

Final Minutes



10035 108 ST NW FLR 10
EDMONTON AB T5J 3E1
CANADA

Ph (780) 427-9793
Fax (780) 422-3127
E-mail casa@casahome.org
Web www.casahome.org

Performance Measures Subcommittee Meeting #37

Date: Monday, April 16, 2007
Time: 9:30am to 3:30pm
Place: CASA Office
10th floor, 10035 – 108 Street
Edmonton, AB

In attendance:

Name	Organization
Jillian Flett	CASA
Brian Free	CASA
Mary Griffiths	The Pembina Institute
Bob Myrick	Alberta Environment
Ted Stoner	Canadian Petroleum Products Institute

Action Items

Task	Who	When
34.8 Revise the description of the methodology.	Brian Free	July
35.3 Do the statistical analysis of the odour complaint data Marianne has collected.	Brian Free	After consulting with CFO team
35.4 Check the EUB report with respect to terminology to be used around coalbed methane.	Brian Free	For next meeting
37.1 The Confined Feeding Operations team will be contacted to determine what they suggest as a performance indicator related to odour.	Brian Free	For next meeting
37.2 Richard Melick of AENV will be consulted about mercury, ammonia and carbon monoxide emissions.	Brian Free	For next meeting
37.3 A timeline showing the status of projects in the Alberta oil sands will be found and distributed to the Subcommittee.	Brian Free	For next meeting
37.4 The table of responses to Martha Kostuch's comments will be completed and distributed to the Subcommittee and then to Martha.	Brian Free	For next meeting

Task	Who	When
37.5 Bob Myrick will consult with his AENV colleagues to determine the acceptability of these emissions performance indicators.	Bob Myrick	May 1
37.6 A new draft of our report to the Board will be distributed to the Subcommittee.	Brian Free	May 4
37.7 The March draft report will be revised to make it factually correct.	Brian Free	July
37.8 A further assessment of low-rated recommendations from 2002 will be prepared for the Board.	Brian Free	May 21
37.9 The Communications Committee will be asked to review the 2004 stakeholder survey and suggest changes. They will also be asked to advise on the “expert review”.	Sharon Hawrelak	May 9

Jillian chaired the meeting. It commenced at 9:35am

1. Introductions

2. Administration

a) The agenda was approved. It was noted that Sharon Hawrelak, CASA Communications Manager, will be joining us for the discussion of the stakeholder survey (Item 6).

b) The Minutes from Meetings #35 and #36 were reviewed.

- For Meeting #35 on February 5, under “c. Summary of emission trend calculations”, the third last bullet should be deleted. (It currently reads: “ – A footnote should indicate that solution gas includes flared coal bed methane.”). With that change, the Minutes from Meeting #35 were approved.
- The Minutes from Meeting #36 (teleconference call) were approved as distributed.

c) The Action Items from the Meeting #36 Minutes were reviewed.

33.9 Consult with stakeholders re the potential indicators, three measures of particulates and the question of absolute emissions versus emission intensities. **Done.**

33.12 Consult CASA stakeholders with respect to CASA organizing a meeting on the AQHI for Environment Canada. **Done.**

- There was already a presentation by Markus Kellerhals of Environment Canada regarding this issue. It was noted that the Alberta Government does not support this Air Quality Health Index, primarily because of the weak science behind it. This Subcommittee has already developed a recommendation to the Board (see Rec. 7e) to support further work on a

comprehensive indicator of human health effects. Jillian will advise Markus that we will not be having a meeting to discuss this issue at this time.

33.14 Follow-up on the outstanding assessments. (performance measure #3) **Done.**

34.8 Revise the description of the methodology. **Carry forward.**

- Will be based on the final approved list of indicators.

35.1 Correct the minutes of December 18, 2006 and have them posted on the CASA website. **Done.**

35.2 Contact Markus Kellerhals to find out if Environment Canada is still interested in an AQHI meeting in Alberta. **Done.**

35.3 Do the statistical analysis of the odour complaint data Marianne has collected. **Carry forward.**

- Brian Free will first follow up with the Confined Feeding Operations (CFO) team to find out what they might suggest as a performance indicator related to odour.

