

CASA Performance Evaluation 2007:

How effective is CASA in supporting the Government of Alberta in Strategic Air Quality Planning?

Disclaimer: The Performance Evaluation Committee agreed by consensus to this report and the recommendations but consensus was not tested with all stakeholders. The CASA Board received this report as information but has yet to discuss it.

Prepared by the
Performance Evaluation Committee
for the
Clean Air Strategic Alliance
Board of Directors

Final Report

March 25, 2008

Acknowledgements

The Performance Evaluation Committee sincerely thanks those individuals who agreed to be interviewed for this evaluation. Their comments were thoughtful, candid, and reflective of considerable knowledge and experience. They gave the committee a wealth of valuable information to use in answering the question for the 2007 evaluation of CASA performance.

About CASA

The Clean Air Strategic Alliance (CASA) is a non-profit association composed of stakeholders from three sectors – government, industry and non-government organizations such as health and environmental groups. All CASA groups and teams, including the board of directors, make decisions and recommendations by consensus. These recommendations are likely to be more innovative and longer lasting than those reached through traditional negotiation processes. CASA's vision is that the air will have no adverse odour, taste or visual impact and have no measurable short- or long-term adverse effects on people, animals or the environment.

Clean Air Strategic Alliance
10035 108 ST NW FLR 10
EDMONTON AB T5J 3E1

Ph (780) 427-9793
Fax (780) 422-3127
E-mail: casa@casahome.org
Web: <http://www.casahome.org>

ISBN 978-1-896250-57-1
© 2008 Clean Air Strategic Alliance

Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	ii
Executive Summary and Recommendations.....	3
1 Introduction	5
1.1 The 2007 Performance Evaluation Approach and Methodology	6
1.1.1 Interviews.....	6
1.1.2 Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey	7
2 CASA’s Effectiveness in Supporting the Government of Alberta in Strategic Air Quality Planning.....	8
3 Government of Alberta Strategic Air Quality Planning.....	9
3.1 History	9
3.2 Current Status	9
3.3 Priority Air Quality Issues for GoA Departments.....	11
4 CASA’s Role in Strategic Air Quality Planning.....	12
4.1 Setting CASA Priorities	12
4.2 CASA Responsiveness	14
4.3 Implementing CASA Recommendations	14
5 Government of Alberta Understanding of CASA’s Role.....	16
5.1 CASA Board.....	18
5.1.1 Government of Alberta Membership	18
5.1.2 Level of Representation from GoA Departments	18
5.2 CASA Project Teams	19
6 Strategic Air Quality Planning.....	20
6.1 A New Clean Air Strategy for Alberta.....	21
6.1.1 Comments and Observations Related to the Clean Air Strategy Development.....	22
Appendix A: Committee Members and Terms of Reference	23
Appendix B: Interview Questions.....	25
Appendix C: Departments and Agencies Represented in PEC Interviews.....	27
Appendix D: Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey	28
Appendix E: CASA Frameworks	29
Appendix F: Roles of GoA Departments with Respect to Air Quality	30
Appendix G: Priority Air Quality Issues for Departments and Agencies.....	32

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ADM	Assistant Deputy Minister
AEPEA	<i>Alberta Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act</i>
AOPA	<i>Agricultural Operation Practices Act</i>
CAMS	Comprehensive Air Quality Management System
CAS	Clean Air Strategy
CASA	Clean Air Strategic Alliance
CFO	Confined Feeding Operations (project team)
F&V	Flaring and Venting
GoA	Government of Alberta
H ₂ S	Hydrogen sulphide
IAQ	Indoor Air Quality
NO _x	Nitrogen oxides
PEC	Performance Evaluation Committee
PM and O ₃	Particulate Matter and Ozone
RHA	Regional Health Authority
SAQP	Strategic Air Quality Planning
SO ₂	Sulphur dioxide
SOO	Statement of Opportunity
VET	Vehicle Emissions Team
VOCs	Volatile Organic Compounds

Government Departments and Agencies

AF	Alberta Agriculture and Food
AE	Alberta Energy
AENV	Alberta Environment
AHW	Alberta Health and Wellness
CAP	Capital Health
CHR	Calgary Health Region
DTHR	David Thompson Health Region
EUB	Energy and Utilities Board
I&T	Alberta Infrastructure and Transportation
SRD	Alberta Sustainable Resource Development

Executive Summary and Recommendations

At its March 2007 meeting, the CASA Board created and mandated the multi-stakeholder Performance Evaluation Committee (PEC) to evaluate CASA's performance by answering the following question:

“How effective is CASA in supporting the Government of Alberta in strategic air quality planning?”

The PEC obtained most of the information on which it based its evaluation from interviews with 24 individuals representing eight provincial government departments and agencies and three regional health authorities.

The PEC concluded that CASA has been effective in supporting Alberta Environment, which is the only Government of Alberta department with a formal mandate for strategic air quality planning. Department staff has a good understanding of CASA and its role, and Alberta Environment has requested and received strong support from CASA over the last 14 years.

While CASA's successes are generally known, the PEC found that outside of Alberta Environment, government departments do not have a good understanding of CASA and are often under-represented in CASA's activities. Additionally, the activities of several government departments and agencies have direct or indirect impacts on air quality, suggesting that these departments should play a role in strategic air quality planning. The Government of Alberta has not been broadly engaged in strategic air quality planning, and CASA has not played a major role in the work of departments other than Alberta Environment.

The PEC also received significant feedback to suggest that a shift in perspective is occurring in some parts of government: environmental issues such as air quality are seen as the responsibility of the government as a whole and a broader more proactive approach is desirable.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Process for Identifying Air Issues

The Performance Evaluation Committee recommends that:

CASA work with Alberta Environment to develop a periodic visible and inclusive consultation process for identifying air issues (current and future) that includes stakeholders, general public, experts and other jurisdictions.

Recommendation 2: Air Quality and the General Public

The Performance Evaluation Committee recommends that:

CASA formally adopt, and include in appropriate communications, a description of its multi-stakeholder composition as a proxy for the views of the general public on air quality.

Recommendation 3: Liaison with Provincial Government Departments not on the CASA Board

The Performance Evaluation Committee recommends that

Alberta Environment establish a formal process to liaise with and coordinate input from any Government of Alberta departments or agencies that are not represented on the CASA Board, when the Board is considering decisions that could potentially affect the department or agency.

Recommendation 4: Raising Awareness of CASA within Provincial Government Departments and Agencies, both Represented on the CASA Board and not Represented but Involved with Air Issues

The Performance Evaluation Committee recommends that:

- a) The CASA secretariat work with GoA Board members to develop a process and arrange annual face-to-face meetings, starting in 2008, between the CASA Executive and appropriate members of each represented department to report on CASA activities, priorities and plans.
- b) Representatives from the CASA Board, taking direction from the findings of this report, make presentations to departments not represented on the CASA Board but involved in air quality issues, to increase awareness and facilitate discussion of CASA's role.
- c) The CASA Board consider mechanisms to improve communications and connections between CASA and the regional health authorities.

Recommendation 5: Potential Additions to the CASA Board

The Performance Evaluation Committee recommends that

The CASA Board consider inviting Alberta Agriculture and Food to join the Clean Air Strategic Alliance Association and appoint representatives to serve on the Board of Directors.

Recommendation 6: Level of GoA Representation on the CASA Board

The Performance Evaluation Committee recommends that

Participating Government of Alberta departments review their level of representation at the CASA Board.

Recommendation 7: Identification of Project Team Members

The Performance Evaluation Committee recommends that

- a) CASA Working Groups be more specific in identifying which branch or area of a particular GoA department is proposed for membership on a project team when they develop their terms of reference. This will ensure proper representation on the issue.
- b) The CASA GoA members, as part of their preparatory discussions prior to Board meetings, review the proposed membership of a project team when its terms of reference are presented to the Board for approval, to ensure the right GoA department, agency and branch is involved.

1 Introduction

The bylaws of the Clean Air Strategic Alliance Association (CASA) specify in clause 16.01, Date of Review, that:

The performance of the Society will be evaluated upon the expiration of three (3) years from the date of its incorporation, or the date of its last performance evaluation, by the Members of the Society.

