



Minutes

Complaints Task Group, Meeting #13

Date: November 20, 2014
Time: 9am – 3:30pm
Place: CASA office, Edmonton

In attendance:

Name	Stakeholder group
Ann Baran	Southern Alberta Group for the Environment
Joseph Hnatiuk	Canadian Society of Environmental Biologists
Jim Lapp	City of Edmonton/SWANA
Tanya Moskal-Hébert	Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development
Lori Weltz	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.
12.5: Jim, Dalene, Jen and Keith will help to fill in the ‘odour boxes’ in the decision tree by answering: 1. What activities would produce those odours? 2. What province-wide number would you call in that case?	Jim, Keith	November 5, 2014.
12.6: Ludmilla will send Celeste the names of the HealthLink Alberta participants for pilot testing.	Ludmilla	November 12, 2014.
13.1: Since quorum was not achieved, Celeste will follow-up with industry members.	Celeste	ASAP.
13.2: Ann will identify information from the background report that relates to each of the topics identified under Investigation Response at meeting #13.	Ann	December 1, 2014.
13.3: Celeste will ask Ludmilla and Keith if they can provide some information on the legal implications of recording personal information (data collection section).	Celeste	Meeting #14.

1. Administrative Items

Tanya chaired the meeting which began at 9:15am. Participants introduced themselves and were welcomed to the meeting. Quorum was not achieved.

Action Item 13.1: Since quorum was not achieved, Celeste will follow-up with industry members.

The agenda and meeting objectives were approved.

The minutes from meeting #12 were reviewed and approved with the correction of several typos. The action items from meeting #12 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.
12.1: Celeste will update the document 'Booklet Worksheet – Potential topics to be covered' based on discussion at meeting #12.	Celeste	Complete.
12.2: Jen will identify information from the background report that relates to each of the topics identified under Initial Response at meeting #12.	Jen	Complete.
12.3: Keith will prepare a generic 'initial response triage matrix' as described at meeting #12.	Keith	Complete.
12.4: Keith will provide a list of the province-wide numbers and a one-line description of when those numbers should be called.	Keith	Complete.
12.5: Jim, Dalene, Jen and Keith will help to fill in the 'odour boxes' in the decision tree by answering: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What activities would produce those odours? 2. What province-wide number would you call in that case? 	Jim, Dalene, Jen, Keith	Carry forward.
12.6: Ludmilla will send Celeste the names of the HealthLink Alberta participants for pilot testing.	Ludmilla	Carry forward.
12.7: Celeste will ask Lori if she is available to write the 'Booklet'.	Celeste	Complete. See additional information.

Additional Information:

Action Item 12.7: Lori has agreed to undertake the writing/editing of the 'Booklet'. The OMT has given approval for this contract.

2. CASA Update

Celeste provided an update on the Odour Management Team:

- The OMT last met on November 13, 2014.
- The OMT is working on details to assemble and to roll-out the Good Practice Guide.
- The OMT will meet next on December 2nd, 2014.

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 is currently working to finalize both streams of work and to prepare their final report for the OMT.

Odour Assessment Task Group:

- The task group is working with a consultant to prepare an inventory and analysis of odour assessment tools. The report will contain a 2-page overview of each odour assessment tool (with links to more detailed resources), general guidance steps for choosing tools depending on the

purpose of the odour assessment, and a matrix outlining the characteristics of each tool allowing users to easily compare tools.

- The task group is currently working with the consultant to finalize the report.

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 Board will meet next on December 4th, 2014 in Calgary.
 - The OMT will have time on the agenda to provide an update – see item 7.
- CASA is holding a training workshop in interest-based negotiation on November 27, 2014. The session is already full. Anyone who would like to attend the next session (likely spring 2015) should contact Celeste.

3. Review Worksheet – Potential topics to be covered in ‘Booklet’

The task group continued the exercise begun at meeting #11. The purpose of this exercise was to review the list of potential topics that could be included in each of the three sections (brainstormed originally at meeting #9) and determine which topics should be included in the booklet. The task group determined what topics would be covered under investigation response as outlined in Appendix A.

The task group has now completed this exercise for all three sections (data collection, initial response, and investigation). The task group will use information from the background report as the starting point to develop content for the ‘Booklet’ under each topic – see item 4.

Action Item 13.2: Ann will identify information from the background report that relates to each of the topics identified under Investigation Response at meeting #13.

4. Develop Content for Booklet

The task group reviewed the vision that they developed for the ‘Booklet’ at meeting #11 in order to help Lori understand their expectations of the deliverable.

With respect to the layout for the ‘Booklet’, the task group emphasized that it should be easy to read and use and that creative ideas like side boxes and checkboxes are welcome. The task group noted that Lori is not being asked to do any graphic design as this will be done later by the OMT for the whole GPG.

