

Minutes



Odour Management Team, Meeting #8

Date: April 30, 2014
Time: 10am- 3:30pm
Place: CASA, Edmonton, Alberta

In attendance:

Name	Stakeholder group
Tanya Moskal-Hébert	Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development
Tracy Smith	CAPP (Shell)
Ann Baran	Southern Alberta Group for the Environment
Janis Seville	The Lung Association
Joseph Hnatiuk	Canadian Society of Environmental Biologists
Gord Start	Alberta Forestry Processors Association (Hinton Pulp)
David Spink	Prairie Acid Rain Coalition
Keith Denman	Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development
Carolyn Kolebaba	Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties
Humphrey Banack	Alberta Federation of Agriculture
Al Schulz	Chemistry Industry Association of Canada
Merry Turtiak (PM only)	Alberta Health
Celeste Dempster	CASA
Robyn Jacobsen	CASA

Action Items:

Action Items	Who	Due
5.2: Keith will provide an overview of Three Creeks, Alberta situation when it is appropriate with the team's needs.	Keith	Meeting #9.
8.1: Joseph will follow-up with his federal contact regarding the Eco-Action Community Funding Program.	Joseph	Meeting #9.
8.2: The team will invite the AER to give a presentation on the odour-related changes to Directive 60.	Celeste	As time allows.
8.3: David will follow-up with AER to reconsider providing funding to the team.	David	ASAP.
8.4: Celeste will confirm with the Odour Assessment Task Group regarding taking on Prevention/Mitigation work.	Celeste	ASAP.
8.5: Celeste will update the Prevention/Mitigation workplan and send to the task group electronically for final approval.	Celeste	ASAP.
8.6: Team members will coordinate representatives for membership on the Enforcement/Role of Regulation Task Group.	Various, see item 6	16 May 2014.
8.7: Celeste will update the Enforcement/Role of Regulation workplan and send to the task group electronically for final approval.	Celeste	ASAP.
8.8: Celeste will poll for dates for meeting #9 in mid-June.	Celeste	ASAP.

1. Administrative Items

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

The agenda and meeting objectives were approved.

The minutes from meeting #7 were reviewed. There were some typos. With that change, the minutes were approved. The action items from meeting #7 were updated as follows:

Action Items	Who	Status
5.2: Keith will provide an overview of Three Creeks, Alberta situation when it is appropriate with the team's needs.	Keith	Carry forward to meeting #9.
6.1: Celeste will investigate additional details about Environment Canada's EcoAction Community Funding Program.	Celeste	Complete. See additional info.
6.2: Each task group will outline their needs around engagement with complainants and the key questions they would like to ask.	All task groups	Complete. Item 7 on today's agenda.
7.1: Celeste will prepare a straw dog for each of the four topics reviewed at meeting #7 based on discussions.	Celeste	Complete. Two will be discussed today, two at meeting #9.
7.2: Celeste will update Handouts 1 and 2 which illustrate the team's workplan.	Celeste	Complete. See additional info.
7.3: Celeste will provide some ideas on a cost estimate for designing and printing the Good Practice Guide.	Celeste	Complete.
7.4: Celeste will poll for dates in April for meeting #8.	Celeste	Complete.

Additional Information:

Action Item 6.1: There was no additional info on their website regarding whether a portion of a project could be funded. Celeste has tried to contact them and is waiting to hear back. Grants are awarded Nov 1, which likely won't work with the team's timelines.

Action Item 7.3: \$15,000 to assemble the Good Practice Guide would be reasonable, not including printing. The team is not sure how many copies will need to be printed, but this will be an important consideration.

Action Item 8.1: Joseph will follow-up with his federal contact regarding the Eco-Action Community Funding Program.

2. Updates

CASA Update:

- The next CASA Board meeting will be June 5th in Calgary. The CASA 20th year celebration will take place on June 6th in Calgary.
- The Odour Management Team will be providing an update at this meeting to the Board on progress to date and next steps to action the remaining areas of work in the project charter. The update will be discussed further under agenda item 8.

