

Minutes



Odour Assessment Task Group, Meeting #5

Date: May 30, 2014
Time: 9am – 11am
Place: Teleconference

In attendance:

| Name | Stakeholder group |
|---------------------|--|
| Atta Atia | Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development |
| Ron Axelson | Intensive Livestock Working Group |
| Phyllis Chui | Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development |
| Ike Edeogu | Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development |
| Gerald Palanca | Alberta Energy Regulator |
| Tracy Smith | CAPP (Shell) |
| David Spink | Prairie Acid Rain Coalition |
| Abena Twumasi-Smith | Wood Buffalo Environmental Association |
| Celeste Dempster | CASA |

Action Items:

| Action Items | Who | Due |
|--|---------|------------------------|
| 5.1: Celeste will type up the feedback for the consultants discussed at Meeting #5 and send to task group for review. | Celeste | 30 May 2014 |
| 5.2: Members will review action item 5.1 to ensure that feedback for consultants discussed at Meeting #5 has been accurately captured in Celeste's write-up. | All | End of day 1 June 2014 |
| 5.3: Celeste will share the feedback from Meeting #5 on sections 1, 2 and 3 as well as the completed example tool templates with the consultants. | Celeste | 2 June 2014 |
| 5.4: Celeste will poll for dates for meeting #7 in July to review the draft report and determine the format for the 'key' with the consultants. | Celeste | ASAP |

1. Administrative Items

The meeting began at 9:00am. Participants introduced themselves and were welcomed to the meeting. Quorum was achieved.

The agenda and meeting objectives were approved.

2. Review Draft Sections 1, 2 and 3

The task group reviewed draft sections 1, 2 and 3 of the odour assessment report and prepared feedback for the consultants. Prior to today's meeting, task group members submitted written editorial/non-substantive comments that will be passed on to the consultants. Page numbers referenced in the feedback below are referring to this document which contain the group's compiled written comments. The task

group focused on making sure that the content that needs to be included has been properly addressed. The next draft will require significant editing by the consultants. The final report must contain all the relevant information presented in a logical manner and be easy to read.

General Comments on Sections 1, 2, and 3:

- There are several paragraphs that have been plagiarized directly from other documents. These *must* be paraphrased and referenced appropriately. See examples below:
 - Most of the content from bottom of page 7 to page 8 was copied from page 64 of the ‘Good Practice Guide for Assessing and Managing Odour in New Zealand’.
 - Page 15 of the report uses page 41 & 42 of ‘Department for Environment Food Rural Affairs Odour Guidance for local Authorities’.
 - Page 16 and 17 of the report were copied from ‘Techniques for odour and Sampling Area and Fugitive Sources’.
- In general, the task group noticed that there are *many* missing references throughout the document. Missing references decrease the overall credibility of the document. These references must be inserted. The ‘Compiled Comments’ notes many places where references are needed.
- Other jurisdictions, such as Germany, are referenced. There has been work done in Canada that could add to these discussions that and consultant should consider/add these.
- The group would like the term ‘odourant’ to be used to describe ‘odourous compounds’.
- There are some places in the document where the writing is prescriptive. Will provide examples in section-specific comments below.
- Much of the document is written in simple enough language but there are still places where more clarity is needed. The group noted that the consultants may wish to engage with a technical writer to help them with this (or could already be planning to do so?). The group has noted several concrete examples of where more clarity is needed in the ‘Compiled Comments’.
- There are a number of editorial errors in the document that need to be corrected, these have been noted in the ‘Compiled Comments’ and include:
 - Typos
 - Incomplete sentences
 - Unclear sentences
 - Repetition between sections that needs to be consolidated
 - Organization of the document is not always clear and logical (section intros could help to clarify)
- Overall, sections 1, 2 and 3 require significant editing. These sections must include all the relevant information, be easy to read and understand, and flow logically.

Section 1:

- Page 1, paragraph 1: Needs to include that the audience for this document is Alberta. This can likely be added to the very first sentence.
- Page 1, last paragraph, last sentence: This is an example of where the document is prescriptive (see General Comments above). While the content is fine, it needs to be reworded to sound less prescriptive.