‘Booklet’ Section - Data Collection:

The task group reviewed their vision for this section of the Booklet developed at meeting #11 to help Lori understand their expectations.

The task group noted that they would like to see a list of the information that should be collected as well as from that an organization could use or modify. This aligns with the overall vision of the

Booklet to include “quick sheets’ as well as extra information. The task group also noted that they liked the NRCB data collection form.

Using the extended data collection table (action item 11.5), for each topic to be covered in this section, the task group reviewed related information from the Background Report and discussed what advice/guidance they would like to provide on this topic –see Appendix B.

The task group also thought that it would be useful to include some information for the reader on the implications of collecting personal information (possibly a side box).

Action Item 13.3: Celeste will ask Ludmilla and Keith if they can provide some information on the legal implications of recording personal information (data collection section).

The task group noted that they would also like to include some general advice around communication to help the call operator speak with the complainant.

‘Booklet’ Section - Initial Response:

The task group reviewed their vision for this section of the Booklet developed at meeting #11 and #12 to help Lori understand their expectations. The task group noted that the vision evolved at meeting #12 when the title of the section was changed from “Initial Response Time” to “Initial Response”. At this time the task group determined that the ‘time factor’ was one component rather than applicable to the whole section (see minutes from meeting #12).

Using the extended initial response table (action item 12.2), for each topic to be covered in this section, the task group reviewed related information from the Background Report and discussed what advice/guidance they would like to provide on this topic –see Appendix C.

The task group had some confusion about common practices for the call-back process to complainants and how many calls are made (i.e. does one occur right after the complaint and one after the investigation is complete or just one after the investigation is complete). The task group decided to table this question for discussion at meeting #14. The task group continued initial response discussion as best as possible and recognized that the answer may affect what was developed in Appendix C.

The task group decided to wait to review the initial response matrix at meeting #14.

The task group discussed next steps as follows:

- Lori will draft the content from data collection and initial response developed at meeting #13.
 - The task group noted that because of missing information, the draft material on initial response will be very preliminary. The task group will use the draft material to help them to discuss and clarify this section.
- The task group will review this draft material together at meeting #14 and provide feedback.
- At meeting #14, the task group will continue discussion on the initial response matrix and investigation response.

If Lori has any questions she will contact Celeste. If Celeste is not able to respond, she will contact the co-chairs. If the co-chairs are not able to provide a response, the question will be put to the whole task group.

The task group noted that although they do not have quorum at the meeting (no industry members present), all members will have an opportunity to provide input in all three sections at meeting #14.

The task group noted that having a draft document to work from will make it easier to discuss specific issues and to provide feedback.

5. Workplan: Timelines and Budget

The task group noted that they are on budget and on schedule. The task group anticipates that their final report to the OMT will be ready in February 2015. The task group noted that work is progressing well.

6. Meeting Wrap-up

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

The objectives for meeting #14 are:

- Review draft 'Booklet' material from Lori and provide feedback.
- Develop content for each topic under initial response and investigation response.

The meeting adjourned at 1:50pm.



Minutes

Appendix A

<p><i>Investigation Response:</i> is focused on good practices for investigating complaints. Person who receives that call is not necessarily investigating the complaint. You should have an investigation complaint process. Here are the elements that you should include and some considerations. Lay out high level principles/common ground, but not getting into details. Not writing a manual for field investigators.</p>	
<i>Topic</i>	<i>Notes from meeting #11/12</i>
How frequently to update the complainant?	Depends how long the investigation lasts. Should at least get a call back when investigation complete. May want to contact at key milestones in the investigation if it is particularly complex.
Safety concerns (ex. weather)	If hinders the investigation (ex. Blizzard), should let the complainant know that something has changed (ex. The investigator couldn't make it out). Provide some short guidance on considerations around this topic.
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 investigation response	Example if far away, could call local industry to investigate What makes something urgent/not urgent? -odour could indicate that there is an emergency and the response would reflect that