3. Final Report and Recommendations from the AER Peace River Panel

The team had the opportunity to share their thoughts on the *Final Report and Recommendations from the AER Peace River Panel* and discussed implications for the work of the team:

- Many of the topics covered in this report are relevant to the team's work.
- The report recommendations highly relate to the work of the Complaints Task Group. For example, they are planning to do a study on complaints.
- The report points out that the current framework is insufficient to manage hydrocarbon odours as well as that the AAQOs are not adequate to manage odours.
- The report (on page 48) has a recommendation that ESRD investigate the feasibility of defining an ambient odour objective for Alberta based on a perception threshold. The ESRD Minister has made a public commitment to this recommendation. This recommendation overlaps with the work of the Odour Assessment Task Group as well as Enforcement/Role of Regulation.
- The report highlights some regulatory gaps and lack of enforcement as well as cumulative health effects.
- Industry is interested to see how this all links to the Joint Oil Sands Monitoring (JOSM).
- The report did not include ecosystem effects.
- The report refers to our work and AER highlights that they are participating in our work.

Action Item 8.2: The team will invite the AER to give a presentation on the odour-related changes to Directive 60.

Action Item 8.3: David will follow-up with AER to reconsider providing funding to the team.

4. Task Group Updates

The team heard an update on the work of the task groups:

Odour Assessment Task Group:

- The task group had a kick-off meeting with the successful consultants who will be conducting an inventory and analysis of odour assessment tools/practices and their applicability to the Alberta context. This work is expected to be complete in September.

Health Task Group:

- The task group is focused on two pieces of work:
 - Stream 1 - A backgrounder about odour and health:
 - The task group has prepared a table of contents and is currently drafting the backgrounder, which will then be circulated to the team for feedback (likely end of June).
 - Stream 2 - Tool(s) for individuals to track the health-related impacts of odour
 - The task group has begun designing this tool. They are considering the creation of an app.
- The task group will meet next on June 12th when they will review the backgrounder and continue designing the tool.

The team discussed the update from the Health Task Group with highlights as follows:

- Phyllis (from the Odour Assessment Task Group) and Janis were involved in the development the AQHI app and may be able to offer advice.
- The group should also be aware of an app called “Breathe” being developed in Ontario for asthma that links air quality and asthma action.
- It will be important to consider confidentiality while developing the tool.
 - The group has had an initial consultation with the legal department at Alberta Health and will revisit the issue once they have some more concrete ideas.
- The group will need to coordinate with the Complaints Task Group.

- The self-reporting nature of the tool will introduce a certain amount of subjectivity to the information.
- The team reviewed and confirmed the decision that animal health is out of scope for this piece of work.

Complaints Task Group:

- The background report compiling information about the different groups that handle odour complaints is complete and the task group used this document as the foundation for the day’s discussion. This report is available on the team login page. The task group then used this information to identify and discuss strengths and gaps in the current odour complaint landscape in Alberta.
- At their next meeting on May 13th the task group will group the strengths and gaps thematically, prioritize where work should be focused, and discuss next steps for tool development.

With respect to timelines, all task groups are aware of the team’s expectation that work be completed by the end of 2014. The Odour Assessment Task Group anticipates completing their report in September 2014 and the Health and Complaints Task Groups should have a better idea of specific timelines after their next meetings. The team can assist the task groups by continuing to provide timely feedback.

5. Finalize Workplan: Prevention/Mitigation

The team discussed their current budget and how funding availability will affect actioning the remaining areas of work in the project charter. The team developed three funding scenarios that will be put before the Board during the June update. The scenarios are based on the following assumptions:

- The current budget (\$165,000) is only sufficient to complete the work under complaints, odour assessment, and health as well as to assemble the Good Practice Guide.
- Under the current funding scenario there is no money available to complete work under prevention/mitigation or enforcement/role of regulation.
- No money will be spent to complete the work under Education/Communication/Awareness or Continuous Improvement.
- No money has been allocated for engagement or printing.
- *Scenario #3 is the strongly preferred path forward.*

Summary of Budget Scenarios:

	Scenario #1: Status Quo	Scenario #2: “DIY”	Scenario #3: Consultants
Prevention/Mitigation	\$0	\$10,000	\$30,000
Enforcement/Role of Regulation	\$0	\$10,000	\$30,000
Total	\$0	\$20,000	\$60,000

The ensuing discussions about both the Prevention/Mitigation and Enforcement/Role of Regulations workplans elaborate on what the work in Scenario #2 and #3 would entail.