CASA's first formal performance evaluation was done in 1997. Referred to by most members as "the renewal," this evaluation was undertaken by the full Board of Directors consulting with their stakeholder groups regarding their support for CASA. This was a three-stage process, and the outcome was an action plan that addressed communications, board role and processes, and ways to improve the effectiveness of project teams.

The second evaluation, in 2001, was more limited and was undertaken by four board members who considered the question: *Does CASA have the necessary elements in place to support its work?* This committee recommended that the Board renew the CASA mandate for a further three years and also made suggestions regarding funding.

For the third review, in 2004, the Board used an independent consultant, PAGE Management Counsel Ltd., to conduct the review. The two key conclusions were that:

1. CASA is an effective organization that is making progress on its mandate and following its procedures, although there is room for improvement; and
2. CASA is very strong in developing action plans when priorities are set and in following the principles of shared responsibility, consensus building and collaboration.

Five areas for improvement were noted in the evaluator's recommendations in 2004 and the Board responded by establishing a process to address each of these areas. The consultant also provided advice, which the Board accepted, on future approaches to performance evaluation. The consultant noted that future evaluations could be done by stakeholder representatives and the Board may want to consider alternating between internal and external evaluations. The consultant also advised that interviews with representative stakeholders should be included in future evaluations.

At its March 2007 meeting, the CASA Board created a committee to develop terms of reference and to conduct the fourth performance evaluation internally. The Board also provided the key question to be answered by the evaluation, and approved the terms of reference for this review in September 2007. See Appendix A for a list of committee members and their terms of reference.

Another important CASA project was initiated in June 2007, when the Board approved the terms of reference for a team to develop a new Clean Air Strategy for Alberta. The Performance Evaluation Committee felt that the information it was assembling relative to strategic air quality planning could be valuable in shaping this team's work. The committee met several times with the Clean Air Strategy Project Team to keep them informed about the committee's general findings.

1.1 The 2007 Performance Evaluation Approach and Methodology

The goal of the 2007 Performance Evaluation Committee (PEC) was to evaluate CASA's performance by answering the question, "*How effective is CASA in supporting the Government of Alberta in strategic air quality planning?*"

As part of its preparation, the PEC examined several documents: organization charts of selected government departments, previous performance evaluations, CASA's Comprehensive Air Quality Management System (CAMS), and the 1991 Clean Air Strategy for Alberta.

For the purpose of the performance evaluation, the PEC viewed strategic air quality planning as:

The process of developing a plan or series of plans to achieve the goals established relative to clean air in Alberta. The plans would be developed and implemented through either government or other groups in concert with or in supporting roles to government. They would be developed in consultation with stakeholders and the public.

This plan or plans would include the establishment of priorities, allocation of appropriate resources (personnel and dollars) and timelines to accomplish the goals and would include the necessary performance measures, monitoring and reporting on the success or failure of the plans.

For the purpose of this evaluation, the PEC assumed that the phrase "the Government of Alberta" includes the broader provincial government as a whole, rather than a specific department such as Alberta Environment.

1.1.1 Interviews

The PEC gathered most of the information for its evaluation via personal interviews. PEC members developed a list of potential interviewees from Government of Alberta departments and other agencies that were thought to have a role in strategic air quality planning. The initial list was compiled from CASA stakeholder records, government organization charts, suggestions from government members on the CASA Board, and suggestions from the PEC members based on their experience. The PEC agreed to focus on those individuals who understand or have responsibility for strategic air quality planning and who operate at a strategic planning level in their job. Interviewees occupied a variety of positions in their departments, including deputy ministers, assistant deputy ministers, executive directors, directors, and other professional staff.

The PEC also interviewed:

- a) the Alberta Energy and Utilities Board because of its regulatory responsibilities related to emissions sources in the oil and gas sector, and
- b) regional health authorities (RHAs) because they were created by the Government of Alberta, they are actively involved in delivering front line services to Albertans, and they have a mandate to respond to public complaints or concerns about health, including those related to air quality.

A series of questions was developed and piloted with two Government of Alberta staff, one who was very familiar with CASA and one who was less familiar. This enabled the PEC to refine the questions and test the overall approach; the responses from the pilot are included in the PEC's

analysis. The questions were emailed in advance to all interviewees. The final list of questions used in the interviews appears in Appendix B. The interviewees demonstrated a wide range of knowledge and experience. The ensuing analysis of information gained through the interviews was qualitative rather than quantitative in nature. This report generally reflects the PEC's analysis of the information provided in the interviews.

The PEC requested interviews with 34 people. Not everyone who was invited to participate was able to accommodate the request and, in the end, the PEC interviewed 24 individuals between October 12 and November 26, 2007. Most interviews were conducted in person, although a few were done by teleconference. See Appendix C for a list of the departments and agencies represented in the interviews.

1.1.2 Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey

As well as conducting an overall performance evaluation every three years, CASA also undertakes a stakeholder satisfaction survey from time to time as part of its performance measurement system. As the performance evaluation and the stakeholder survey coincided in 2007, the PEC added three specific questions to the survey to get additional information for use in the performance evaluation. Several other questions on the survey were also relevant to the performance evaluation, giving the PEC an opportunity to cross reference the information obtained in its interviews with the responses provided in the survey.

The 85 responses to the survey could be sorted by stakeholder group. Although most government respondents were from Government of Alberta departments or agencies, this category also included federal and municipal departments and agencies. The PEC looked particularly at responses from the government sector to see how closely the survey responses and the interviews correlated. They also briefly examined responses from other sectors in the survey to get a sense of the issues and perspectives from other sectors.

The specific survey questions added by the PEC are noted in Appendix D, along with a list of the additional questions that were deemed relevant to the performance evaluation.

2 CASA's Effectiveness in Supporting the Government of Alberta in Strategic Air Quality Planning

The PEC found that CASA has been effective in supporting Alberta Environment's responses to air quality issues in significant areas. Most frequently cited in the PEC's interviews were the development of major air quality frameworks including the Acidifying Emissions Management Framework; Flaring and Venting; the Emissions Management Framework for the Alberta Electricity Sector, and the Particulate and Ozone Management Framework.¹ CASA's structure and consensus process are recognized as important features contributing to its success in these areas. This recognition has also led to Alberta Environment's request for CASA to develop the new Clean Air Strategy for Alberta, which is now underway.

While CASA's successes are generally known, the PEC found that outside Alberta Environment, government departments do not have a good understanding of CASA and are often under-represented in CASA's activities. Additionally, the activities of several government departments have direct or indirect impacts on air quality, suggesting that these departments should play a role in strategic air quality planning. However, the PEC found that all departments defer to Alberta Environment to address air quality issues.

The PEC's key findings were:

1. The concept of strategic air quality planning is changing from issues management to proactive, outcomes-based planning.
2. Alberta Environment is the only department with a recognized mandate for strategic air quality planning, although the work and responsibilities of several departments may affect air quality.
3. CASA is viewed as a tool of Alberta Environment and has been effective in supporting that department.
4. The Government of Alberta has not been broadly engaged in strategic air quality planning, and CASA has not played a major role in the work of departments other than Alberta Environment.

For the reasons detailed in the rest of this report, the PEC concludes that, to the extent that the Government of Alberta carries out strategic air quality planning through Alberta Environment, CASA has been effective in supporting this work. However, several factors have limited CASA's effectiveness in supporting the Government of Alberta as a whole in strategic air quality planning. These factors include:

1. No perceived responsibility for strategic air quality planning other than by Alberta Environment.
2. Low awareness or understanding of CASA by the Government of Alberta as a whole.
3. The length of time CASA's process requires in relation to the short-term issues that occupy some government departments.

¹ For a more complete list of CASA frameworks, see Appendix E.

3 Government of Alberta Strategic Air Quality Planning

The focus for the current evaluation was on CASA's support for the Government of Alberta's (GoA) strategic air quality planning (SAQP). Thus it was necessary, as part of the evaluation, to clarify the current state of air quality planning in Alberta. Interviewees were asked about the history of CASA and how departments presently undertake strategic air quality planning. While assessing the GoA strategic air quality planning process was not part of this evaluation, respondents did provide suggestions on improvements needed to SAQP in Alberta.

