



Minutes

Odour Assessment Task Group, Meeting #6

Date: July 16, 2014
Time: 10am – 3:30pm
Place: Shell, 400 4 Ave SW, Calgary

In attendance:

Name	Stakeholder group
Atta Atia	Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development
Phyllis Bielawski	Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development
Anna Bokowa (until 3pm)	Environmental Odour Consulting
Kim Johnson	CAPP (Shell)
Gerald Palanca	Alberta Energy Regulator
Randy Rudolph (until 3pm)	Millennium EMS Solutions Ltd.
David Spink	Prairie Acid Rain Coalition
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 #7.
6.1: Revisit gap analysis of odour assessment in Alberta as a task group once the report is complete.	All	As appropriate.
6.2: Kim will propose an alternate title for the report for the task group's consideration.	Kim	Meeting #7.
6.3: Celeste will compile all feedback on draft 2 of the report and send to Randy and Anna.	Celeste	July 18, 2014.
6.4: Celeste will poll for dates for meeting #7 in late September.	Celeste	ASAP.
6.5: Celeste will confirm with the team the differentiation between odour assessment and prevention/mitigation task groups.	Celeste	August 28, 2014.

1. Administrative Items

David chaired the meeting which began at 10:10am. Participants introduced themselves and were welcomed to the meeting. Kim Johnson will be replacing Tracy Smith as the CAPP representative going forward. Quorum was achieved.

The agenda and meeting objectives were approved.

2. Review Draft Report

The task group reviewed the draft report and provided the following comments to be incorporated into the next draft of the report:

General Comments:

- Need consistency around terminology and their use in this document: Need definitions/common understanding of odour measurement (i.e. olfactometry methods and odour units), measurement, odourants (talking about compounds).
- Need a glossary of acronyms
- Editorial comments: repetition, grammatical and spelling errors

Section 3:

- Section 3.1: add a bit of context with respect to screening – i.e. also potential effects or to verify the emissions
- Add to 3.3.2 a short description of the difference between objective and subjective techniques
- Section 3.3.2 - Subjective odour investigations should include the following:
 - Verification of odours (screening) using human nose observations and wind direction.
 - Would suggest taking a look at the AER inspection tool (Hydrocarbon odour protocol): <http://www.aer.ca/rules-and-regulations/directives/directive-060>
 - Note that subjective odour investigations can also be conducted by regulators and operators (not just residents)
 - Add indirect means of verifying the presence of odours. For example Methane or total hydrocarbon can be used to detect the presence of the plume to verify the presence of the odour. Dispersion modelling can also be done using dominant components (e.g. hydrocarbon). This is currently used in the oil and gas industry.
- Reference acronym FIDOL in section 2.5
 - Described in more detail in 4.4 (after odour index)
- Section 3.4: Sources types – this section is very important and will be the backbone of how you determine what odour assessment tools you use
 - Remove sampling types (will be inserted into 4.1)
 - Simplify, add specificity with respect to definitions
 - Reconsider how use term ‘fugitive’
 - Describe characteristics of each of those types of sources
 - Include facility types as examples that are relevant to Alberta (from OMT brainstorm)
 - Add line, volume, and multi-source (within a facility and within an area with different sources)
- Remove 3.5 (will be rolled into examples)
- Move 3.4 (types of odour sources) to 2.6
- Move 3.7 to section 2

Section 4:

- Add rationale introduction to section 4 about the logic of how section 4 is organized.
- Section 4 will be a short general overview to provide the uninitiated reader with context. It provides organizational structure and logical flow to the tool template section and each subsection in section 4 should link specifically to the corresponding template
- Short overview for each tool should reference its application to different source types (section 3.4) – this will be repetition from the tool template.
 - A little bit more detail about when tools can be used (ex. A point source tool can be used for stack but not a vent)
- Detail should be in the tool template not in section 4
- Incorporate 4.1.1 into 4.1
- Incorporate 4.3.5 into 4.1

- Change 4.1 to ‘Source Sampling Methods’ (NB: for odours and odourants), this is to address concerns about mixing together sampling and measurement
- Add VOC canister sampling under 4.3.4 (intermittent)
- Move draeger tubes to section 4.3.4 (currently in 4.3.6)
- Use a different example in Figure 4.2
- Consider if Airdar is worth mentioning in 4.6
- Limitations of tools should be in the tool template section (not section 4) and should be listed for every tool
- There should be a corresponding tool template for every tool listed in section 4
- Add odour diary to section 4.4 as they relate to assessing odour in order to address concern that the use of complaint data as an odour assessment tool has been omitted

Tools Template Section:

- Tool order should follow structure and order laid out in Section 4, should be able to see an obvious link. There should be a tool template for each item (or items that can be grouped together) listed in Section 4.
- Tool template should have the details on the tools and additional references
 - Move technical details currently in section 4 to tool template
 - Still keep concise, templates may end up being longer
 - Keep writing style consistent with current draft
- Tool template should note if the tool is objective or subjective
- Each template should indicate its application to different source types (section 3.4) in ‘Applicability of the Method to One of More Sources of Odour’. This should repeat what is listed in section 4 to strengthen that link.
- Template should indicate if tool is being used in Alberta
- Need more cross-referencing with main text
- Add section or information about the use(s)/application(s) of the tool e.g. whether for screening, is a short-term and/or long-term method, applies to new, existing, expanding facilities
 - Stronger link between section 3 and 4 and tool section
- Olfactometry: unclear if referring to the instrument or the approach. Needs to be clarified.

