



# Minutes

## Prevention/Mitigation Task Group, Meeting #4

Date: October 23, 2014  
Time: 9am – 11am  
Place: Teleconference

### In attendance:

Name	Stakeholder group
Atta Atia	Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development
Ron Axelson	Intensive Livestock Working Group
Ike Edeogu	Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development
Kim Johnson	CAPP (Shell)
James Jorgensen	Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development
David Spink	Prairie Acid Rain Coalition
Imai Welch	City of Edmonton
Robyn Jacobsen	CASA
Celeste Dempster	CASA

### Action Items:

Action Items	Who	Due
4.1: Celeste will provide Pinchin with documents on CASA's CFO Project Team.	Celeste	ASAP.
4.2: Celeste will send Pinchin the feedback on interim materials developed at meeting #4.	Celeste	ASAP.
4.3: Celeste will request that Pinchin respond to the feedback on interim materials developed at meeting #4.	Celeste	ASAP.
4.4: Celeste will poll for a 2 hour teleconference in the week of November 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2014.	Celeste	ASAP.

## 1. Administrative Items

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

The agenda and meeting objectives were approved.

## 2. Review 'Odour Management Tools Chart'

At the kick-off meeting with Pinchin the task group asked that, as Pinchin develops the draft report, Pinchin provide the Odour Management Tools Chart as well as any other interim material that is available in mid-October 2014. The purpose of providing these interim materials is for the task group to provide initial feedback and to help ensure that the draft report is on target.

Members provided the following general comments and discussion highlights on the Odour Management Tools Chart:

- Overall, the task group liked the chart and felt that it was on track.

The task group prepared specific feedback for Pinchin on the Odour Management Tools Chart as follows:

- \*The group was initially confused as to whether the Chart related to the 7 areas of work outlined in section 2.2 or section 4 of the report. The task group concluded that it relates to section 4. It needs to be made clear that this report is only focused on item 4 (prevention/mitigation) from the 7 areas of work in section 2.2. This should be stated explicitly and also be reflected in the headers of section 3 and 4. The task group provided additional related feedback when they reviewed the Report Outline. \*All related comments are marked with an \*.
  - The task group liked how the chart captured the linkages between the 7 areas of work.
- The task group had a lengthy discussion about the first diamond in Screening & Assessment labelled “Potential for adverse effects” and its relation to the last box “Probability for adverse effects”. The task group would like to see comments/suggestions/updates from Pinchin based on the following discussion:
  - The task group noted that the starting point of the chart needs to be relevant for prevention (ex. a proposed facility) or mitigation (ex. an existing facility that has received many complaints).
  - The task group discussed that the first step is likely focused on the potential for odour and if the activity in question is likely to produce an odour (rather than an adverse effect). Then one would undertake an odour assessment to determine the probability of an adverse effect. For example, an odorous activity in an isolated area would have little probability of an adverse whereas a slight odorous activity in an urban setting would have a high probability of an adverse effect.
  - The task group noted that when considering the first diamond and the potential for producing odour, there are likely three outcomes: 1. No potential for odour; 2. Likely potential (so would conduct an odour assessment and determine if potential is likely or not likely); and 3. Not likely, but potential (so probably wouldn’t do a lot of odour assessment, or could come to this point if the odour assessment determines that potential is not likely but the facility wants to be a good neighbour).
  - If the answer to the first diamond (as provided in the interim material) is ‘not likely’ why does the arrow lead to prevention and mitigation actions?
- \*Change title of the chart to “Odour Prevention & Mitigation Planning Chart”
  - The task group thought that this better reflected the link between the chart (ie. section 3 of the report) and section 4 of the report (and specifically section 4.2
- Within the “Odour Assessment” dotted rectangle:
  - In reference to the boxes “Qualitatively Rank Odorous Contributors” and “Quantify Odorous Emissions”: odour assessment can be both quantitative and qualitative. These two boxes should be on the same ‘level’ and both feed together into the box “Assess adverse effects”.
- In Prevention & Mitigation section:
  - The task group interpreted the chart to read that the first ‘row’ of tools are working in parallel (ie. You can use one or multiple tools and be able to move onto the next ‘row’). The second row must be completed in serial. Is this the correct interpretation? Is there any way to provide additional clarification in the chart?
- Why is the “Monitoring & Review” box under Prevention & Mitigation and not under Monitoring & Evaluation?
- For overall readability, consider using colour-coded bars to separate the sections rather than lines. It was sometimes confusing to follow the lines between the sections.

