



Minutes

Odour Assessment Task Group, Meeting #8

Date: October 1, 2014

Time: 10am-3:30pm

Place: CASA office, Edmonton

In attendance:

Name	Stakeholder group
Atta Atia	Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development
Ron Axelson	Intensive Livestock Working Group
Phyllis Bielawski	Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development
Ike Edeogu	Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development
Kim Johnson	CAPP (Shell)
Gerald Palanca	Alberta Energy Regulator
David Spink	Prairie Acid Rain Coalition
Abena Twumasi-Smith (by phone)	WBEA
Celeste Dempster	CASA

Action Items:

Action Items	Who	Due
4.1: The task group will discuss how to pilot the key with government and industry stakeholders.	All	Meeting #10.
6.1: Revisit gap analysis of odour assessment in Alberta as a task group once the report is complete.	All	Meeting #10.
8.1: Ike will provide specific wording and references related to persistence and diffusibility in relation to citing Alberta-specific work.	Ike	ASAP.
8.2: David will provide additional wording around section 4.5.3 comment.	David	ASAP.
8.3: David will provide new wording around Section 6.4.1 calculation comment.	David	ASAP.
8.4: Celeste will determine if the report has already been reviewed by a technical editor.	Celeste	ASAP.
8.5: Phyllis will provide additional examples of missing quotations marks in the report.	Phyllis	ASAP.
8.6: Celeste will poll for dates for meeting #9 in the week of October 6 th 2014.	Celeste	ASAP.
8.7: Celeste will poll for dates for meeting #10 in November 2014.	Celeste	Post meeting #9.

1. Administrative Items

Kim chaired the meeting which began at 10:00am. Participants introduced themselves and were welcomed to the meeting. Quorum was achieved.

The minutes from meeting #6 and #7 were reviewed and approved. The action items from meeting #6 and #7 were updated as follows:

Action Items	Who	Status
4.1: The task group will discuss how to pilot the key with government and industry stakeholders.	All	Carry forward.
6.1: Revisit gap analysis of odour assessment in Alberta as a task group once the report is complete.	All	Carry forward.
6.2: Kim will propose an alternate title for the report for the task group's consideration.	Kim	Complete.
6.3: Celeste will compile all feedback on draft 2 of the report and send to Randy and Anna.	Celeste	Complete.
6.4: Celeste will poll for dates for meeting #7 in late September.	Celeste	Complete.
6.5: Celeste will confirm with the team the differentiation between odour assessment and prevention/mitigation task groups.	Celeste	Complete.
7.1: Celeste will contact the consultants to emphasize the need for fulsome referencing in the next version of the odour assessment draft report.	Celeste	Complete.

The task group briefly noted that they hoped to finish their work by the end of November 2014, but will revisit overall timelines after providing their last round of feedback to the consultants.

2. Review Draft 3 of Consultant's Report

The task group noted that this will be the last round of feedback before finalizing the report. The purpose of this agenda idea is to provide specific feedback to the consultants to incorporate into the final version of the report. Members were asked to focus their comments on showstoppers ie. anything that they are not able to live with.

The task group began by having an overarching discussion about the report:

- The task group noted that the purpose of the report is to provide an 'odour assessment 101'.
- The task group noted that the report will be included in the Good Practice Guide (GPG). The audience for the GPG is government and industry but should be easily understood by a member of the public (i.e. will be written in plain language for a non-technical person).
- The GPG will also unify all the work of the various task groups and put into the context of odour management.
- The task group noted that the overall style of the report can be improved (see comments below).
- The report must serve the audience of the GPG.
- The task group noted that when the Odour Management Team is assembling the GPG they will be hiring an editor.
- The task group noted that some people may wish to refer specifically to the odour assessment report.