The team reviewed the Prevention/Mitigation workplan and made the following updates:

- A cross-jurisdictional review (see bullet 1 from the Objectives) should be added to Step 1.
- The scope of the task group should:
 - Be generic and non-industry specific

- Include types of options/tools available (including jurisdiction)
- Be organized by source, pathway, receptor
- The work should include land-use planning (both provincial and municipal) and be sure that mitigation is given the same attention as prevention.
- If a consultant is used to gather information, the task group will take the lead in evaluating tools from other jurisdictions in terms of their applicability to the Alberta context as well as in identifying gaps.

Other highlights from the discussion:

- The overall goal of this work is to contribute to the GPG.
- The cross-jurisdictional review should occur in both scenarios. It will be difficult to take on the cross-jurisdictional piece without the money to hire a consultant. In general, having a consultant do the work will result in a much better product.
- Similar to the Odour Assessment Task Group work, the tools should be grouped into categories (e.g. point source), rather than being industry-specific, with a discussion about how the tools could be used in certain circumstances (i.e. Here's a suite of technologies that could be used and here's the pros and cons of each of them – 3 or 4 pages each).
- Similar to the Odour Assessment Task Group work, the task group could develop a decision key that looks at the type of situation and helps the reader to work out which tool(s) best applies.
- The *Odour Impact Assessment Handbook* has a useful approach for describing tools (i.e. by category of tools) such as source treatment technologies, use of perfumes and masking agents and setback for industrial operations but does not include land use planning.
- Looking at gaps (Step 2) can be subjective. It should focus on what tools are available, how they might work in Alberta, and when and how they are used (similar to the Odour Assessment Task Group).

The team reviewed the interests represented on the Odour Assessment Task Group and thought they matched well with who would need to be included in Prevention/Mitigation work. The team felt that it was a natural progression from the work under Odour Assessment and the process and format for the work was very similar. As such the team would like the Odour Assessment Task Group to take on the work under Prevention/Mitigation with the addition of a member with expertise in land-use planning (potentially from ESRD land-use planning group or from the City of Edmonton). The team noted that, while the organizations represented align, individual members could feel that they are not the person best suited from their organization to participate in this work. In such cases, the team discussed membership tag-teaming or transitioning to a new member, if necessary.

Action Item 8.4: Celeste will confirm with the Odour Assessment Task Group regarding taking on Prevention/Mitigation work.

Action Item 8.5: Celeste will update the Prevention/Mitigation workplan and send to the task group electronically for final approval.

6. Finalize Workplan: Enforcement/Role of Regulation

The team reviewed the Enforcement/Role of Regulation workplan and made the following updates:

- The task group should liaise with ESRD regarding the roll-out of Recommendation 3 from the Regulatory section of the *Report of Recommendations on Odours and Emissions in the Peace River Area*.
- There are many resources available (ex. AER report, RWDI Phase 3 Report for AER Proceeding Number 1769924, work from AARD, CEMA reports, municipal) that can contribute to Step 1.
- Step 2 should include approvals at the federal, provincial and municipal regulatory levels.
- Wording in Step 5 will be changed from “good practices” to read “regulatory practices”. This step is meant to collect any relevant information that may have been gathered by other task groups.
- Step 5 should precede Steps 1, 2, 3, and 4.
- Step 6 will be removed.
- The task group should provide a definition of enforcement as well as any other related definitions.
- A consultant can be used for information gathering steps, but the task group should take the lead in evaluating results.

Other highlights from the discussion:

- The team discussed if this work has already been addressed by AER Proceeding 1769924:
 - The Report concludes that the existing framework is insufficient to manage odours.
 - The scope of the panel was a specific industry (oil and gas).
 - The Report does include a recommendation to investigate the feasibility of defining an ambient odour objective for Alberta based on a perception threshold. This recommendation is provisional but would apply across sectors.
- The team concluded that due to the sector-specific nature of AER Proceeding 1769924 this work is still needed.
 - It was noted that this work ties in to ESRD’s work on the above noted recommendation. The Government of Alberta would be open to help from this task group and the more information and investigation the group takes on related to sensory-based thresholds, the better.
- It is very important that the task group link regulation to enforcement and what the people are doing in the field.
- It would be helpful for the task group to have a primer presentation on regulation at their first meeting.
- The team discussed the kinds of recommendations that are anticipated to emerge from Step 7:
 - The task group will be looking at all regulatory related rules and how they’re enforced, then identifying gaps as well as reviewing regulatory mechanisms and approaches from other jurisdictions. The task group should come up with recommendations on a go-forward basis about what odour regulation and enforcement programs might look like in the province.
 - For example: the task group could develop 3 or 4 good models and describe in what circumstances and for what reasons these models may be appropriate.
 - For example: the task group could develop a recommendation on what a regulation could include in terms of sensory perception.
 - It would be great if this CASA project could come up with an idea of what a sensory threshold would look like. However, given the time and resources that would be required to do this piece of work, it is out

of scope. The task group could make recommendations about future work in this area.