Action Item 37.1: The Confined Feeding Operations team will be contacted to determine what they suggest as a performance indicator related to odour.

35.4 Check the EUB report with respect to terminology to be used around coalbed methane. **Carry forward.**

- A question was raised about the inclusion of flaring of coal bed methane as part of solution gas flaring. It was agreed that final resolution of this issue is needed and Brian will contact Kim Eastlick of the Energy & Utilities Board to clarify if and how coal bed methane flaring is reported.

35.5 Revise the documents in question and insert them in the appropriate places in the report. **Done.**

35.6 Draft an executive summary for the performance measures review report and forward it to subcommittee members for review and use in stakeholder consultations. **Done.**

35.7 Consult with stakeholders as soon as you receive the executive summary of the report. **Done.**

35.8 Revise the performance measures review report and forward it to subcommittee members for review. **Done.**

35.9 Forward comments on the executive summary and the report to Marianne. **Done.**

35.10 Prepare slides for both presentations to the board (performance measures review and performance measure #3). **Done.**

35.11 Present the performance measures review report and the performance measure #3 report to the board at their March, 2007 meeting. **Done.**

35.12 Finalize the indicators for performance measures #s 4 and 5. **Done.**

36.1 The Performance Measures Review report will be modified to remove the indicators for greenhouse gas emissions and greenhouse gas emissions intensity. **Done.**

36.2 Feedback from CAPP will be shared with the Subcommittee. **Done.**

36.3 The assessment of the implementation of substantive recommendations from 2002 will be circulated for Subcommittee review. **Done.**

36.4 The report to the Board about Performance Measure #3 will include an offer to provide a future report on the low-rated recommendations from past years. **Done.**

3. Report from the March 29 CASA Board Meeting.

- An excerpt of the draft Minutes for the March 29 Board meeting was circulated.
- An earlier e-mail from Brian provides a good report on our Subcommittee's presentation to the Board. It reads:

"At the Board meeting last Thursday, Ted Stoner did a superb job of presenting our report on the Performance Measuring System Review. We knew ahead of time not to expect a simple "rubber stamp" and we weren't disappointed. The Board members had obviously given our report a careful read and at the meeting they engaged in some thoughtful, animated discussion.

As you will recall, Martha Kostuch had given us some prior feedback, noting a couple of incorrect numbers and statements in the report. Although she acknowledges that we have happily committed to make the corrections, she did not feel that it was appropriate for the Board to "accept" a report containing errors. She explained that, once accepted by the Board, the report is final. However, she was willing to accept the recommendations, even though she would prefer to have GHG emissions included.

And so we've been directed to make any and all corrections to the report before bringing it back to the Board for their approval. (I'll take the lead on that.)

A second area of discussion focussed on performance measure 1b, "Reduced emissions...." Peter Watson questioned the value of this as a CASA performance measure because recent emissions trends reflect current economic growth and not CASA's performance. He agrees that they could be reported as "trends" that offer context to CASA's performance, but he does not like the emissions to be called performance measures.

Some Board members agreed and others disagreed – Is CASA a success if pollution levels continue to increase... irrespective of growth? Further discussion led to the conclusion that more clarity around the definitions of "performance measures", "indicators", and "trends" is needed. Our Subcommittee has been asked to provide clarification.

Ted's presentation about the implementation of CASA's recommendations from 2002 went well and the Board accepted our result of 74% for that year. They also agreed that our Subcommittee should report back on the lower rated recommendations, as we had proposed.

And finally, Tony Hudson of the Alberta Lung Assoc. presented the Communications Committee report on Performance Measure 5 – recognition of CASA as a major vehicle for delivering improved air quality.

The Board accepted the website and news stories indicators, as proposed.

And so we still have some work cut out for us.....

- 1) Correcting the facts and figures in the Performance Measuring System Review report.

- 2) Providing more clarity about the concepts of performance measures, environmental indicators and trends.
 - 3) Follow-up on the low-rated recommendations from 2002.
 - 4) Strategizing about how to find the proper comfort level for our respective sectors and Board members." (end of email)
- One Board member questioned some of the emissions trends in our report because they do not appear to reflect the perceived contribution from the growing oil sands sector. Our Subcommittee stands behind our data and suggests that much of the growth in the oil sands sector is still in its early stages and would not affect the pre-2004 data in our report. The sources of the data used for the indicators are the Environment Canada Criteria Air Contaminants inventory for the criteria air pollutants and the Environment Canada National Pollutant Release Inventory for hydrogen sulphide and mercury.