Section 2:

- Page 5, paragraph on Odour Intensity: would like to include commentary on the link between odour intensity and persistence. A reference has been included in the ‘Compiled Comments’. The group also noted that simple diagram could be useful to illustrate this concept.
- Page 9, one third of the way down the page: would like to include a discussion of TCEQ guidelines. A reference has been included in the ‘Compiled Comments’.
- Page 9, section 2.4:

- Title should be changed to ‘Composition of Odours’
- First paragraph, fourth line: The sentence beginning with “An average person can discriminate...” does not fit with this section and should be moved to a more appropriate section of section 3.
- In general this section could be made shorter and more to the point.
- Would like commentary to be added about density and buoyancy of odourous emissions as potential considerations.
- Page 11, third paragraph: Remove this paragraph. It is too sector specific and refers to legislation which is out of scope. These first three sections should be focusing on the general properties of odour and explaining them to the reader.
- Section 2: would like to see a short write up on diffusibility included in this section. Diffusibility is discussed on page 13 of the ‘Odour Impact Assessment Handbook’ (editors Belgiorno, Naddeo and Zarra).
- The group also noted that there is an inconsistencies within the document where referring to single compounds and mixtures.

Section 3:

- Section 3 in the draft document differs from the original Table of Contents that was agreed upon:

| Section 3 in the Original Table of Contents | Section 3 in the Document Provided | Differences |
|---|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 3.1 What is odour assessment | 3.1 What is odour assessment | |
| 3.2 Purpose of odour assessment | 3.2 Purpose of odour assessment | |
| 3.3 Types of odour assessment | 3.3 Odour assessment approaches | Modified |
| 3.4 Types of odour sources | | Missing |
| 3.5 Facility type | 3.4 Facility type | Not correctly characterized |

- The new organization of section 3 does not meet the needs of the group and the next draft must be aligned with the original agreed upon table of contents.
- Section 3.3 is missing the discussion on scale of assessment that was agreed upon during the finalization of the table of contents – this is very important for cumulative effects which is an issue in Alberta. See the minutes from that meeting where we finalized the table of contents (pg.2).
- Page 14, Section 3.3.3:
 - Want to see a commentary on the two modelling options: modeling individual compounds and then comparing to odour thresholds then converting to OU, vs. modeling OU directly.
 - The definition of source sampling needs to be clarified and need to elaborate on what is meant by source sampling.
 - The title of section 3.3.3 should read “Odour Emission Rates and Dispersion Modelling”.
- Page 16, Section 3.3.3.2: There are different types of flux chambers, please note the types.
- Page 17, Section 3.3.3.3 & page 18 Section 3.3.4: The document discusses in several places that samples are collected and then sent to an odour panel for analysis – heavy emphasis on the odour panel. This approach is not that common in Alberta – there are many options. This is another example of the document being prescriptive. The document should list and explain the various options without bias or prescribing a particular option. Analytical methods also need to be acknowledged.
- Page 17, Section 3.3.3.3: Include examples of fugitive sources in Alberta.
- Page 19, Section 3.4 (Facility Type): As we discussed when finalizing the table of contents, this section is meant to talk about facility type, i.e. new, expanding, existing, etc. Currently, odour sources have been listed in this section – this is not correct and is too industry specific. Remove current content and replace with content from section 3.3.2.1, 3.3.2.2 and 3.3.2.3.

- Need to insert a section on ‘Odour Sources’ as in the original table of contents. This is meant to list types of sources i.e. point, line, volume, etc. Move section 3.3.3.1, 3.3.3.2 and 3.3.3.3 to this section. Additionally, add a section on volume and line as these have been forgotten. A general description of each ‘type’ should be accompanied by some generic Alberta-related examples. Use the examples that were in the document that was provided to you when we finalized the table of contents. See the minutes from the meeting where we finalized the table of contents (pg.2).
- Page 22, Section 3.7: This section needs more context about when/how baselines are used. It gives the impressions that baselines are always used, when in Alberta they aren’t typically used. This is another example of the document being prescriptive. Needs more context given to what value baselines can add.