The task group began by reviewing the 'key' (draft 4). Members provided the following general comments and discussion highlights in relation to the 'key':

- Overall, the task group liked the key and thought that it was an excellent piece of work.
- Some task group members noted that they had gone through the steps outlined in the key using some simple scenarios and it worked.
- The task group noted that the key will be included in the Good Practice Guide.
- The task group felt that the format of the key has been improved from the last version.

- The task group noted that the key is a very important piece and provides context for the detailed report.
- The task group noted that the ‘key’ is critical but requires some prior knowledge to be fully understood.
- The task group discussed re-ordering the columns, but decided that this wouldn’t add additional value to the table and the user could ultimately focus first on whatever column they wanted.

The task group then prepared specific feedback for the consultants on the ‘key’ (draft 4):

- General:
 - Change the title of ‘key’ to “The CASA Odour Assessment Guide” (from now on it will be referred to as the ‘guide’ rather than the ‘key’).
 - Change all references to the ‘key’ to ‘guide’.
 - Reference/introduce the guide in Section 1.0 of the report and add the guide to the report as an appendix.
 - Increase connectivity between the guide and the report. In document, link the “Tool Type” and “Tool” listed in the Table (on page 2 and 3) to the corresponding headings in the report Section 6. I.e. if the user clicked on a Tool in the guide it would take them to the appropriate tool overview template.
- Purpose:
 - Add language that speaks to this point: It is recommended to read section 2 and 3 of the report before using the guide as it provides important backgrounder knowledge that assists with understanding.
- Use of the key:
 - Insert a reference to the glossary here.
- Who should use the key?:
 - Change “or the provincial government reviewing legislative options” to “the provincial, and regulators.”
- Suggested Steps:
 - Ensure that language used aligns with the headings in the report for easy reference.
 - Ensure that consistent language is used within the table itself.
- Table (page 2 and 3):
 - Column “Level of Detail”:
 - Use ‘high’, ‘medium’ and ‘low’ instead of ‘detail’ and ‘screen’. Provide context in the glossary. I.e. a low level of detail provides screening information that can be used to determine if there is an issue.
 - Column “Odour Episode Characterization”:
 - Add term to glossary and provide context for ‘high’ and ‘low’
 - Add links from the column headers to the glossary terms. I.e. if I clicked on “Level of Detail” I would be taken to that term in the glossary.
 - Row “Community survey”: It’s classification as ‘Yes’ under “Quantification” and points to Footnote A which indicates that the community survey uses field olfactometers. This conflicts with messaging in the section 4 and 6 where community survey is described as having trainer observers (not trained field inspectors) to rate the intensity of odour using tools like an odour wheel or odour descriptors. The guide and the report need to be aligned.
 - “Dispersion Model” section:
 - AERScreen, CMAQ, CFD, and Receptor modelling to do have a corresponding tool template in Section 6. Add corresponding sections for these tools in Section 6.
 - Page 3:

- Under “Odour Episode Characterization” column, “Locations” column is different than on page 2. Remove “single”.
- Throughout the table:
 - Use ‘N/A’ rather than ‘No’
 - Use ‘✓’ (checkmark symbol) rather than ‘Yes’
- Glossary:
 - Add the term ‘Odorant’

Next, the task group reviewed the report (draft 3). Members provided the following general comments and discussion highlights in relation to the report:

- The task group discussed removing section 3.3.1 but ultimately decided to leave it in as some users may choose to only read the overview section.
- The task group updated how fugitive emissions is discussed in the report.
- The task group changed the placement of Odour Index in the report.