3.1 History

The late 1980s and early 1990s were a time of expanding public concern about environmental issues, with national and international focus on the impact of fossil fuels on global warming, acid deposition and urban smog; these were issues of particular concern to Alberta as an energy producing province. At that time, few opportunities existed for the public (especially those members of affected communities and organized environmental groups) to be heard and meaningfully engaged with government on air quality issues. Regulatory approvals hearings were one of the few such opportunities and as a result, broad air quality issues began to be raised repeatedly at such hearings, leading to additional expense and frustration for all parties.

In 1990, the Clean Air Strategy for Alberta consultation initiative was undertaken to address this situation, creating a forum for the government, the public, industry, and environmental non-government sectors to identify issues, outline actions to reduce emissions, and develop air policy recommendations in a collaborative and constructive process. Following extensive consultations and public discussion, a report to the Ministers of Environment and Energy was prepared and released in November 1991.

This report, entitled *Clean Air Strategy for Alberta*, recommended the establishment of the organization that became the Clean Air Strategic Alliance (CASA). The GoA established CASA in 1994 to undertake and report on the operation of the Comprehensive Air Quality Management System, the conduct of strategic air quality planning in Alberta, and the prioritization of problems with respect to Alberta's air quality and specific actions to resolve problems. The Comprehensive Air Quality Management System (CAMS) is CASA's basic decision-making tool and process that clearly describes the criteria and steps used by the CASA Board to identify, assess and allocate resources to action on air quality issues in a consensus based multi-stakeholder forum.

Since 1994, CASA has successfully led work on 40 major air issues and is recognized by all GoA departments as having a strong track record at addressing issues and reaching consensus-based solutions.

3.2 Current Status

Since 1990, the provincial government has not undertaken any similar public consultations on strategic air quality planning. Based on the PEC's interviews it appears that Alberta Environment is the only department that presently has air quality as a specific part of its mandate. Alberta Environment has responsibility for air quality policy and related legislation, regulations and standards and was the only department to identify that it has responsibility for strategic air quality planning. Other departments do not conduct strategic air quality planning; rather, they focus on

specific issues within their areas of responsibility and participate in Alberta Environment or CASA initiatives as needed.

Interview results also showed that other departments may recognize links in their mandate or operations to air issues,² but they look almost totally to Alberta Environment as the home for these issues and defer to Alberta Environment's leadership on air quality matters, including planning (see Appendix F for information on roles of departments with respect to air quality). While CASA is seen as working mainly with Alberta Environment, a number of interviewees said stronger coordination is needed among GoA participants along with broader participation among all departments involved directly or indirectly with air quality regardless of whether they are on the CASA Board.

The PEC is also aware that Alberta Environment undertakes its own air quality initiatives independently of CASA; examples include ongoing work on greenhouse gas emissions and the work that was recently started on cumulative effects in the industrial heartland area. Alberta Environment also participates in multi-stakeholder projects external to CASA, such as the Cumulative Environmental Management Association (CEMA) in the Fort McMurray area.

To date, the GoA has focused mainly on managing air quality issues and has come to rely on CASA to deliver results on specific air quality projects. The success of CASA projects and projects undertaken by Alberta Environment means that the sum of these projects has, *de facto*, become the air quality plan in the province, certainly in terms of addressing obvious existing issues. This has resulted in a plan that is largely issues-based and reactive. A new strategy would provide the opportunity for more planning and a more anticipatory, proactive approach.

Comments by interviewees and survey respondents also indicated that while a project focus has been successful, more attention should be paid to setting overall future direction and priorities to meet changing needs and circumstances. Rather than focusing on specific air quality issues, a broader and longer term perspective on air quality and air quality issues and trends is needed. The GoA needs to look at where it is headed in terms of development, emissions increases, and emerging public concerns about air quality so it can ask these questions up front. Interviewees indicated there is a need for clear outcomes, specific objectives and targets, and long term future direction for air quality.

Alberta Environment recognizes that an overall plan for strategic air quality planning has been a missing part of its activities, and is working to correct this. It has begun this process through two avenues:

- a) Developing within the department an internal strategic plan to address air, water, climate change and oilsands; and
- b) Presenting a statement of opportunity to CASA in June 2007, for a new Clean Air Strategy (CAS) to replace the one developed in 1991.

These two projects are connected, in that the CAS should integrate with Alberta Environment's internal plan. The CAS also provides an avenue for participation by other GoA departments, to the degree they feel provides comfort that any air issues connected to their operations are either handled by the department itself, or by Alberta Environment. These two projects should, if

² Some of the air quality-related issues that other departments indicated they are working on include mould, tobacco (smoking), worksite exposure, public health complaints, and sour gas.

developed with strategy rather than issue management in mind, provide the basis for GoA strategic air quality planning. The CAS is discussed in more detail in section 6.

3.3 Priority Air Quality Issues for GoA Departments

Interviewees were asked what air quality issues were priorities for their department or agency at the present time. Although air quality is not the focus for most departments, they did identify a number of priority air quality issues. The table in Appendix G compares the air issues identified by interviewees with work that CASA has underway. It also notes if the department or agency is involved with any CASA team that is working on the issue at the present time. Not all interviewees specifically indicated if they were working on an issue outside of CASA, and this table also does not reflect prior CASA work on an issue; for example, a few years ago, CASA had a pollution prevention team.

In most cases where CASA had a team working on the issue, the appropriate department or agency was involved. In a number of cases, CASA has made recommendations that a specific department or agency then became responsible for implementing (e.g., flaring and venting, PM and Ozone) and those issues often appear to be continuing priorities.

This information points to potential future air quality work, including such topics as:

- Volatile organic compounds
- Odour (other than CFO), such as sewage treatment and biofuel processing
- Urban air quality (and urban planning for air quality)
- Vehicle idling
- Wood stoves
- Cumulative effects of non-regulated development on public lands

Question 11 in the CASA Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey asked: “What air quality issues do you think CASA should work on next?” Responses to this question could be interpreted as a reflection of the respondent’s priority issues. There was considerable overlap with the issues identified through interviews. The following specific issues were named in the 15 precise survey responses from the “government” sector, in no particular order: urban air quality (examples being vehicle emissions, urban air toxics, smog and benzene); vehicle emissions generally; indoor air quality; air quality impacts on human and animal health; effects of nuclear plants on air quality; ozone; use of economic incentives; addressing toxics and metals on a province-wide basis; and improving data collection and management.

Responses from the other two sectors in the survey (industry and non-government organizations) also overlapped somewhat, with the following issues being noted, in no particular order: greenhouse gases and climate change; energy efficiency and conservation; vehicle idling; vehicle emissions and transportation generally; PM; urban air quality; NOx and nitrogen emissions generally; indoor air quality; cumulative effects; emissions from oil and gas development and oilsands; air impacts on human and animal health; odour; emissions related to municipal sewage treatment; emissions from agricultural processing; emissions from confined feeding operations; emissions associated with biofuel development; and fugitive emissions.

4 CASA's Role in Strategic Air Quality Planning

Formally, CASA's role is defined by Ministerial Order as an advisory committee under the *Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act* and the *Department of Energy Act* to undertake and report on, among other things:

- [t]he conduct of strategic air quality planning for Alberta through shared responsibility and the utilization of a consensus-building, collaborative approach. Planning shall include:
- i. Clear identification of issues.
 - ii. Prioritization of specific problems.
 - iii. Allocation and coordination of resources.
 - iv. Development of action plans.
 - v. Evaluation of results.

CASA executes this role through a well-documented, systematic process, *The Comprehensive Air Quality Management System: CASA's Decision-making Process (2005)* (the CAMS). The CAMS is a step-wise examination of an issue, initiated by any party through the submission of a *statement of opportunity* (SOO), which tests the issue against priority criteria, including:

1. Relative risks to human health
2. Risks to ecological integrity
3. Potential for economic damage or damage to the resource base
4. Apparent trend
5. Urgency
6. CASA's ability to influence and manage the problem
7. Cost of the response and benefits
8. Personal and professional judgement
9. Degree of public concern.

Statements of Opportunity from any party are one of three means CASA uses to identify priorities. The CASA Board also carries out a three-year business planning process and a Board Strategic Planning process, both of which are used to identify priority issues.