3. Review Example of Completed Template

The task group reviewed the example of a completed tool template and prepared feedback for the consultants. Prior to today’s meeting, task group members submitted written editorial/non-substantive comments that will be passed on to the consultants. The task group focused on making sure that the content that needs to be included has been properly addressed.

Example Tool Template Comments:

- Generally, the tool is on the right track and has the right level of information.
- We discussed at the meeting where we finalized the table of contents that: the modelling tools should be organized according to types of models (grid, puff, Gaussian), characterize them in terms of application for odour dispersion modelling and provide examples (ex. CMAQ, AERMOD, CALPUFF). The description should focus on these types of models. Examples of models should focus on models that are sanctioned in Alberta but if there are other good models used in other jurisdictions these should be included. See the minutes from the meeting where we finalized the table of contents (pg.3).
- Under “Quality control required”: highlight the importance of having quality emissions data
- Under “Limitations of Tool use in the context of odour assessment”: include limitations of the tool itself, and limitations with respect to applying it to odours
- As the template is applied to other tools, use the following as guidance:
 - Under the section “Information Output of Tool”, include a generic sentence upfront that describes what the tool is used for, then if there are multiple types of that particular tool include a breakdown of all the outputs. Example: Olfactometry generally does [blank]. Different kinds of olfactometry X, Y and Z give you [blank], [blank] and [blank].
 - Clarify the titles of sections:
 - Applicability of the method to one or more sources of odour
 - Method performance on mixtures
- Under the section “Applicability of the method to one or more sources of odour” it must state specifically to what types of odour sources the tool can be applied in terms of line, point, volume, etc. (or combination of these source types), in order to relate this back to section 3 and the design of the ‘key’.

4. Next Steps

Action Item 5.1: Celeste will type up the feedback for the consultants discussed at Meeting #5 and send to task group for review.

Action Item 5.2: Members will review action item 5.1 to ensure that feedback for consultants discussed at Meeting #5 has been accurately captured in Celeste's write-up.

Action Item 5.3: Celeste will share the feedback from Meeting #5 on sections 1, 2 and 3 as well as the completed example tool templates with the consultants.

If the consultants have any questions about the feedback discussed at Meeting #5, the following protocol will be followed:

- Celeste will answer the consultant's question, if possible.
- If Celeste is not able to answer the question, she will bring it to the task group co-chairs (David and Tracy).
- If the co-chairs are unable to answer the question, it will be brought before the group for consideration.

Action Item 5.4: Celeste will poll for dates for meeting #7 in July to review the draft report and determine the format for the 'key' with the consultants.

5. Prevention/Mitigation Work

The Odour Management Team met on April 30th and would like the Odour Assessment Task Group to take on the work under Prevention/Mitigation that is outlined in the team's project charter. The team felt that it was a natural progression from the work under Odour Assessment and the process and format for the work was very similar. The task group reviewed and discussed an update on this work with highlights as follows:

- The workplan for prevention/mitigation has been finalized by the team and shared with the Odour Assessment Task Group by email.
- The team felt that a representative with land-use planning expertise should be part of this work. Imai Welch, a planner with the City of Edmonton, has agreed to participate.
- On April 30th the team reviewed the interests represented on the Odour Assessment Task Group and thought they matched well with who would need to be included on prevention/mitigation. If a member felt that they were not the person best suited from their organization to take on this work, the task group discussed the possibility of membership tag-teaming or involving a new member if necessary to assist with prevention/mitigation. Members should contact Celeste to discuss.
- Members should expect a continued commitment of one meeting per month.
- Members expressed concerns about workload with the added responsibility of prevention/mitigation work. Members should review their needs with respect to workload and be prepared to discuss at the kick-off meeting on June 18th, 2014.
- The go-ahead for this piece of work is contingent on the CASA Board's June 5th discussion on funding. Celeste will provide the task group with an update on the Board's discussion in the week of June 9th.

The meeting adjourned at 11:00am.