



# Minutes

## Prevention/Mitigation Task Group, Meeting #5

Date: November 24, 2014  
Time: 1pm – 3pm  
Place: Teleconference

### In attendance:

Name	Stakeholder group
Atta Atia	Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development
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
Celeste Dempster	CASA

### Action Items:

Action Items	Who	Due
5.1: Celeste will send Pinchin the list of items for discussion so that they can prepare in advance of the December 10, 2014 meeting.	Celeste	ASAP.
5.2: Members should send any editorial comments on the draft report to Celeste in track changes.	All	No later than December 5, 2014.

## 1. Administrative Items

The meeting began at 1pm. Quorum was achieved. Participants introduced themselves and were welcomed to the meeting.

The agenda and meeting objectives were approved.

## 2. Initial Discussion on Draft Report from Pinchin

The purpose of today’s meeting was to discuss initial thoughts on the draft report from Pinchin and to discuss what feedback the task group would like to discuss with Pinchin on December 10, 2014.

The task group began by discussing what worked well about the draft report:

- Liked the way the Plan-Do-Check-Act model was incorporated.
- Liked the way they addressed our feedback on the interim materials.
- Liked the use of Alberta-specific examples and case studies and the emphasis on the Alberta context.
- Liked the use of graphics and illustrations.
- Liked that it was an easy read.
- Liked the Benefits/Considerations summaries in section 5.
- Appendix A2:
  - Liked that previous feedback has been incorporated.
  - Liked the updates to the “Screening and Assessment” section

- Liked the colour coding and reduction in the number of horizontal lines.
- Provides a good 1-page summary.
- Liked Appendix A3.

*Overall, the task group thought that the draft report was on track.*

Next, the task group identified items that they would like to discuss with Pinchin on December 10, 2014. The task group will decide the specific feedback that they would like to give to Pinchin regarding each of these items at the meeting on December 10, 2014. The items for discussion are:

- Including more oil and gas examples, for example:
  - Sundre Petroleum Operators Group
  - Use of stack incineration to remove total reduced sulfur
  - Generally, showing how the oil and gas industry is involved in prevention & mitigation
- Section 5.8:
  - Includes lots of specific examples, but there could potentially be others.
    - Discuss appropriate level of detail for this section, possibly adding wording that not limited to these categories.
- Consistent use of the term ‘odour’ and ‘odorant’
- Section 3:
  - Appendices are listed without describing them or relating them to the report.
- Section 2.3.2 (pg.7):
  - Canadian Shield represents a small percentage of the Alberta landscape. Should it be highlighted?
- Section 4.1 (pg. 12):
  - ‘Weight of evidence’ approach is not explained.
- Figure 4 (pg. 10):
  - Is it necessary to include in text and as an appendix?
- Figures 9 and 10 (pg. 30 and 31):
  - Are not properly cited in-text.
  - AARD can provide the appropriate references as well as a higher quality version of Figure 9.
- Section 5.1 (pg. 18):
  - Buffers are also defined by the Municipal Government Act.
- Figure 5 (pg. 18):
  - Not sure how the figure illustrates safety and risk management buffer.
- The task group noted several spelling errors, typos, etc. The task group would like to ensure that the report will be thoroughly edited to remove these.
- Section 5.6 (top of pg. 27):
  - Is Alberta Air Quality Index meant to read Alberta Air Quality Health Index?
- Section 5:
  - Can we make the Benefits/Considerations summaries into tables?
- Appendix A2:
  - Include arrowheads on the horizontal lines in the peach and blue sections to increase readability.
  - Review title – does it reflect the content of the flow chart?
- Section 2.3.3 (pg. 7):
  - Are there other sensitivity issues that should be included?
  - FIDOL: pg. 7 vs. pg. 8 – defines the ‘O’ as odour offensiveness and then as odour unpleasantness
- Section 5:

- Mentioning at the very beginning of the section if can be applied to source, pathway or receptor.
- Section 5.2.4 (pg. 20):
  - Fourth bullet – Should this read ESRD or EPEA rather than AER?
- Section 5.7.1 (pg. 29):
  - Discuss combustion and raising the temperature of flue gas.
- Figure 3 (pg. 1):
  - Quality of figure.

The task group discussed if additional background information should be included in section 2 such as diffusibility. The task group agreed that the information was discussed in the consultant's report in development from the Odour Assessment Task Group and does not need to be covered.

The task group discussed next steps as follows:

Celeste will use this list to develop the agenda for the meeting on December 10, 2014. The task group decided that they would focus their discussions at the meeting on those items that require a group discussion. The task group noted that some additional items for discussion could arise at the meeting.

***Action Item 5.1: Celeste will send Pinchin the list of items for discussion so that they can prepare in advance of the December 10, 2014 meeting.***

The task group decided that they will capture feedback for Pinchin that they will capture feedback developed at upcoming meeting #6 in a feedback table (similar to feedback table used to provide feedback on interim material). Pinchin will be asked to record how they incorporated the feedback.

The task group discussed how they would manage editorial comments. It was noted that Pinchin does have a 'plain language writer' on staff who was included in their original proposal. *The task group also noted that Pinchin is being paid to edit the document so task group members should not spend a significant amount of time wordsmithing the draft report.* Pinchin has requested that all comments be provided to them in a single document. The task group decided that, in addition to the feedback table with their content-related feedback, they would pass along to Pinchin a single document with any editorial comments in track changes for their consideration. Pinchin will not be asked to record how this feedback is incorporated.

***Action Item 5.2: Members should send any editorial comments on the draft report to Celeste in track changes.***

The task group noted that, according to the contract, the meeting on December 10, 2014 is the last round of feedback before Pinchin finalizes the report. If the task group feels that another round of feedback is required this will need to be negotiated with Pinchin. The task group agreed to discuss this issue on December 10, 2014.

### **3. Meeting Wrap-up**

The next task group meeting will be on December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014 from 10am-3:30pm in Edmonton. The task group will be joined by consultants from Pinchin.

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

The meeting adjourned at 1:55pm.