While CASA's practices have evolved over the years, the 2004 external evaluator found that CASA has effectively implemented this process. His two key conclusions were that:

1. CASA is an effective organization that is making progress on its mandate and following its procedures, although there is room for improvement, and
2. CASA is very strong in developing action plans *when priorities are set* and in following the principles of shared responsibility, consensus building and collaboration (emphasis added).

4.1 Setting CASA Priorities

Internally, CASA assesses and prioritizes air quality issues every three years. This activity serves as a system of checks and balances to ensure that CASA is working on priority issues and that it identifies issues of rising concern. This was done most recently in September 2005 when the CASA Board identified 60 issues in nine broad categories, six of which CASA was already active on. Board members later heard presentations on five new issues, one of which resulted in further action.³

³ The issue was nitrogen emissions, and CASA held a science symposium on this topic in 2006.

Since CASA was formed, Alberta Environment has submitted a number of statements of opportunity. Also, in 2000 and 2004, CASA planned and implemented two workshops for Alberta Environment to identify and recommend priority substances for the department's Ambient Air Quality Objective Setting Process. The resulting lists of priority substances became the focus of that group's three-year work plans.

As the 2004 CASA evaluator noted, when priorities are set, CASA is effective at developing responses. CASA's development of several air quality management frameworks illustrates this effectiveness (see Appendix E).

Some interviewees and survey respondents did express concern about the extent to which CASA's priorities represent those of the general public. Some individuals perceived that the direction and/or deliverables of CASA favour one sector over others. Some felt that CASA is too influenced by industry, while others thought it is unduly influenced by environmental activists. The views of the "general public" are missing.

The PEC is skeptical that a "general public" view on air quality exists. In the absence of an air quality "crisis" that draws public attention, most people who are knowledgeable about air quality are motivated by a strong interest that distinguishes them from the majority of the public who trusts that others are attending to matters that reside beyond their own immediate interests. The PEC suggests that multiple stakeholders with differing vested interests, who are engaged in a common-interest seeking negotiation process, can function as a proxy for a reasonable public interest. The agreement among the various interests results in a decision to which a reasonable, disinterested person would not object.

The 2004 external reviewer observed that:

"Stakeholders are a proxy for public input on concerns (and likely an excellent proxy given the breadth of participation at CASA), but that does not alter the fact that direct public input does not form a continuous part of the identification, prioritization and action planning/execution of concerns with air quality."⁴

The PEC reached a similar conclusion. The PEC adopts this concept of CASA participants being a proxy for the general public, but this does not exclude the need for the public and other interested parties to be consulted when determining issues and priorities. This is particularly so today with a growing number of stakeholder groups and interests, expanding research and expertise on air quality, and the need for inter-jurisdictional consultation. This process must be proactive and visible. Some interviewees expressed concern that CASA is not visible with the public and consequently awareness and understanding of what it does and knowledge of its current projects and priorities may be largely restricted to those directly involved.

Recommendation 1: Process for Identifying Air Issues

The Performance Evaluation Committee recommends that:

CASA work with Alberta Environment to develop a periodic visible and inclusive consultation process for identifying air issues (current and future) that includes stakeholders, general public, experts and other jurisdictions.

⁴ PAGE Management Counsel Ltd. 2004. *Performance Evaluation CASA 2001-2004*. Page 9.

Recommendation 2: Air Quality and the General Public

The Performance Evaluation Committee recommends that:

CASA formally adopt, and include in appropriate communications, a description of its multi-stakeholder composition as a proxy for the views of the general public on air quality.

4.2 CASA Responsiveness

Interviewees cited stakeholder involvement and the consensus process as one of CASA's most significant features. At CASA, consensus means that each party is satisfied with a decision and can live with the outcome. Membership on CASA bodies (board, committees, and project teams) includes all parties that have a vital interest in the issue, are needed to devise broadly supported solutions, and/or could block the implementation of a plan or framework. By engaging and facilitating stakeholders, utilizing shared information, joint information gathering, and a structure that strives to "level the playing field" among the parties, CASA solutions are seen to be better informed, more broadly supported, and longer lasting.

Interviewees also identified CASA's responsiveness as a key feature. Echoing the 2004 evaluator's finding that "CASA is very strong in developing action plans when priorities are set," several interviewees viewed CASA as an effective tool for government to respond to air quality issues. Further, CASA's "process and discipline" for following up on recommendations and measuring outcomes was acknowledged as being mature and thorough.

When it is asked to respond and is given clear direction, CASA has a strong history of responding well. But it was also reported that government commitment and direction are critical, and the government must maintain a high level of commitment to working with CASA for CASA to continue to work and work well.

CASA's process is clearly seen as having strengths and benefits, but these also come with recognized costs and weaknesses. Involving stakeholders, especially ones new to working in a collaborative manner, can require substantial time to "get up the learning curve." Similarly, moving beyond positions to common interests from which consensus solutions may develop, takes time and patience. The time that CASA's consensus process requires is seen as a barrier to its use by some government departments, especially in situations where rapid reactions are needed.

4.3 Implementing CASA Recommendations

When teams submit their reports to the CASA Board they are expected to recommend a process and timelines for implementation and how progress should be monitored and evaluated. CASA itself is not an implementer, so it is important that project team recommendations clearly indicate what is to be done, who is to do it, approximately when the work is to be done and approximate cost of implementation, if any. Team members are expected to test acceptance of their recommendations with their organization to secure support before asking the Board to approve them.

After the Board approves a team's recommendations, the designated implementing agencies are expected to follow through. Implementation is typically achieved through one, or a combination, of three approaches:

- directly by the appropriate agency that has agreed to take on the tasks,

- coordinating implementation via a CASA implementation team or by reconvening the team at a specified interval, or
- direct implementation through a small-scale pilot project by a CASA team.

Implementing agencies are expected to keep the CASA Board informed through regular progress reports and a final report when the plan is fully implemented. If progress is slow or appears impeded, the CASA Board may provide feedback and support to the implementing agency and other stakeholders. As well, recommendations may specify or foresee further CASA involvement.⁵

Implementation is also reported in the Implementation Matrix, a compilation of progress made in implementing CASA recommendations, which is updated quarterly and presented to the Board annually. The matrix gives board members an opportunity to raise any issues with implementation and it frames discussions under the “Implementation Review” section of board meetings at least once per year. It reminds implementers of deadlines and encourages current teams to address implementation in detail.

In addition to these reports, CASA has a performance measure that involves a one-time assessment of implementation progress for recommendations that can lead directly to improved air quality (substantive recommendations); this assessment is done within three years of their approval by the CASA Board. Calculations of this performance measure reveal that three-quarters of substantive recommendations are implemented.

Question 5 in CASA’s stakeholder survey asked about satisfaction with implementation of substantive recommendations. Respondents expressed concerns about implementation, with more than 40% (all three sectors combined) rating their satisfaction as a “3” (neither satisfied nor dissatisfied); this suggests a lack of certainty about implementation. While 40-45% of government and industry gave a rating of 4 or 5, only 21% of NGOs did.

Based on the PEC’s interviews, it was determined that government commitments to implementing CASA recommendations are funded separately by individual departments. If they do not receive specific budget approval through annual ministry budget-setting processes in September and October of each year then implementation is subject to departments finding money from existing approved budgets through internal reallocation. This puts implementation at risk if its priority is not considered high enough or understood well enough to compete with other demands. High level organizational commitment to implementation is essential in such circumstances to ensure follow-up action is taken. Government team members must have the authority to commit to implementation or must be able to obtain this commitment through their Board member.

Where recommendations involve implementation by several departments, coordinated action by all departments is expected. It was unclear to the PEC how such a coordinated commitment of several departments would be secured.

⁵ In 2007, the Board heard progress updates on the implementation of two frameworks and recommendations from three former projects (PM and Ozone Management, Acid Deposition Management, Vehicle Emissions – Transportation Demand Management, Ecological Effects Monitoring and the 2004 Priority Setting Workshop). The Board also created a team to undertake the scheduled five year review of the Electricity Framework, and the Flaring and Venting Team reconvened to commence its review in 2008.

The PEC expressed particular concern about teams that develop recommendations for government departments that are not represented at the CASA Board. It is unclear how a firm commitment of resources would be obtained from these departments without a senior department official participating in the review and approval of recommendations, or a process by which the team's recommendations are formally taken to the department's senior management. The PEC addresses this matter in recommendation 4.

An annual progress review on implementation by government is also needed. The PEC suggests elsewhere in this report that annual meetings between CASA and departments who are board members should be initiated and should include a review of progress on implementation of CASA recommendations.

Recommendation 3: Liaison with Provincial Government Departments not on the CASA Board

The Performance Evaluation Committee recommends that

Alberta Environment establish a formal process to liaise with and coordinate input from any Government of Alberta departments or agencies that are not represented on the CASA Board, when the Board is considering decisions that could potentially affect the department or agency.

5 Government of Alberta Understanding of CASA's Role

The PEC asked several questions to determine interviewees' current level of understanding of CASA. This information, along with information on their role with respect to air issues, is presented in Appendix F.

With the exception of Alberta Environment, most departments said that air quality is not part of their mandate. Departments that did report involvement with air quality issues stated that their work is highly reactive: it is complaint-driven, driven by an event such as the public release of a new report or an accident with potential air quality impacts, or a response to environmental issues scans. While some work may be required for CASA to become more prospective and broadly strategic, the PEC observed that the GoA as a whole has similar challenges.

To the extent that departments and agencies do get involved in air quality, they use various approaches to identify issues and determine priorities. With the exception of Alberta Environment, CASA was not viewed as having a major role in identifying priorities or emerging air quality issues for any department or agency. However, in several cases CASA did help them to address an issue that affected or could affect a department's core business by responding to a statement of opportunity (e.g., emissions from power generation, confined feeding operations, particulate matter and ozone), directing specific recommendations to a regulatory body (e.g., flaring and venting), or identifying a particular issue that required action (e.g., mercury emissions from power plants).

CASA is widely viewed within the GoA as an adjunct to Alberta Environment; other departments recognize that while they may have responsibility to manage or deliver on specific air quality responsibilities, they defer to Alberta Environment to manage the broader strategic policy and air quality agenda. Most respondents were aware, by reputation, of what CASA is and its multi-stakeholder consensus approach, but not all had participated in CASA projects. CASA was

recognized within the GoA as having a reputation for successfully finding multi-stakeholder consensus-based solutions.

Interviewees regarded CASA as being a project-focused rather than a strategy-setting organization. While CASA, through its project teams, may engage in broader stakeholder consultations on air issues, the role of these discussions in setting broader GoA air quality strategy and priorities was not clear or understood. There was general support for CASA playing a bigger role in identifying broad strategic air issues and recommending priorities to the GoA.

It was clear to the PEC from interviews that Alberta Environment is seen as having the mandate and responsibility for strategic air quality planning. This tends to prevent CASA from having a connection with other departments that derive their understanding and knowledge of CASA through Alberta Environment.

A number of interviewees expressed concern that the current CASA approach alone would not be sufficient to address the growing complexity and range of issues affecting air quality in coming years. One of the considerations in developing a Clean Air Strategy would also be to look at what role CASA and airsheds could play in implementing the new strategy.

Questions were also asked about how the government's air quality agenda is set, who influences this agenda, and whether CASA is working on the right priorities. Again this question seems best answered by establishing a broader strategic planning process.

Respondent ratings of CASA's performance were generally 4-5 on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent), with the exception of Alberta Health and Wellness and RHAs, who both placed CASA at 2-3. Lower ratings seemed to stem from inconsistencies in direction within AHW and between AHW and Regional Health Authorities, need for greater involvement on the Board by AHW, and need for better connection between CASA and RHAs.

Particularly among departments less familiar with CASA there was a need to increase awareness about the role and work of CASA and how it could be utilized by these departments. It was also suggested that CASA should improve its communication with and provide greater reporting to a broader segment of the GoA departments on the CASA Board. Regular face-to-face reporting would facilitate discussions of air issues, work priorities, and resourcing.

Recommendation 4: Raising Awareness of CASA within Provincial Government Departments and Agencies, both Represented on the CASA Board and not Represented but Involved with Air Issues

The Performance Evaluation Committee recommends that:

- a) The CASA secretariat work with GoA Board members to develop a process and arrange annual face-to-face meetings, starting in 2008, between the CASA Executive and appropriate members of each represented department to report on CASA activities, priorities and plans.
- b) Representatives from the CASA Board, taking direction from the findings of this report, make presentations to departments not represented on the CASA Board but involved in air quality issues, to increase awareness and facilitate discussion of CASA's role.
- c) The CASA Board consider mechanisms to improve communications and connections between CASA and the regional health authorities.

5.1 CASA Board

5.1.1 Government of Alberta Membership

Alberta Environment, Alberta Energy, and Alberta Health and Wellness have been represented on the Board of Directors since CASA was created in 1994. CASA's creation was mandated under Acts administered by Alberta Environment and Alberta Energy and the two departments provided joint and relatively equal funding for CASA operations until Alberta Health and Wellness became a third funding partner in 1996. The three departments shared the funding partnership and responsibilities on the Board until Alberta Health and Wellness ceased funding CASA in 2006. Alberta Health and Wellness continued its membership on the Board and on numerous project teams. Since 2006, Alberta Agriculture and Food has provided funding towards CASA operations but is not a member of the Board.

When asked which department(s), if any, should be added to the CASA Board, nearly half of interviewees mentioned directly or indirectly Agriculture and Food. The only other department suggested more than once was Municipal Affairs. Several interviewees noted the challenges associated with a larger board. The PEC is of the view that Alberta Agriculture and Food would make a valuable addition to the Board. This department has been actively engaged with CASA through the Confined Feeding Operations team, and biofuel development is a potential new area of activity.

Regional health authorities (RHAs) expressed a strong interest in becoming more engaged with CASA. They are front-line service providers and are expected to deal with many of the issues related to air quality and health in the regions they serve. The PEC heard that Alberta Health and Wellness does not always speak for the RHAs, but it was also clear from the interviews and from experience that RHAs do not always have the same priorities, concerns, perspectives or approaches among themselves. The PEC acknowledges the potential contribution that could be made to CASA by the RHAs but also recognizes the challenges associated with determining how RHAs should be represented at the Board level.

Recommendation 5: Potential Additions to the CASA Board

The Performance Evaluation Committee recommends that

The CASA Board consider inviting Alberta Agriculture and Food to join the Clean Air Strategic Alliance Association and appoint representatives to serve on the Board of Directors.

5.1.2 Level of Representation from GoA Departments

At the Board level, some departments are participating at a high level but others are less engaged, which several interviewees named as a concern. When CASA was formed, it was envisioned that the GoA representatives on the Board would be deputy ministers to ensure that the representative could speak for the department. Some commented that this would still be the ideal situation, while some said others can act as agents for their department's deputy minister and executive. The three departments have had varying degrees of success in providing the desired representation. Initially, the Deputy Ministers of Environment and Energy also served, in rotation, on the Executive Committee and as President of CASA. More recently, those roles have been filled by the Deputy Minister of Alberta Environment exclusively. Alberta Environment has provided deputy minister representation on the Board with an Assistant Deputy Minister (ADM) as the alternate. Early on, the other two departments provided a similar level of representation but over time board

membership has gradually fallen to others below the ADM level in those departments.⁶ Nevertheless, whoever is the representative must be able to accept responsibilities, make commitments on behalf of the department and secure department resources. In general this would be consistent with at least an ADM level of representation. Interviewees acknowledged that this is something the GoA needs to address rather than CASA.

Greater coordination among GoA departments involved with CASA work was another identified need. At the time of the interviews GoA members on the Board had begun meeting in caucus immediately prior to CASA board meetings. However, it was recognized that this was last minute and there was a need to begin meeting with others from the GoA involved in CASA well in advance of board meetings to review the agenda and ensure that everyone understands and is prepared to discuss the items. This would also allow time to obtain more information, clarify topics and consult with other departments that might be affected by any CASA Board decisions. It is the PEC's understanding that the GoA caucus is now meeting well in advance of board meetings and is involving all departments engaged in CASA project work whether they are on the Board or not. The PEC views this as a very positive step.