The task group then prepared specific content-related feedback for the consultants on the draft report (draft 3):

- General:
 - Change title from “Inventory of Odour Assessment Tools and Practices” to “review of Odour Assessment Tools and Practices for Alberta”
 - Add acronym list after Glossary (see Glossary comments below)
 - Throughout the document, need to use the terms “odour” and “odorant” consistently
 - Change Appendix A to “The CASA Odour Assessment Guide”
- Glossary:
 - Move this section to just before the “List of Figures”
 - Update “Fugitive emissions” as follows: Unintended emission from any openings, such as doors, windows, trucks waiting to load or unload odorous materials, valves, phalanges, pumps. Fugitive emissions can be parts of point, area or volume sources.
- Section 1:
 - Add reference/introduction to the guide, including in bulleted list
 - Update last paragraph as follows: “The recommendations provided within the sections are not intended...” (underline indicates update)
- Section 2.1:
 - Paragraph 6, 3rd sentence: Here you use the term “Acclimatization” but you use the term “adaption” in the glossary. Need consistency in use of terms.
- Section 2.2:
 - Paragraph 6 (beginning with “For odours, n ranges...”): state this point even more explicitly
 - Add a paragraph on persistence and diffusibility
 - It was noted that specific Alberta work can be cited here.
 - At the end of this Section add a short paragraph about odour index (see comments on Section 6.4.1)
- Section 2.6:
 - Add – Fugitive emissions can be considered point, area, volume or line sources depending on the domain being considered.
 - Move all material related to fugitive emissions from 2.6.3 into 2.6. Additionally provide examples of point, area and line fugitive emissions.
 - Ex. Example of a line fugitive emission- Rail car or trucking
- Section 2.6.1:

- Paragraph 3, just after bulleted list: Remove “Alberta legislation” and replace with “EPEA and approvals granted under EPEA”
- Section 2.7.2:
 - Change “Effect on Emissions” to “Effect of Emissions”
 - Change “Effect on Transmission and Dispersion” to “Effect of Transmission and Dispersion”
 - Both the headers referenced in the two bullets above are misplaced. Add them as sub-headers 2.7.1.1 and 2.7.1.2 under “2.7.1 Meteorology”
- Section 2.7.3
 - Rectify inconsistency between this section and Figure 2.2
- Section 3.2:
 - Clarify the wording of the last bullet and apply this wording to the guide (in addition to applying it here in section 3.2)
- Section 3.3.2:
 - Some of the examples of objective and subjective technique cited are inconsistent with the way those tools are described later (ex. Community odour surveys)
- Section 4.3.6:
 - Remove last sentence of paragraph 3 and replace with “However, they can be used as a screening tool”.
 - Example of inconsistency – it is discussed again on page 74
- Section 4:
 - Each section in Section 4 should reference the corresponding section in Section 6
- Section 4.1:
 - Paragraph 2: mention high flow sampler DIAL laser
- Section 4.3.2: - not consistent
 - Section 4.3.2.1 – should read ‘source monitoring’ not ‘emissions monitoring’
- Section 4.3.4 and Section 6.3.4
 - Include discussion on canister sampling
- Section 4.4.2:
 - Last paragraph:
 - Change “FIDOL is not a” to “FIDOL is a”
 - Explain why FIDOL is not being discussed further.
- Section 4.5.2:
 - The bulleted list is cumbersome to read – related to formatting style (see below).
- Section 4.5.3:
 - Last sentence: Cite Ontario as Alberta does not have a recommended p value.
- Section 5:
 - This entire section needs to be proofread – see comments related to Referencing below.
 - Not all references listed here are actually cited in the text.
 - The Good Practice Guide for assessing and managing odour in New Zealand needs to be included in the list.
- Section 6:
 - Include diagrams for lung sampling method, source sampling, and static hood (similar to 6.3.1)
- Section 6.1.1:
 - Under “Limitations”: highlight transportation as a limitation, relates to point from “Description of Tool”, “Dilution Sampling Method”, last paragraph about the acceptable time between sample collection and evaluation.
- Section 6.2.2:
 - Reference the specific section the reader should look at.

- Section 6.3.5:
 - Change title to “Passive Monitoring” and add a tool template for this item – as it is used as a screening tool (see comments above from section 4.3.6)
- Section 6.4.1:
 - Change title to “Triangular Odour Bag Method”
 - The task group agreed not to include “Odour Index” in the tool section but rather to include in Section 2.2 as an analysis tool (similar to FIDOL).
 - Under “Information Output of Tool”:
 - The calculation provided gives intensity and should not be included here.