- For example: Make sure you have a certain number of trained staff in using the equipment.
- The task group should consider the work of the other groups work before making recommendations.
- The task group should also consider how recommendations would be implemented i.e. from the regulators perspective.

The team discussed that given the specific expertise required, that a new task group will be formed rather than repurposing a currently existing task group to take on this work. The team drafted an initial membership list to be used to begin coordination of task group formation. The team member responsible for coordinating a representative is listed in brackets:

- CIAC (Al)
- AARD (Tanya)
- NRCB (Tanya)
- Hinton Pulp (Gord)
- ESRD (Keith)
- AER (Celeste)
- NGO (NGO caucus)
- Alberta Health (Merry)
- CAPP, maybe (Tracy)
- AAMDC (Carolyn)
- AUMA (Angella)
- Federal government (Joseph)
- Alberta Energy (Keith)

Action Item 8.6: Team members will coordinate representatives for membership on the Enforcement/Role of Regulation Task Group.

Action Item 8.7: Celeste will update the Enforcement/Role of Regulation workplan and send to the task group electronically for final approval.

Once the Enforcement/Role of Regulation workplan has been updated, team members can use it to coordinate representatives.

7. Public Engagement

The Complaints, Odour Assessment, and Health Task Groups were asked to consider whether it would be useful for them to receive input from complainants and to outline their needs around engagement. The team reviewed and discussed the feedback from the three task groups:

- A common theme in the feedback received was to speak to complainants about issues they've had and then to ask complainants to provide feedback on the tools that have been developed.
- The team noted that the industry and government perspectives about handling complaints are also essential.
- The team noted that many of the tools being developed will be directed at government and industry so it will be important to test tools with these sectors.
- Engaging with the public is important but could potentially be costly and time-consuming.
- It was raised that some OMT representatives are already bringing the "public" perspective to discussions.
- Giving the timing of current activities, it may be best to engage around products. For example, once tools have been developed to ask for feedback or once the Good Practice Guide is drafted to ask for feedback. It would need to take place at a stage where it would

still be possible to incorporate changes. This engagement would need to include complainants, government and industry.

- It will be important to make the Board aware of the team's thoughts, and possible costs, around public engagement at the June update.

The team agreed that this topic will need to be revisited at a subsequent meeting.

8. June Update to CASA Board

At the June 5th Board meeting, the team will provide a presentation on progress to date and next steps to action the remaining areas of work in the project charter. David and Humphrey have volunteered to present on behalf of the team. Celeste will prepare the presentation, with the help of the team co-chairs, as follows:

- Provide an update on the work of the Complaints, Odour Assessment, and Health Task Groups using the 1-page meeting summaries.
- Describe the work to be completed under Prevention/Mitigation and Enforcement/Role of Regulation as described today under items 5 and 6.
 - Explain the three scenarios for a path forward depending on available funding. The presentation will emphasize Scenario #3 as the preferred path forward.
- Describe next steps for Education/Communication/Awareness and Continuous Improvement using the minutes from meeting #7 with the caveat that the team is still working to finalize these pieces.
- Request direction from the CASA Board as to how the team should proceed vis-à-vis funding availability and the three scenarios.

9. Meeting Wrap-up

The team reviewed the action items from this meeting.

The objectives for meeting #9 are:

- Review feedback from the June 5th CASA Board meeting.
- Review and finalize the straw dog workplans for Education/Communication/Awareness and Continuous Improvement (see Action Item 7.1).
- Hear an overview presentation of the situation in Three Creeks, Alberta (see Action Item 5.2).
- Hear a presentation on the odour-related changes to AER Directive 60, if time allows (see Action Item 7.2).

Action Item 8.8: Celeste will poll for dates for meeting #9 in mid-June.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm.