

Minutes



Odour Management Working Group, Meeting #2

Date: Friday, January 25, 2013
Time: 8:00 am to 1:00 pm
Place: CASA Office, Edmonton

In attendance:

| Name | Stakeholder group |
|----------------------|--|
| Keith Denman | Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development |
| Carolyn Kolebaba | Alberta Association of Municipal Districts & Counties |
| Lance Miller | Devon Canada Corporation |
| Al Schulz (by-phone) | Chemistry Industry Association of Canada |
| Janis Seville | The Lung Association |
| David Spink | Prairie Acid Rain Coalition |
| Merry Turtiak | Alberta Health |
| Angella Vertzaya | City of Edmonton |
| Robyn Jacobsen | CASA |
| Celeste Dempster | CASA |
| Struan Robertson | CASA |

Action Items:

| Action Items | Who | Due |
|---|---------|-----------------------------------|
| 2.1: Merry will provide an update about the literature review being done by Alberta Health looking at odour and health. | Merry | For next meeting. |
| 2.2 Celeste will update the straw dog project charter and send to the working group for review. | Celeste | January 31 st by noon. |

1. Administrative Items

The meeting began at 08:10am. Participants introduced themselves and were welcomed to the meeting. Quorum was achieved.

Lance and Carolyn were thanked for making the trip to Edmonton.

The agenda and meeting objectives were approved.

The minutes from meeting #1 were reviewed and approved.

The action items from meeting #1 were updated as follows:

| Action Items | Who | Status |
|---|---------|-----------------------------|
| 1.1: Celeste will search for information on the development of the CASA vision as relates to odour. | Celeste | Completed. See update below |

| | | |
|--|---------|------------|
| 1.2: Celeste will draft a straw dog project charter based on discussions from first meeting. | Celeste | Completed. |
|--|---------|------------|

Additional CASA information from Action Item 1.1

The original CASA vision was:

- *The air will be odourless, tasteless, look clear and have no measurable short or long term effect on people, animals or the environment.*

In 2006, the board raised concerns that the term odourless in the CASA vision was unrealistic and in 2007, CASA’s vision was updated to articulate a more realistic view for odour:

- *The air will have no adverse odour, taste or visual impact and have no measureable short or long term adverse effects on people animals or the environment.*

The working group wondered if any additional information was available about the term “adverse” used in the revised CASA vision. CASA used the same definition of adverse used in the Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act.

- *Adverse means impairment of or damage to the environment, human health or safety or property.*

The group reviewed and confirmed the Ground Rules that were developed at the first meeting.

2. Project Objectives

The group discussed the importance of having clear objectives in place for the project team. CASA’s Guide to Managing Collaborative Processes defines project objectives as:

- *High level statements identifying what the project will accomplish. The objectives should be specific, measureable, realistic and time framed.*

The team considered the need to make the project objectives achievable within an approximate timeframe of 18 months. (The timeframe is up for discussion.)

At the last meeting, the group put forward seven topics as potential objectives. The group discussed each potential objective and considered what the work of the Project Team would look like under that objective keeping in mind the suggested timeframe.

1. Complaints

- Need a standardized approach that can produce results and add credibility to the system. This system should be both reactive and proactive. A process map would be helpful to reinforce the desired approach.
- The current process needs to be clarified and better understood, including clarification of roles and responsibilities.
- There should be better communication with the community and the process should be iterative, but there needs to be an end-point.
- There needs to be communication between government departments.
- A triage system that determines what level of response may be required could be beneficial.
- Establishing levels of complaints, depending on the risks associated with the odour, would be a management tool, triggering what type of response may be necessary. Addressing complaints will require a variety of responses, whether that is prevention, education, enforcement etc. Complaints can also be used to focus and prioritize management efforts as well as identify hotspots.
- As a part of the complaints process, the person receiving the initial complaint should understand how to manage complaints and provide the complainant with all the

information they need through the use of specific messaging. In turn, they should solicit all relevant information needed to follow up on the complaint.