4. Moving forward with the Performance Measures Review Report

a) Making factual corrections

- The Subcommittee reviewed the table that summarized comments from Martha Kostuch. It was noted that many of these items may be unnecessary for the next version of our report.
 1. Confirmed that primary fine particulate matter is reported.
 2. We use data reported in the National Pollutant Release Inventory (NPRI) for the hydrogen sulphide and mercury emissions.
 3. The hydrogen sulphide emissions from the upstream oil & gas sector are already presented. For mercury, it is reported for the entire "crude petroleum and natural gas industry". (Bob suggests we consult with Richard Melick of AENV.)
 4. The incorrect footnote will be removed.
 5. The NO_x emissions from oil sands is correct. Although there is more activity, the newer mining vehicles and equipment are reported to produce fewer NO_x emissions.
 6. Will investigate the rise in ammonia emissions from the transportation sector. (Bob suggests we consult with Richard Melick of AENV.)
 7. The increase in CO corresponds to growth in the upstream oil & gas industry. (Bob suggests we consult with Richard Melick of AENV.)
 8. Brian will ensure the correct percentage for the decrease in venting is used.
 9. The reporting of coal bed methane flaring will be clarified by the EUB.
 10. Fuel sales have increased likely because more people are driving bigger, heavier vehicles and they are driving further.
 11. Care will be taken to ensure that all trend lines in future graphs will photocopy well.

Action Item 37.2: Richard Melick of AENV will be consulted about mercury, ammonia and carbon monoxide emissions.

Action Item 37.3: A timeline showing the status of projects in the Alberta oil sands will be found and distributed to the Subcommittee. The report "Oil Sands Fever", published by the

Pembina Institute in 2005, shows the relative emissions from existing versus approved and planned projects.

Action Item 37.4 The table of responses to Martha Kostuch’s comments will be completed and distributed to the Subcommittee and then to Martha.

b) Resolving issues around the inclusion of emissions, such as GHGs

- Discussed the role of emissions trends in performance measurement. It is clear that Alberta Environment and some industry representatives on the Board are not comfortable with the inclusion of emissions trends as performance measures for CASA. They are more amenable to reporting these as environmental trends to provide context for CASA performance. On the other hand, some NGO reps on the Board feel that rising emissions for some contaminants do reflect the success (or not) of CASA activity.
- The Subcommittee discussed the relationship between performance measurement and state of the environment reporting. A favoured approach is to retain the proposed performance measure **1b** on emissions, but to limit the indicators to those emissions that have a direct link to CASA project team recommendations. It was agreed that Alberta Environment will be asked to report on other emissions that are not covered by the CASA performance measure.
- Also discussed whether this same criterion of “directly-related to CASA recommendations” should be applied to other performance measures, such as **1a** - ambient air quality. Decided not to revisit those performance measures that have already been approved by the Board, but to focus on the newly proposed performance measures.
- The Subcommittee developed a first-cut at a table to show which emissions trends relate to which CASA project teams whose recommendations have been accepted by the Board and which remaining emissions trends should be reported by Alberta Environment or others.

Table 1. Relating CASA performance indicators to areas of CASA action

Indicator	CASA Team and/or area of action	Emissions trends to be reported by others
1b) Emissions		
NOx	EPT – power generation	AENV - Alberta total, other sectors
SOx	EPT – power generation F&V – oil & gas industry	AENV - Alberta total, other sectors
Fine particulates	EPT – power generation	AENV - Alberta total, other sectors
VOCs		AENV - Alberta total, other sectors
Ammonia		AENV - Alberta total, other sectors
Carbon monoxide	No team was identified	AENV - Alberta total and all sectors