Action Item 8.1: Ike will provide specific wording and references related to persistence and diffusibility in relation to citing Alberta-specific work.

Action Item 8.2: David will provide additional wording around section 4.5.3 comment.

Action Item 8.3: David will provide new wording around Section 6.4.1 calculation comment.

The task group noted that the consultants were planning to hire a technical editor to review the document and wondered if this task had already been completed.

Action Item 8.4: Celeste will determine if the report has already been reviewed by a technical editor.

As noted in the opening comments, the task group agreed that the overall readability could still be improved. If the technical edit has not already occurred, the task group proposed collecting specific examples where readability in the report could be improved that will be shared with the technical editor.

The task group provided specific notes related to the overall ‘readability’ of the report:

- Define an acronym the first time that it is used, then in subsequent references use the acronym only
- Examples of ‘unclear’ writing:
 - Section 2.1, paragraph 7
 - Section 2.4, paragraph 2
 - Page 12, just after header Effect of Transport and Dispersion, paragraph 1
 - Section 3.1, paragraph 7
- Examples of writing that could be simplified and condensed:
 - Section 3.1
 - On page 16, make the three paragraphs after “Assessment can be made for...” into a bulleted list.
- Examples of repetition:
 - Section 4.3.4, paragraph 2 and Section 4.3.5, paragraph 2
- Formatting style:
 - Section 4.5.2: The bulleted list is cumbersome to read
- Referencing in text:
 - Inconsistent use of referencing:
 - Section 2.3, last two bullets at the top of page 7: The full references should be in Section 5 with an in-text references used here (as in the preceding bullets)
 - Section 4.3.1, paragraph 1: improper in-text referencing
 - Missing references:
 - Section 2.1 is missing *numerous* references

- Missing quotation marks (i.e. there is a direct citation with an in-text reference but no quotation marks)
 - Top of page 4, Defra (2010) reference
- Referencing Section 5
 - Misspelled references:
 - Section 5 – “Belgiomo” should read “Belgiorno”
 - Not in alphabetical order:
 - Natural Resources Canada
 - Discrepancies between Section 5 and in-text references
 - Ex. Jeng, Scotten and Burns – Figure 4.3 cites it as 2011 and Section 5 says 2012
 - Referencing websites:
 - If the website is likely to change need to include the date it was accessed (unlike if it’s a link to a paper or a document).
- Typos:
 - P.20, paragraph 2: Change “odurants” to “odorant”
 - Section 4.2: there is a random _
- Inconsistent terminology:
 - Section 4.1, paragraph 21: “Fugitive” is not a source type. Correct this sentence.
 - See other specific examples under General and Section 2.1
- Inconsistencies in information:
 - See example under Section 4.3.6 above
 - See example from 3.3.2
- Inaccurate/missing references to other sections:
 - Last sentence of 4.2.2: references section 4.2.6 – there is no such section.
 - Section 4 references to Section 6 – inconsistent (see Section 4 comments above)

Action Item 8.5: Phyllis will provide additional examples of missing quotations marks in the report.

The addition of the Air Quality Health Index (AQHI) to the report was discussed but is an outstanding item.

The task group completed their review up to page 74 of the report and did not complete their review of the entire report.

The task group agreed to complete the review at a 2 hour teleconference.

Action Item 8.6: Celeste will poll for dates for meeting #9 in the week of October 6th 2014.

The task group agreed that the agenda items that were not completed today will be revisited at meeting #10 (full day meeting in Edmonton).

Action Item 8.7: Celeste will poll for dates for meeting #10 in November 2014.

3. Meeting Wrap-up

The task group reviewed the action items from this meeting.

Objectives for meeting #9:

- Provide any remaining content-related comments (i.e. show stoppers) to the consultants.
- Discuss the readability of the report.

The meeting adjourned at 3:35pm.