### 3. Review Additional Materials

In addition to the Odour Management Tools Chart, Pinchin also provided the report outline and Prevention & Mitigation Tools diagram. The task group prepared the following feedback on these interim materials:

Members provided the following general comments and discussion highlights on the Report Outline:

- Generally the task group thought that the report outline was on track
- The task group discussed whether an overview of CASA should be included in section 1.1 and decided that it should be included for context so that the document can ‘stand alone’.
- The EPEA definition of “adverse” used in the report comes directly from the OMT’s Project Charter. This definition of adverse is also used in CASA’s vision. The Project Charter states that the work of the team will focus on odours that are adverse.

The task group prepared specific feedback for Pinchin on the Report Outline as follows:

- Section 2.0:
  - Last paragraph: include definition of ‘adverse’ from EPEA - “impairment of or damage to the environment, human health or safety or property”. The work of the parent Odour Management Team is focused on odour that are ‘adverse’ as defined by EPEA.
- \*Section 2.2:
  - For flow, suggest including this information in Section 1.0 instead in order to provide the full contextual picture of CASA’s Odour Management Team.
  - Note that the CASA Odour Management Working Group (OMWG) developed the Odour Management Team’s Project Charter. The Odour Management Working Group was subsequently disbanded and the Odour Management Team was formed to undertake the work outlined in the Project Charter.
- \*Section 3.0:
  - Change title to “Odour Prevention & Mitigation Planning Chart”
- \*Section 4.0:
  - Suggest changing title to “Odour Prevention & Mitigation Planning, Implementation and Evaluation”
- Section 4.2.1:
  - Include as a consideration that the process that is illustrated in the “Odour Prevention & Mitigation Planning Chart” is a process that is revisited on an ongoing basis and that can have different results for different conditions (ex. normal, upset, start up).
- Section 4.4:
  - The task group discussed continuous improvement and thought it should include evaluating the effectiveness of your plan once it has been implemented including checking for gaps to see that you haven’t missed anything. The task group also suggested including the ISO14001 “Plan, do, check, act” model.
- Section 5.0:
  - Clearly state that source and pathway tools will be covered in section 5.1 to 5.8 and that receptor tools will be covered in section 5.9
  - The task group noted that they anticipate that the subsections will include Alberta examples of when these tools have been used.
- Section 5.6:
  - Reference “shelterbelt” as a key word as this is a commonly used term in Alberta
- Section 6.0:
  - The task group anticipates that the case studies will help to illustrate the tools outlined in section 5.

- The task group explored the idea of including the CASA Confined Feeding Operations Project Team’s odour work as a case study. Industry and government worked together to develop an Odour Management Plan template. The task group was unsure if this would fit best as an example in section 5.3 or as a case study in section 6.
- Section 6.1:
  - Liked the layout of the case study

***Action Item 4.1: Celeste will provide Pinchin with documents on CASA’s CFO Project Team.***

The task group prepared specific feedback for Pinchin on the Prevention & Mitigation Tools diagram as follows:

- The task group liked the idea of using graphics but would like to see more “Alberta” graphics.
  - Example – source: use several graphics such as a pumpjack, tank or someone spreading manure
  - Example – pathway: an open field would be a common Alberta landscape
  - Example receptor: a graphic that shows both urban and rural Alberta
- The task group wasn’t sure what was meant by back-end engineering controls. Will a definition be provided? If not, would like a definition.
- The task group discussed the box “Warning Signage”. This comes from the new section 5.9 of the report. The task group discussed if odour event notifications would be included in this category. Alberta has an Air Quality Health Index that provides odour messaging about the likelihood of an odour being present.
- Generally, the task group noted that the report should be written in plain language. Every attempt should be made to describe technical terms in plain language.

## 4. Next Steps

The task group outlined the following next steps:

<i>Next Steps</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
Celeste will send Pinchin feedback developed under items 2 and 3 at meeting #4	ASAP
Pinchin will respond to task group feedback describing how feedback has/has not been incorporated	November 12, 2014
Pinchin will deliver draft report	November 12, 2014
Teleconference to discuss task group’s initial response to the draft report and to discuss any show stoppers in advance of meeting with Pinchin	Week of November 24, 2014
Meeting with Pinchin to review draft report and provide feedback	December 10, 2014 (Edmonton)

***Action Item 4.2: Celeste will send Pinchin the feedback on interim materials developed at meeting #4.***

***Action Item 4.3: Celeste will request that Pinchin respond to the feedback on interim materials developed at meeting #4.***

***Action Item 4.4: Celeste will poll for a 2 hour teleconference in the week of November 24<sup>th</sup>, 2014.***

## 5. Meeting Wrap-up

The task group reviewed the action items from today’s meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 10:40am.