These meetings are in addition to the GoA's participation in the Board's government caucus, which comprises board members and alternates from the three provincial government departments plus representatives from federal, local (urban and rural), First Nations and Métis government organizations. The caucus meets prior to board meetings to coordinate the government sector positions and responses. It is expected that caucus members and the respective project team members will enter into dialogue on upcoming agenda items prior to each board meeting.

Recommendation 6: Level of GoA Representation on the CASA Board

The Performance Evaluation Committee recommends that

Participating Government of Alberta departments review their level of representation at the CASA Board.

5.2 CASA Project Teams

Project teams are where a great deal of CASA's work is done, and it is essential that the teams have the right composition to ensure their success. In general, those who are needed to implement recommendations, those who could block a decision, and those who are affected by a decision should be part of the team. Like the Board, team members have to anticipate and respond to situations in which broader GoA involvement or engagement is needed. The expectation is that those at the table will test ideas and obtain commitments as recommendations are developed to ensure that their department and the GoA as a whole are comfortable with the overall direction. Where a government department is potentially responsible for implementation, the expectation is that the government members on the team will secure departmental and/or government approval to commit the necessary resources for implementation. These expectations should be reviewed and discussed every time a new team is formed to ensure that members understand their role.

Not only do the right departments or agencies need to be involved, the right area and person within that organization should be identified to participate. A number of interviewees questioned whether the right people were at project team tables, raising concern about how membership is determined and whether there is any review to identify and address critical membership gaps.

⁶ Late in 2007, Alberta Health and Wellness appointed an ADM as its director on the CASA Board. Alberta Energy is currently represented by a Business Unit Leader.

Membership on project teams is currently a self-selection process by each sector (government, industry and NGO). In the early stages of a project, the working group identifies organizations as potential members of the proposed project team while developing the team's terms of reference. At the CASA board meeting where the terms of reference are approved, board members are asked to assist with securing team members from their sector. Ideally, the sector is able to recruit capable and appropriate representatives for the project team. CASA's Executive Director and the team's Project Manager may provide assistance upon request. This approach meets with varying degrees of success and has its challenges.

Especially for departments without a history of CASA engagement, it may be necessary for CASA staff or the team co-chairs to describe the expectations related to participation so that the right area of the department is approached and the appropriate person selected to represent them. Given what the PEC also saw as varying degrees of involvement and familiarity on the part of departments and agencies about CASA projects, leaving membership to a self-selection process presents significant risk to any project's success and future implementation.

Recommendation 7: Identification of Project Team Members

The Performance Evaluation Committee recommends that

- a) CASA Working Groups be more specific in identifying which branch or area of a particular GoA department is proposed for membership on a project team when they develop their terms of reference. This will ensure proper representation on the issue.
- b) The CASA GoA members, as part of their preparatory discussions prior to Board meetings, review the proposed membership of a project team when its terms of reference are presented to the Board for approval, to ensure the right GoA department, agency and branch is involved.

6 Strategic Air Quality Planning

The PEC found that the meaning of the term "strategic air quality planning" appears to be evolving. In the past it has referred to an essentially reactive process to identified issues. "Strategic air quality planning" is now also being used to refer to the prospective planning for building the kind of future Albertans should create over longer time frames.

CASA was very successful in its early years in addressing a number of issues of the day. CASA's performance in recent years has been rated lower due to changes both in the nature of the issues it is facing and the environment within which it must work. Today's issues are more complex and solutions are harder to envision. Instead of single issues, we are dealing with interconnected issues and cumulative effects. There is a need to manage air, water and land issues together rather than independently. There is a better informed public, more stakeholders and interest groups, jurisdictional changes, new players in the form of the Water Council and airsheds, and greater need for "on the ground" management of the issues.

In June 2007, Alberta Environment identified the need for a new Clean Air Strategy for Alberta and asked CASA to lead this work. The role and place of CASA under the new CAS will need to be considered given the changing landscape within which it must work.

6.1 A New Clean Air Strategy for Alberta

The Clean Air Strategy project is not a typical CASA project in the sense that it will recommend provincial air quality policy and set long-term direction. It is a GoA initiative and will create a new Clean Air Strategy for Alberta. Development of the CAS needs to be profiled appropriately to ensure it receives participation and input from all essential stakeholders and the public. It must also receive commitment from across the GoA, ensuring all departments with roles and responsibilities for air quality are involved.

It also presents a timely opportunity for CASA to examine if it has a role and position in implementing the new CAS, as well as examine the roles of the GoA and other implementing agencies, including airsheds. Airsheds are entering a new phase, with an expected shift in coming years from strictly monitoring to increased activities related to air quality management. This will require creativity, innovation, and collaboration among a number of parties. Opportunities for effective local decision making, supported by a province-wide perspective, are needed and the CAS can provide this guidance. The PEC also heard comments about the need for more receptor monitoring, particularly as it relates to human health.⁷

Consistent with Alberta Environment's approach, climate change was not included in this CASA performance evaluation. Various interviewees had difficulty understanding why air quality and climate change are being addressed separately, given that a) both relate to air, and b) some solutions could help address both issues. The CAS offers an opportunity to describe the linkages between these two topics and provide a rationale as to why the GoA has chosen to address them separately.

Given the continuing public interest in air quality issues, the PEC concluded that a better job needs to be done to allow the public to assess progress toward cleaner air. This involves clear outcomes for air quality and transparent approaches to measuring progress in achieving these outcomes. The CAS can provide guidance by recommending more transparent and more meaningful measures of performance. Further, a higher profile for air quality would raise public awareness and ensure that it gets the required attention. Water, for example, tends to have a much higher profile, but air quality is less "front and centre" until there is something like a forest fire or industrial incident.

A major future challenge will be anticipating, assessing and managing cumulative effects and monitoring open sources of emissions. The CAS will make a very significant contribution if it can provide recommendations and guidance in this area. As noted earlier, the PEC learned that Alberta Environment is developing a strategic plan that will address air, water, climate change and oilsands. The PEC recognizes that these two initiatives are clearly overlapping and a strong connection will be needed between them. As the CAS proceeds, continued input will be expected from the Alberta Environment representatives on the team to ensure the end results of both initiatives are consistent.

To date, Alberta Environment's process for developing its strategic plan has been focused within the department. Before it is completed the plan will need to engage the balance of GoA departments, both for those that have links to air quality issues and as a general communication

⁷ CASA is also preparing a new Ambient Monitoring Strategic Plan for Alberta, which will address some of these matters.

and education mechanism for all departments. The PEC understands that this will occur later in the process.

Because of the importance of the CAS to the future of Alberta's air quality, the PEC feels that Alberta Environment should have a senior representative on the CAS team, such as an Assistant Deputy Minister (ADM), an approach similar to the Multi-Advisory Committee on Natural Gas in Coal. A task force of ADMs from Energy, Agriculture and Food, Municipal Affairs and Housing, Infrastructure and Transportation, Health and Wellness, and Sustainable Resource Development, for example, should be established to provide the GoA connection within government and ensure the recommendations receive broad review and support. It would also signal to all those participating, the importance of the CAS Project Team.

6.1.1 Comments and Observations Related to the Clean Air Strategy Development

The PEC recognizes that recommendations regarding the specific content of the new Clean Air Strategy are outside the scope of its terms of reference. However, given the great significance of this project to CASA and to the future management of air quality in Alberta, the PEC offers the following comments and observations, based on its analysis of the information gathered during the course of its work, in the hope that these insights can contribute constructively to the CAS development.