<p>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)? Type of response</p>	
<p>Determining urgency of concern and appropriate investigation response - this type of matrix does not currently exist, but we can provide some considerations that you can consider when determining your investigation response, including: - Upset or routine operations at potential source? - Filling out the decision tree (bottom boxes relating to source) in order to determine source (to help you determine where to start your investigation not to point fingers in front of the caller)</p>	<p>All complaints are valid. It's always urgent for the caller. Need to decide how to use available resources (ex. Wake someone up at 3am to investigate). It can take to change a process to reduce an odour. Most complaints aren't urgent. Many times a situation can be resolved without a field visit. <i>Urgency – do they send an email to weekend person, call directly, call on Monday</i> 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?</p>
<p>Upset or routine operations at potential source?</p>	<p>Upset – has certain connotations – be careful of wording (non-routine?)</p>
<p>If source is found, should try to find root cause (using root cause analysis) - Make a very short reference to it in the section only as being covered by PMTG.</p>	<p>Usually responsibility of the industry (not government). Usually a long-term. Could be short. Could be multiple sources. Difficult to get. Don't want call operator to speculate. This is "stage 3" investigation. This is more mitigation. Sometimes the root cause is a standard practice. It will still smell. The root cause is acceptable. We're not managing for zero odour. If the root cause is not acceptable, can we do anything about it? 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 cause"</p>
<p>4. Alternative data sources (other than the complainant, such as monitoring stations)</p>	<p>Where available. Can be useful, example wind direction can help determine source. Need to be careful of false positives. Monitoring stations don't necessarily look for odour and so can't necessarily provide data. Need to be clear about what</p>

	monitoring stations can and can't provide. Need to note these limitations in this section. Providing information on how to access this data (what is and is not available).
5. Multiple calls regarding the same issue (trends) - How this impacts your <u>investigation</u> (not how to deal with them on the phone)	If are already working on the issue, may not need to go out and investigate. If receive many calls with the same complaint, can indicate a trend. Can reassure that is already being investigated.
6. Who are your partners in the investigation (ex. airshed zones, NRCB, environmental public health)	Provide high level guidance only (we're not writing a field manual). This is something that the investigator should be aware of.
7. Any existing mitigation practices going on?	This falls under the jurisdiction of the Prevention/Mitigation Task Group. It's piece that occurs much farther down the road.

End of meeting #12.

Beginning of meeting #13.

8. What preventative measures to address issue?	Covered by prevention/mitigation task group
9. What is considered closure?	When investigator should consider the investigation closed. Appropriate follow-up with complainant regardless of outcome (i.e. whether something can be done or not). The point at which follow-up with the individual complainant is done. We won't be covering the circumstance of a group that is complaining. We're focused on individuals.
10. Correspondence with complainants (who, how, what)	Might be overlap with some of the other topics Ex. One of one telephone conversations is more personal than an email
11. What boundary is being used (link to who are your partners?)?	As written is covered by 6, so reframed
11. Knowing what are the local odour sources	Ex. In a particular area, odours are likely in the spring Ex. In a particular area, here are the main odour-producing activities
12. Existing protocols to deal with that issue may affect level of response (i.e. regulation)	Awareness
13. Has this issue happened before (trends)?	Covered by 5 and 11
14. Trends	Covered by 5 and 11

Training: will have a section on training in each section (data collection, initial response, investigation response) and what skill sets are needed

- Need different skill sets for each step
- Ex: data collection – need someone who can talk to people (but don't need nose calibration)

- Ex. Investigation response – need someone who is trained in odour investigation, need to be able to communicate with complainant and source

NB: in all of the stages you need to be a good communicator, in investigation you need an additional skill (odour investigation)

<p>15. Staff training*- come back to this later, seems to be a cross-cutting issue, not sure where it fits</p> <p>16. Suitability of person responding -providing some high level guidance about who should be going out and training</p>	<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>
---	---

Appendix B

<i>Data Collection:</i> is focused on what information should be collected from a complainant when they call to make a complaint.		
<i>Topic</i>	<i>Content for 'Booklet'</i>	<i>Notes</i>
1. Initial messaging to caller	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial messaging to caller about why information is being collected: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (try to/help to) 'investigate' the source of the odour • Like NRCB blurb • Need to manage expectations – that we will try to investigate but may not be able to solve it • Need to manage expectations – not sure about the word 'investigate' because not all complaints are necessarily investigated 	<p>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</p>
2. Caller name, contact information and location (closest town /municipality)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Like NRCB form • Follow up could be by email or telephone (depending on an organization's ability/protocol and the callers preference) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Need to be aware of any legal ramification of written correspondence ○ If your policy is not to provide a written 	<p>Caller will likely note here if they are calling on behalf of someone else. However, this question 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</p>