Indicator	CASA Team and/or area of action	Emissions trends to be reported by others
Hydrogen sulphide	F&V – upstream oil & gas	AENV - Alberta total, other sectors
Mercury	EPT – power generation	Environment Canada
Solution gas	F&V – upstream oil & gas	Energy & Utilities Board
Methane		AENV - Alberta total, other sectors
1c) Energy use		
Total gasoline sales	No team was identified	Statistics Canada
Total diesel sales	No team was identified	Statistics Canada
Energy mix* (Percentage of total electricity generation)	EPT – electrical power generation R&A – for electrical power only	AENV - Alberta total, other sectors
EPT – Electricity Project Team F&V – Flaring & Venting Project Team R&A – Renewable & Alternative Energy Team		

* For the energy mix performance measure, we need to determine if the measure relates to sales or generation capacity. Matthew Dance, Project Manager for the R&A team joined the meeting briefly. He reported that the government target of 3.5% for renewable energy is for new electricity generation and it is projected that this target has already been achieved. We need to check the wording of the government target to make it match the indicator.

Action Item 37.5: Bob Myrick will consult with his AENV colleagues to determine the acceptability of these emissions performance indicators by May 1 and whether they will be reported by AENV on line.

- The wording of two performance measures will be revised as follows;
 - 1b) ~~Reduced~~ *Change in* emissions of substance of concern in areas of CASA action.
 - 1c) ~~Energy use~~ *Change in electrical energy mix* as an indirect measure of air quality in areas of CASA action. [Bob Myrick will check with AENV on this wording.]
- Using table above, once reviewed and revised, a new draft report to the Board will be prepared. It will be a much shorter, more strategic report.
- The Subcommittee’s original report will be revised to reflect the changes and retained for future reference. It contains a lot of useful information.
- All CASA project teams should prepare relevant performance measures as part of their work. Once our report is accepted by the Board, this Subcommittee will likely need to meet with CASA project teams to explain the need for performance measures.

Action Item 37.6: A new draft of our report to the Board will be distributed to the Subcommittee by May 4.

Action Item 37.7: The March draft report will be revised to make it factually correct.

5. Reporting on low-rated recommendations from 2002

- The Board has directed the Subcommittee to provide more information about the low-rated recommendations from 2002. This includes those recommendations rated from 0 to 3. There are nine such recommendations.
- Brian agreed to follow-up with the relevant Project Teams to get responses to the additional questions normally asked about low-rated recommendations.

Action Item 37.8: A further assessment of low-rated recommendations from 2002 will be prepared for the Board.

6. Stakeholder Survey

- The Stakeholder survey, which provides the data for Performance Measure #4, needs further revision. Some input from the Communications Committee has been received, but not incorporated, as yet.
- Using the 2004 survey as a basis, agreed to delete questions 10 to 15, 19, 20, 22, and 23.
- Questions 4 to 9 should be kept, but may be revised.
- Consider using a 5-point scale instead of a 7-point scale.
- Sharon Hawrelak, Communications Manager at CASA, joined the meeting. There was support for her suggestion that a survey “expert” review the survey before it is finalized. This will postpone the survey until later this fall.
- When designing the 2007 survey, attention will be paid to maintaining consistency with previous versions. However, some changes are needed to improve the validity of the questions being asked.
- The main guideline for designing the survey is, “What do we want to learn from this survey?” One important outcome is to provide data for performance measure #4: “Degree of CASA members, partners, and clients’ satisfaction with the CASA approach.” Other useful information should also be sought.
- It was noted that the CASA 3-year performance evaluation will also be conducted in 2007. The current suggestion is to have industry and NGO representatives interview government representatives, using the main question of “How effective is CASA in supporting the Government of Alberta in strategic air quality planning?” The timing of this evaluation will be taken into consideration when planning the schedule for this stakeholder survey.
- A web-based survey will be considered. It will allow us to direct respondents relevant groups of questions, based on their responses. e.g. some questions may apply only to Board members or airshed respondents.
- The Communications Committee will suggest some tantalizing prizes to encourage stakeholders to respond.

Action Item 37.9: The Communications Committee will be asked to review the 2004 stakeholder survey and suggest changes. They will also be asked to advise on the “expert review”.

7. Updating the Subcommittee’s work plan

- The 2007 work plan for the Subcommittee was reviewed and updated.

8. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on May 9, 2007 in Edmonton. Brian will distribute the new draft (and short) Subcommittee report by May 4.

Jillian adjourned the meeting at about 3:00pm.