With respect to the Clean Air Strategy now being developed by CASA, the PEC suggests that:

- Alberta Environment assign an Assistant Deputy Minister to be its lead representative on the Clean Air Strategy project, and that this ADM provide the connection between the strategic air quality planning being done internally by Alberta Environment and the work of the CASA Clean Air Strategy project team.
- The Government of Alberta, through Alberta Environment, establish a task force of other ADMs from Energy, Agriculture and Food, Municipal Affairs, Infrastructure and Transportation, Health and Wellness, and Sustainable Resource Development and any other involved departments to ensure the eventual Clean Air Strategy is representative of Government of Alberta strategy.
- CASA and the Government of Alberta review the participation on the Clean Air Strategy project team to ensure all necessary points of view and stakeholders are represented.
- The CAS address implementation of the strategy including the roles and responsibilities of implementing agencies such as CASA, airsheds and others.
- The CAS describe its connection and relationship to greenhouse gases and Alberta's Climate Change Action Plan.
- The CAS should point to other GoA strategies and frameworks that contribute to air quality, such as the comprehensive energy strategy being developed by Alberta Energy, which is expected to address renewable energy, as well as energy efficiency and conservation, among other things.
- The CAS should include clear outcomes expected for air quality in Alberta and propose ways to enable the public to more meaningfully assess progress toward these outcomes.
- The CAS should propose mechanisms for anticipating, assessing and managing cumulative effects and for monitoring open sources of emissions.

Appendix A: Committee Members and Terms of Reference

Performance Evaluation Committee Members

Mike Boyd	Alberta Energy
Myles Kitagawa	Toxics Watch Society of Alberta
John Squarek	Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers
Dave Byler	Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers (corresponding member)
Sharon Hawrelak	CASA

Terms of Reference

Board approved: 20 September 2007

Background:

In the Bylaws of the Clean Air Strategic Alliance, Article 16.01 states:

***DATE OF REVIEW.** The performance of the Society will be evaluated upon the expiration of three (3) years from, the date of its incorporation, or the date of its last performance evaluation, by the Members of the Society.*

Performance evaluations were conducted in-house by a board committee in 1997 and 2001. The most recent evaluation was an independent evaluation completed in November 2004 by PAGE Management Counsel Ltd. The board accepted a recommendation to consider the comments of PAGE Management Counsel Ltd. on future approaches to performance evaluation when planning the 2007 CASA performance evaluation. The comments pertinent to the 2007 evaluation are:

- Using only documents to conduct the evaluation is a difficult approach. There are nuances that will only be derived from the input of people (stakeholders) who have been involved in or observed the work over the three year evaluation period. Therefore, it would be advisable in future evaluations to include some representative interviews with stakeholders involved in selected projects and the overall CASA board.
- Evaluations can be done by stakeholder representatives – although it is likely of value to alternate between internal and external evaluations. Also, the stakeholder representatives should likely not be involved in day to day CASA matters in order to assure objectivity.

At the March 29, 2007 board meeting, the board created a committee to conduct an internal evaluation in 2007 and provided the key question to be answered.

Goal of the Committee:

To evaluate CASA's performance as required every three years according to the Bylaws by answering the question, "How effective is CASA in supporting the Government of Alberta in strategic air quality planning?"

Key Tasks for the Committee:

1. In response to the question, “How effective is CASA in supporting the Government of Alberta in strategic air quality planning?”, the committee will complete the following tasks:
 - a) Define what is meant by strategic air quality planning
 - b) Identify government representatives to be interviewed from each of 4 departments Environment, Energy, Health and Wellness and Agriculture and Food (may or may not be on CASA Board)
 - c) Identify what government has done in the recent past and is currently planning related to strategic air quality planning
 - d) Outline what CASA has done in the recent past and is currently planning related to strategic air quality planning
 - e) Prepare questions for interviews
 - f) Committee members will conduct interviews
 - g) Compile results and prepare a report and recommendations to CASA board
2. Identify areas for future work, if any, and make recommendations to the CASA board as appropriate.

Timelines:

The committee will work towards the following milestones.

- August 2007 – work plan developed
- August 2007 – decide whether question should appear in stakeholder survey
- November 2007 – evaluation information gathering phase completed
- February 2008 – draft report reviewed by the Executive Committee
- March 2008 – Present final report and make final recommendations to the CASA Board

Budget:

No external funds are required for this work at this time. The CASA Secretariat will provide project support.

Membership:

Currently the members are Myles Kitagawa (NGO), John Squarek (Industry), Mike Boyd (Government), Dave Byler (Industry – corresponding member) and Sharon Hawrelak (Secretariat).

Appendix B: Interview Questions

1. How familiar are you with CASA – i.e. what has your involvement been in the past?
Are you aware of what CASA does?

Use this section for those who are familiar with CASA:

Background (Past involvement with CASA):

2. On what specific projects has CASA worked either with your department or your area in the past?
3. (For those who have or had long term involvement with CASA or SAQP) Think back to before 1994 when CASA was created as a multi-stakeholder organization to address complex air quality issues. Why was CASA created? What were the conditions like at the time? What, if anything, has changed because of CASA?

Air Quality Planning/extent air quality issues affect dept. business

4. What is the mandate or purpose of your department with respect to air quality?
5. Who are your air quality stakeholders? What is the relationship with them and how do you consult with them?
6. How does your department do strategic air quality planning?
7. What air quality issues are priorities for the dept or area right now? How does the dept or area identify emerging air quality issues? What role if any does CASA play in identifying these? How are priorities set?

CASA's Role:

8. What do you see as CASA's role in strategic air quality planning in Alberta?
9. How would you describe the extent to which your department has utilized CASA as a tool for managing your air quality issues?
10. How would you rate their performance to date (1-5). What needs improving and how should it be improved (if they rate low).
11. What, in your opinion, has affected (positively and negatively) CASA's performance to date?
12. What would make CASA more useful to your department in its strategic air quality planning?
13. How do you implement CASA frameworks after they have been approved by consensus? How do you ensure resources are allocated into the future to support implementation?

GoA Air Quality Planning:

14. What needs to be done to improve strategic air quality planning in Alberta?
15. Do you think the GoA representation at CASA is adequate? Should other departments be involved?
16. Do you have any other suggestions or comments for developing and delivering improvements to strategic air quality planning in Alberta?

Comments:

17. Do you have any other comments or questions you would like to share?

Use this section for those who are NOT very familiar with CASA:

18. What is the mandate or purpose of your department with respect to air quality?
19. How does your department do strategic air quality planning?
20. What air quality issues are priorities for your department or area right now? How does your department or area identify emerging air quality issues? What role if any does CASA play in identifying these? How are priorities set by your department?
21. How did your department set its goals for air quality issues management, if any? Why did it set the air quality goals it has?
22. How has your department responded to and managed its air quality issues?
23. How did your department determine its approach to air quality issues management?
24. Who are your air quality stakeholders? What is the relationship with them and how do you consult with them?
25. How do you manage intergovernmental relations on air quality?

GoA Air Quality Planning:

26. What needs to be done to improve strategic air quality planning in Alberta?
27. Do you have any other suggestions or comments for developing and delivering improvements to strategic air quality planning in Alberta?

Comments:

28. Do you have any other comments or questions you would like to share?

Appendix C: Departments and Agencies Represented in PEC Interviews

Department or Agency	Number interviewed*	Number of interviews requested
Alberta Agriculture and Food	1	4
Alberta Employment, Immigration and Industry	1	2
Alberta Energy	5	5
Alberta Energy and Utilities Board	1	3
Alberta Environment	5	5
Alberta Health and Wellness	2	5
Alberta Infrastructure and Transportation	2	3
Alberta Municipal Affairs	0	1
Alberta Sustainable Resource Development	3	3
Calgary Health Region	1	1
Capital Health	1	1
David Thompson Health Region	2	1

* In at least two cases, interviewees had involvement at a senior level with a department other than the one they are now with, so were able to provide some insights and comments based on that experience.

Appendix D: Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey

In 2007, CASA conducted an online Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey as part of its performance measurement process. The Performance Evaluation Committee added the following three questions to expand its analysis. These questions were:

14. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is not very effective and 5 is very effective, how effective do you think CASA is in supporting the Government of Alberta in strategic air quality planning?

15. The extent to which CASA supports the Government of Alberta in strategic air quality planning is: a) too little, b) too much, or c) about right

16. In your opinion, how could the Government of Alberta better utilize CASA in strategic air quality planning?

Other questions from the stakeholder survey that the PEC deemed relevant to the performance evaluation are noted below. Unless otherwise indicated, respondents were asked to provide a rating on a scale of 1 to 5 to reflect their level of satisfaction or, in the case of question 14, CASA's effectiveness.