	<p>response, don't offer the caller that option</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Callers who choose to remain anonymous or don't wish to provide a phone number won't receive a follow-up • Need to know where the odour was smelled – location (not necessarily where they live) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There can be FOIP issues with this. 	<p>is calling. People may wish to be anonymous</p>
<p>3. Permission to release contact information to the investigator (if investigator have additional follow-up questions and for investigator to follow-up with the complainant)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can pass along the complaint without passing along the personal information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to be clear about who the information will be passed to and how this information will be used • Need to pass along the location where odour was smelled to investigator in order for it to be investigated • This should happen at the end of the call – see 11. 	<p>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)</p>
<p>4. Time (start and end) when smelled odour as well as date and time received call</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When did you first noticed the odour? (not necessarily when you reported it) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ See frequency and duration used in Lori's first draft of decision tree material • Call operator should log the date and time when they receive the call 	
<p>5. Odour descriptors (what it smells like)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use information from decision tree • Have communication information for how to ask the caller questions (see first version of decision tree guidance document) • See minutes from meeting #12 	
<p>6. FIDL (Frequency, Intensity, Duration, Location)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequency: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tied in with #4 ○ Like NRCB form • Intensity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Like NRCB form, with words 	<p>Offensiveness won't be asked because it doesn't provide useful information, it's very subjective. People don't call to complain unless they're bothered by it. Many people confuse intensity and offensiveness.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Use 3 point scale (removing mention of very strong physical symptoms), first three from NRCB scale ● Duration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tied in with frequency ● Location: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Covered by 2. 	NB: may be used by investigator as an investigation tool
7. Meteorological data (ex. wind direction)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Like NRCB form, like tick boxes ● General conditions ● Cloud cover ● Wind direction ● Wind speed 	
8. Have you contacted anyone else about this specific incident?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● See sensitivity wording from meeting #12. 	Then you would know if the person was referred by anyone and know who their initial contact was. 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? (covered by 8) Combine 8 and 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● See minutes from meeting #12. ● Question may not be relevant if you are the source (ex. Caller is calling a plant directly vs calling ESRD) ● Tie in to 2 and 5 ● Could come up at various points in conversation but leave at the bottom of the form so as not to be leading (see minutes from meeting #12) 	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?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Call operator can note anything else, (see table of things that might come up) 	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Tied into 3. ● If call back requested, let caller know when they can expect that to occur ● Setting expectations ● Need input from Jen, Roxane, and Dalene 	Helps people feel like they've been heard, shows that we are concerned Allows communicate to occur when they're expecting it Process wise A. Do you want a call back?

<p>forward.</p> <p>b. How do you want to be followed up with? (email or phone)</p> <p>c. When is a good time? Is it ok to leave a message?</p>		<p>Next steps: messaging about what will happen with the information and the timeline going forward</p>
--	--	---

Appendix C

<p><i>Initial Response:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Initial contact is complete once the complainant has been informed about any next steps. <p>Caller satisfaction with the <u>process</u> is the goal of initial response. They feel heard and know the next steps (even if they aren't necessarily happy about them).</p>		
<i>How</i>	<i>Content for 'Booklet'</i>	<i>Notes</i>
<p>1. Give complainant a reference number or point of contact (i.e. some way that the complainant can follow up)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some organizations may use reference numbers, others may not An organization could choose to add a place for an internal reference number on the form An organization should have some way to track their complaints records, such as a reference number Provide some suggestions, if/than language May fit better with data collection 	<p>Depends on who they call, if calling small organizations don't necessarily need one, larger organizations will have one, some organizations don't have reference numbers</p> <p>Can reduce frustration if complainant feels that they can follow-up themselves if need be</p> <p>Don't necessarily want to give out the contact person for a specific person, because they may start calling that person to complain.</p>
<p>2. Who is receiving the call (i.e. who is answering the phone)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Combination of training and do/do nots when taking a call Not sure if it fits here May fit better with data collection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will ask Lori to see where it fits best and review at next meeting ISO document may have some suggestions 	<p>Organization needs to understand who will be taking the call and ensuring that they have the appropriate information.</p> <p>Person receiving the call should know their boundaries, not speculate about the odour.</p> <p>Having the right training (including soft skills).</p>

<p>3. Coordinating amongst agencies regarding who will be communicating with the complainant</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on your industry, you work with different agencies. You should know this ahead of time and know who should be taking the lead. • Who do you need to work with and who is responsible for what? • How does information sharing amongst agencies work (especially if complainant hasn't given permission to share their information?) • The industry themselves need to answer these questions. 	<p>This relates to agencies. It may be unavoidable (i.e. could still receive multiple call backs). When referring a complaint to a different agency, need to clarify who will be communicating with the complainant. Ensuring that person who receives the initial call understands if the complainant has a particular desire about how/who they are communicated with them. This is not about a referral. It's about coordinating partners.</p>
<p>4. Letting the caller know about next steps (what will or will not happen)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relates to discussion in Data Collection #11. • Provide guidance about good practices for this topic (rather than telling them exactly what to do) • Each group will need to customize for their situation/protocols <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ex you should develop response standards and adhere to them 	<p>AER triage piece When they will receive a call back/updated Ex. You will receive a call back in 24 hours Ex. We will be sending out an investigator Ex. We will not be sending out an investigator If voicemail message, making it known how often machine is checked. We'd like to provide advice about how to deliver this messaging. There are environmental factors (example can't expect inspectors to go out in a blizzard) If can't do what said they would do, letting the complainant know.</p>