2.Odour Assessment

- The team discussed updating an inventory of tools to assess odours.
 - Review the tools available in Alberta and other jurisdictions.
 - Tools should be practical in terms of human resources and financial cost.
 - Tools could be used for assessing complaints from receptors, managing the source (e.g facilities), monitoring, etc. .
 - Need to provide information on when certain tools are appropriate or not appropriate.
- The team discussed the characterization of odours
 - There should be the ability to identify the source.
 - A means to quantify the odour.
 - Determine the impact of the odour on the individual.
 - Quantify the objective vs. subjective impacts of odour.
- Thresholds and baselines could be used similar to the PM and Ozone Framework.

3.Prevention

- Review best practices in other jurisdictions, considering what worked and what did not work.
- There needs to be better planning at the interface (where residential development meets potential odour sources) as well as personal responsibility for choosing where individuals decide on living.
- Cumulative effects of clustering odour intensive industry in certain areas will need to be addressed. Effective management will need to consider the region as a whole rather than each source individually.
- Prevention and mitigation efforts could consider source, pathway and receptor organized according to:
 - The source (what actually emits the odour).
 - The pathway (what is in between the source and the receptor).
 - The receptor (the person becoming aware of the odour).

4.Enforcement/Role of Regulations

- The group discussed that in some cases regulations are being enforced, but in other cases, the regulation is vague in specific reference to odour, making enforcement difficult. For example, AAQOs are not being exceeded, but people are still complaining about an odour being a nuisance.
- Work under this objective could include doing a review and gap analysis of existing regulations, such as EPEA, Municipalities, The Public Health Act etc.
- The team should consider that enforcement is only one possible outcome of a complaints process.
- One suggestion was for the project team to develop criteria for enforcement.
- There should be transparency around enforcement and the response should be timely.

5.Health

- Health is embedded in all of the objectives and should be taken into consideration when approaching each objective.
- Work under this objective could include reviewing the work that has been done on odour in the broader context and the effects of odour on health.

- How do we “action” existing literature reviews of odour?
- What could be done with this information?
- How will this information fit into the framework?
- (There is work currently being done by Alberta Health.)
- Could use health concerns to prioritize odour management efforts.
- Currently there is no method for individuals to track health impacts from odour.
 - There are examples out there that we can apply to the Alberta situation. (E.g. odour diary).
- Health could turn into a lot of work for the project team, so the scope of this objective should try to be realistic.

Action Item 2.1: Merry will provide an update about the literature review being done by Alberta Health looking at odour and health.

6. Education

- Information to the public should be transparent, timely, responsive, and easy to understand.
- Fundamental awareness material should be made available to help people make informed decisions and could include:
 - Basic factsheets on how odour, as well as how it might impact health.
 - Balanced information.
 - Potential management strategies.
 - Information about what can realistically be expected from odour management (i.e. that there will likely never be ‘zero’ odour)?
- Public consultation could be used to inform the framework and make sure the public’s concerns are met, as well as promoting awareness of what the CASA odour management team is doing Cooperation with Industry associations, Synergy groups, and Airsheds should be encouraged.

7. Continuous Improvement

- The team could develop a five year performance indicator for the overall work of the Project Team as described under the new CASA performance measurement strategy.
 - The performance indicator could act as a report card for the CASA odour framework.
- Promote continuous improvement of the CASA odour framework for example through future audits or reviews.
- Encourage continuous improvement of odour management best practices and approaches to stakeholders.

After discussing each of the seven topics, the secretariat suggested that there was enough information to compose draft objectives for inclusion in the straw dog project charter. These objectives will be prepared for consideration at the working group’s next meeting.

Action Item 2.2 Celeste will update the straw dog and send to the working group for review.

Based on today’s discussion, it was suggested that there may be a need to revisit the project goal that was drafted at meeting #1. One suggestion was that the current project goal could be used as the vision for odour management in Alberta and a more focused goal could be drafted to represent the work of this Project Team.

4.Next Steps

Next meetings:

1. Face-to-Face meeting
 - Tuesday, February 5 @ 11:00 am to 4:00 pm
2. Face-to-Face meeting
 - Friday, February 15 @ 9:00 am to 2:00 pm

Key tasks for the next meeting include:

- Discuss and finalize project objectives.
- Discuss project scope and deliverables.
- Review project goal.

The meeting adjourned at 12:25pm.