While reviewing the draft, the task group also discussed the following:

- The appropriate elements are present in the report to provide an “odour 101”. The next step is to organize components more logically and to find the balance between section 4 and tool section while keeping a consistent level of detail.
- The linkages between sections 3 and 4 and the tool section needs to be explicit.
- The task group discussed the possibility of including a gap analysis of what is currently done in Alberta around odour assessment. The task group noted that this would be a very large undertaking and has already been covered to some extent in the report and may also be covered in part by the work under prevention/mitigation and enforcement/role of regulation. The topic could be revisited and addressed by the task group once the report has been completed.
- The consultants have added a reference to table 3.1
- There was a comment that it would be good to have more detail in section 3.3.3 (assessments based on source sampling) on how to estimate emissions for further analysis. The task group noted that source quantification is a large piece of work on its own and would be difficult to address more fully in this report. Section 4 and the tools section will describe approaches and supply references where users can look for more details on specific tools.

- Section 4 should provide a basic description of the tool and the user should be pointed to the tool template for more detail.
- Schematics/visuals could be used in section 4 to quickly illustrate a concept.
- The task group discussed if section 4 should be reorganized and explored several possibilities. Ultimately, the task group determined that the order should stay as is but an introductory paragraph should be added that explains the logic of the organizational structure of section 4. The tool section will follow the same order as section 4.
- The Yes/No Non-Forced Choice Method discussed in section 4.4.4 is a real method.
- The task group noted that the use of public complaint data in odour assessment needs to be included in the report and ‘odour diaries’ will be added to address this concern.
- There was a comment about including Environmental Impact Assessment modelling requirements in the report. It was noted that there are no guidelines around odour assessment and that current odour regulatory requirements in Alberta is being reviewed by the Enforcement/Role of Regulation Task Group.
- It was noted that Millennium plans to use a technical writer.
- There was a suggestion to reorder the tool section into three categories: emission determination, odour quantification and odour assessment. The task group decided that the tool section should be aligned with section for consistency throughout the report.
- The task group clarified that the references in the tool section are meant to provide detail on how to use a tool, understand results and can reference associated standards and approaches if appropriate.
- The task group noted that change suggestions made at today’s meeting will supersede any written comments that are contradictory.

Action Item 6.1: Revisit gap analysis of odour assessment in Alberta as a task group once the report is complete.

Action Item 6.2: Kim will propose an alternate title for the report for the task group’s consideration.

3. Discuss Format of the ‘Key’

The task group discussed the format for the key:

- The key should achieve:
 - Link the purposes of odour assessment (outlined in section 3.2) with odour assessment tools
 - Transparency (vis-a-vis how/why an odour assessment approach is chosen).
- The task group thought that the key should speak to the considerations that a user would need to consider when they are trying to decide what odour assessment tool to use.
- The key should take a matrix-style approach – the group thought that a flow chart/decision tree approach may be overly prescriptive and complicated.
- The basis for the matrix will be the eight reasons to undertake odour assessment outlined in section 3.2.
 - The task group thought that likely some of these bullets could be consolidated, such as bullet 2 and 3 (i.e. not necessarily one key per reason).
- The task group noted that they would like to see in the matrix: considerations that the user would need to take into account, possible odour assessment tools that can be applied, breaking down the tools that can be applied by the point in the process where they should be applied (i.e. screening level, when more detail is needed).

- It was noted that the majority of tools could be applied to all situations, but perhaps there is a hierarchy where some are more appropriate than others.
- The task group noted that cost was an important consideration.

4. Timelines and Next Steps

The task group discussed next steps as follows:

Task	Timeline
Celeste will provide Randy and Anna with the feedback from today's meeting as well as the compiled written comments.	By Friday July 18 th
Randy and Anna will prepare two keys for the task group to review (one source and one ambient).	Within two weeks – July 30, 2014
The task group will review the keys and provide comment.	One week
Randy and Anna will prepare and deliver a presentation for the OMT that provides an overview of the report (high level), explain the logic of the components of the report, and present the two keys that are ready.	August 28, 2014 (Calgary)
Randy and Anna will prepare draft 3 of the report and the remaining keys	Early September 2014
The task group will meet to review draft three of the report	Late September
Randy and Anna will finalize the report	Late September/early October

Action Item 6.3: Celeste will compile all feedback on draft 2 of the report and send to Randy and Anna.

Action Item 6.4: Celeste will poll for dates for meeting #7 in late September.

5. Discuss Pilot Testing the 'Key'

The task group discussed that the discussion on pilot testing will need to be carried forward until the report and keys are both ready. Members noted that likely testing amongst the stakeholder through the task group and team's networks will be sufficient.

6. Meeting Wrap-up

The task group noted that it has been very confusing to have the prevention/mitigation and odour assessment work under the umbrella of the 'Odour Assessment Task Group'. For logistical purposes, members would like to create a Prevention/mitigation Task Group (there would be no membership changes).

Action Item 6.5: Celeste will confirm with the team the differentiation between odour assessment and prevention/mitigation task groups.

The objectives for meeting #7 are:

- To review draft 3 of the odour assessment report and provide any feedback.

The Complaints Task Group is undertaking a piece of work to help telephone operators illicit information about odour from complainants and requested if the Odour Assessment Task Group had any information that might be useful. Members noted that the basic information in the odour assessment report about tone and intensity could be of use.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30pm.