1. CASA's mission is "To recommend strategies to assess and improve air quality in Alberta, using a consensus process." How satisfied are you that CASA is contributing to improved air quality in Alberta?

2. How satisfied are you with the CASA way of addressing air quality issues?

5. CASA recommendations are implemented by stakeholders and others. A "substantive" recommendation is one that can lead directly to improved air quality. How satisfied are you with the implementation of substantive recommendations?

8. The value my organization places on its involvement in CASA is: a) high, b) moderate, or c) low

9. What opportunities, if any, do you see for CASA to pursue as an organization? (comments)

20. How satisfied are you that CASA ensures that those who have a stake in the outcome are at the table?

21. Is there any stakeholder or stakeholder group concerned about air quality missing from the CASA table? (yes or no)

23. My organization provides me with adequate support for my participation in CASA. (agree or disagree)

Appendix E: CASA Frameworks

- Ambient Monitoring Strategic Plan for Alberta – 1995
- Sulphur Dioxide Management Framework – 1997 (also known as the Acidifying Emissions Management Framework)
- Acid Deposition Management Framework – 1999
- Human Health Monitoring Framework - 1999
- Pollution Prevention and Continuous Improvement Framework - 2002
- Solution Gas Flaring and Venting Framework - 1998
- Emissions Management Framework for the Alberta Electricity Sector– 2003
- Particulate Matter and Ozone Management Framework – 2003
- Herd and Environmental Record System (Animal Health) – 2003
- In development and expected in 2008:
 - Confined Feeding Operations – March 2008
 - Ambient Monitoring Strategic Plan for Alberta – June 2008

Other related documents

- Alberta Ambient Air Quality Objectives – various dates
- Canada-Wide Acid Rain Strategy for Post 2000 – 1998
- Alberta Sulphur Recovery Guidelines -2001
- Alberta’s Approach to Pollution Prevention and Conservation – 2002
- CEMA (Oil Sands Area) Acid Deposition – 2004
- CEMA (Oil Sands Area) Ozone Management Framework – 2006
- EUB Flaring, Venting and Incinerating Requirements – 1999, 2001, 2007

Appendix F: Roles of GoA Departments with Respect to Air Quality

Department or Organization	Mandate or Purpose of Department/Organization in air quality	Awareness and Understanding of CASA	Extent to Which They Have Utilized CASA in the past	Rating
Environment (AENV)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explicit and implicit role for air quality policy, stewardship, regulation, and standards. Public expects AENV to address concerns even if they are within mandate of another department. AEPEA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sees CASA as a partner. Doesn't utilize CASA for all air quality issues; handles some on its own. CASA has helped them to identify priority substances. CASA is seen as responding to issues and does not take a global forward looking view. AENV sees CASA as playing a leadership role in preparing the new CAS and implementing portions of the new CAS. 	Have used it to address issues and projects. Policy and regulation are Environments.	4-5 based on past work. Not as high a rating now.
Energy (AE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AE role is implicit, as energy sector affects air quality. AENV has mandate. Need to align work on renewable and alternative energy with AENV. Involved in climate change. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CASA develops recommendations to government. Air quality priorities identified from e-scanning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Involved on specific projects. Department doesn't have direct air quality issues. 	4-5 overall based on past
Energy and Utilities Board (EUB)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regulator ensuring standards are met. Does not set air quality standards. Also keeper of SO₂ recovery guidelines and approvals of facilities that do not require approval under AEPEA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Involved on specific projects. CASA does not contribute to identifying air quality priorities for EUB. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flaring and Venting (F&V) work used extensively. Expect next review of F&V to be helpful. 	4 overall
Agriculture and Food	Specific mandate under AOPA to deal with agricultural nuisances such as dust and odour.	Involved on specific projects.	Have used extensively in recent past. Would go to CASA if had issues.	4 overall
Infrastructure and Transportation	<p><u>Infrastructure</u> - involved in IAQ and health of indoor environment for government-funded buildings (schools, health facilities, social housing etc.) Use heating and ventilation standards and codes.</p> <p><u>Transportation</u> - nothing explicit. Build roads. Their mandate covers safety but not vehicle pollution control.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See CASA as a mechanism that identifies air issues. Participate in CASA projects but do not use CASA to do work for them or identify issues. 	Don't see themselves as having air quality issues.	Not rated – commented engagement good, results more difficult to see.

Department or Organization	Mandate or Purpose of Department/Organization in air quality	Awareness and Understanding of CASA	Extent to Which They Have Utilized CASA in the past	Rating
Health and Wellness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responsible for protecting health of Albertans. Set policy and regulations. Involved if air quality affects human health Provide advice to AENV 	Does not rely on CASA in identifying emerging issues.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't use CASA. Involved in some projects. Expect health regions to provide advice in CASA projects. 	2 - need better Board representation from AHW, consistency across departments and within AHW.
Regional Health Authorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect public health. Respond directly to public concerns and complaints – investigate and take action. Can issue health advisories. Work with other stakeholders such as airsheds, review emergency response plans, review development proposals which may affect air quality, involved with IAQ on tobacco legislation. 	CASA does not help them set priorities. Individual RHAs have worked on several project teams. RHAs indicated a strong desire for broader consultation on issues but noted resource and time constraints. Connection between AHW and RHAs was noted as poor.	RHA representatives have worked on several CASA projects	2-3 based on experience with HAH. Better connection between CASA and RHAs needed.
Sustainable Resource Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not in SRD mandate. Rely on AENV to set standards for land use dispositions and review larger projects. Involved in climate change. Forest fire modeling and prevention is SRD focus, monitoring and issues addressed by AENV and AHW 	Familiar with how CASA works but no project involvement. CASA does not have a direct role with them in identifying or addressing issues. NRCB deals with complaint-based issues.	Not using CASA. No project involvement.	Not rated
Employment, Immigration and Industry	Enforces workplace health and safety standards. Look at contamination workers are exposed to on the worksite.	CASA does not help them set priorities. Limited involvement.	Limited involvement.	Not rated
Municipal Affairs	Not interviewed but committee understands they are involved with building codes that would affect IAQ.	N/A	N/A	N/A

Appendix G: Priority Air Quality Issues for Departments and Agencies

Issue	Department or agency identifying the issue as a priority	Is a CASA team working on this issue now?	Is the department or agency represented on the CASA team?	Is the department or agency working on the issue outside CASA?
PM and Ozone	AENV	Yes	Yes	Yes
	DTHR		No	Via airshed
SO2	AENV	Yes for electricity	Yes	???
	AHW		Yes	???
NOx	AENV	Yes for electricity	Yes	
	AHW		??	???
Cumulative effects, regulatory thresholds, emissions growth from development	AENV	Yes (CAS)	Yes	Yes
	AE		Yes	???
Mercury from power plants	AE	Yes	Yes	Yes
Flaring and Venting	EUB	Yes	Yes	Yes
Dust	AAF	Yes (CFO)	Yes	
Odour	AAF	Yes (CFO) No for other odours	Yes	Yes
	AHW		Yes	Yes
Vehicle emissions	I&T	Yes (VET)	Yes	No
	CHR		No	Yes
Indoor air quality	AHW	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mould	I&T	Yes (IAQ)	Yes	Yes
	DTHR		No	Yes
Urban air quality	CAP, CHR	No		No
Cumulative effects of non-regulated development on public lands	SRD	No		No
Wood burning stoves	DTHR	No		Yes
Solid fuel burning	CAP	No		Yes
VOCs	AHW	No		???
Tobacco reduction	DTHR	No		Yes
Vehicle idling	DTHR	No		No

Issue	Department or agency identifying the issue as a priority	Is a CASA team working on this issue now?	Is the department or agency represented on the CASA team?	Is the department or agency working on the issue outside CASA?
Urban air quality	AENV	Not directly		???
	CHR			Yes
Oil and gas development	DTHR	No		Via airshed
Sour gas/ H2S	AE	No		Yes
	DTHR			Via airshed
	AHW			Yes
Greenhouse gases	AE	No		Yes
	SRD			Yes (sequestration)
Jurisdictional issues	AENV	No		Yes
Suite of energy issues (demand side management, alternative energy, efficiency, clean carbon)	AE	No		Yes