

Action Item 11.3: Celeste will update the document ‘Booklet Worksheet – Potential topics to be covered’ based on discussion at meeting #11.

Action Item 11.4: All members should review the updated document ‘Booklet Worksheet – Potential topics to be covered’ and come prepared to discuss at meeting #12.

Action Item 11.5: Tanya will identify information from the background report that relates to each of the topics identified under Data Collection at meeting #11.

6. Workplan: Timelines and Budget

The task group noted that they are on budget and that there are no changes to the timeline at this time.

7. Meeting Wrap-up

The task group reviewed the action items from today’s meeting.

The task group noted that in order to meet timelines around the pilot testing the decision tree, the OMT must provide their feedback on the plan at the next OMT meeting on October 2, 2014. Tanya volunteered to present a progress update and overview of the pilot testing plan.

Action Item 11.6: Celeste will complete the OMT pilot testing proposal template and send to the task group for review.

Action Item 11.7: Celeste will prepare a presentation for the OMT on the plan for pilot testing the decision tree.

The objectives for meeting #12 are:

- Finalize topics for inclusion in the 'Booklet' under initial response time, and investigation response.
- Review draft decision tree with consultant and finalize plans for pilot testing.

The meeting adjourned at 3:10pm.



Minutes

Appendix A

Table 1: Initial Response Time

<i>Initial Response Time:</i>		
<p>refers to the first contact back to the complainant after a call has been made. It acknowledges the complaint and should help the caller to feel heard. It is not about rushing a conclusion or solution in order to meet this timeline (which often takes much longer). For complainants who do not wish to have a call back, the initial call to lodge the complaint is the initial response.</p>		
<i>How</i>	<i>When</i>	<i>Notes from meeting #11</i>
	<p>A. Depending what the call is about, what is the response time?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The question is: Does it require immediate attention? b. Triaging is used to determine the answer c. The Answer would be the response 	<p>The triage piece from this morning, different triggers have a different response. Matrix of situations and timelines (almost like a triage process) – to determine a response Example: Emergency</p>
	<p>A. Timeframes for different processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Call back to complainant b. Inspector in field c. Triaging – getting information out 	
1. How frequently to update the complainant?	B. How frequently to update the complainant?	
2. Give complainant a reference number		
3. Caller satisfaction		
4. Who is responding?		
5. Who is calling (and does this affect the response)?		
6. How to avoid multiple first responses? i.e. who is the lead?		

Table 2: Investigation Response - Things you should consider when investigating a complaint:

<i>Investigation Response:</i>

is focused on good practices for investigating complaints.

<i>How</i>	<i>When</i>	<i>Notes</i>
	A. How long to keep documentation?	Could be a legal requirement for some organizations How long does CIC keep it? Provide some examples Emphasize the importance of tracking Could be influenced by the type of issue
	B. Timing of response	Seems to be related to Initial response time discussions – <i>come back to this</i>
1. Consistent triage process (see next three bullets)		
2. Determine what is the incident		
3. Determine level of response a. What triggers a response (link to determining validity of concern)?		
4. Type of response		
5. Determining validity of concern		Could be valid but maybe there is nothing to be done about it What do you say when you determine that you shouldn't go out to investigate?
6. Upset or routine operations at potential source?		Upset – has certain connotations – be careful of wording (non-routine?)
7. Root cause		Getting at the cause of the event rather than dealing with the symptoms only This can be a longer process Could never get to the root cause or could not be solveable We're not sure about the word "root"
End of meeting #11		
8. Alternative data sources (other than complainant, such as monitoring stations)		
9. Repeat callers (trends)		
10. Who are your partners in the investigation (ex. airshed zones, NRCB, etc.)		
11. Any existing mitigation practices going		

on?		
12. What preventative measures to address issue?		
13. What is considered closure?		
14. Correspondence with complainants (who, how, what)		
15. What boundary is being used (link to who are your partners)?		
16. Existing protocols to deal with that issue may affect level of response (i.e. regulation)		
17. Has this issue happened before (trends)?		
18. Trends		
19. <i>Staff training*- come back to this later</i>		<p>Providing staff with training in investigating odours Not everyone is able to investigate an odour complaint. Some people very sensitive to odour and some people can't smell Underscore for people creating a process <i>Choosing the right person to investigate</i> Compliance and investigating officers often have to be "jack of all trades" Training and classifying odours vs dealing with the public We could possibly make this into a recommendation later?</p>

Table 3: Data Collection

<i>Data Collection:</i>		
is focused on what information should be collected from a complainant when they call to make a complaint.		
<i>How</i>	<i>When</i>	<i>Notes</i>
1. Initial messaging to caller		Caller needs to understand why we need the information requested to properly address the call/issue Operator training is important – soft skills training

		How much information is the caller willing to provide
2. Caller name, contact information and location (closest town/municipality)		Caller will likely note here if they are calling on behalf of someone else. However, this questions doesn't need to be asked directly. If person is calling on behalf of someone else, need to make sure that can get the right information from them. But the response will be the same regardless of who is calling. People may wish to be anonymous
3. Permission to release contact information		Passing along contact information for an industry person to investigate – easier to talk directly to person when investigating (example, from ESRD to a plant operator to investigate) Some people may not wish to have their contact information passed on (example employee)
4. Time (start and end) when smelled odour as well as date and time received call		
5. Odour descriptors (what is smells like)		
6. FIDOL (Frequency, Intensity, Duration, Offensiveness, Location)		
7. Meteorological data (ex. wind direction)		
8. Have you contacted anyone else about this specific incident?		Then you would know if the person was referred by anyone and know who was their initial contact. All the people who've they spoken to. Know where all the records are Avoid duplicating work Did they provide you with a reference number?
9. Possible source? a. If yes, have you tried contacting the source?		The wording here is very important around 'potential' (suspected, potential, possible) If they have already contacted them, it would

		be important to get that information for the investigation – helps to coordinate efforts Could change the response – rather than head out might call the plant
10. Is there anything else that you think we should know?/Would you like to add anything else?		Double checking if anything has been missed Will likely be very short or very long...
11. Do you want a call back? a. Next steps: messaging about what will happen with the information and the timeline going forward. b. How do you want to be followed up with? (email or phone) c. When is a good time? Is it ok to leave a message?	A. Do you want a call back? o Next steps: messaging about what will happen with the information and the timeline going forward.	Helps people feel like they've been heard, shows that we are concerned Allows communicate to occur when they're expecting it Process wise

Data Collection:

Considerations that go beyond what you ask the complainant but you should be thinking about:

- These are part of soft skills (collecting this information)
- Could be somewhere on the sheet, so that call operator can check it off but aren't asking directly
- Could be highlighted during training for call operators

Consideration	Notes
1. Extent of odour	May come out through other questions, isn't something that the caller would know. This is something you think about during you're investigation of the complaint but not something that you ask the caller.
2. Regional context (play zones)	Example Three Creeks An area that you know has had concerns or past issues
3. Who is taking the call?	Make sure you record the name of the person who took the call
4. Any health complaints or environmental concerns?	Do not ask this question it is leading! If they do bring up a health concern, tell them to contact their doctor or 911. (very important messaging) They'll likely bring up environmental concerns during the call.
5. Have you called about this before?	This will come out in conversation on its own. Should be looked into by the investigator as part of the history of the situation.
6. Complainants desired result	Will probably come out in conversation. Should consider as part of the investigation as a whole.

