



Minutes

Odour Management Team, Meeting #16

Date: April 20, 2015
Time: 10:00 am- 3:30 pm
Place: CASA Office, Edmonton, AB

In attendance:

Name

Humphrey Banack
Ann Baran
Kim Eastlick
Francisco Echegaray
Zaher Hashiso
Joseph Hnatiuk
Kim Johnson
Carolyn Kolebaba (by phone)
Tanya Moskal-Hébert
Martina Krieger (by phone)
Gary Redmond
Richard Sharkey
Gord Start
Chandra Tomaras
Lorna Young (by phone)
Amanda Stuparyk
Warren Greeves
Robyn Jacobsen

Stakeholder group

Alberta Federation of Agriculture
Southern Alberta Group for the Environment
Alberta Energy Regulator
Natural Resources Conservation Board (until 1:30 pm)
Alberta Health (until 1:30 pm)
Canadian Society of Environmental Biologists
CAPP (Shell) (until 3:00 pm)
AAMDC (joined at 10:30)
Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development
Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development
Alberta Airshed Council (Alberta Capital Airshed)
Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development
Alberta Forestry Products Association (Hinton Pulp)
AUMA (City of Edmonton)
Chemistry Industry Association of Canada (until 12:00 pm)
CASA
CASA
CASA

Regrets:

Name

Holly Johnson-Rattlesnake
David Spink
Steve Rozee
Kevin Warren

Stakeholder group

Samson Cree Nation
Prairie Acid Rain Coalition
Solid Waste Association of North America (City of Lethbridge)
Alberta Airshed Council (PAMZ)

Action Items:

Action Items	Who	Due
15.2 – The secretariat will obtain quotes/proposals for the OMT final report from the suggested writers and send that information to the co-chairs who will make a recommendation to OMT group.	Robyn/Amanda	Meeting #17
16.1: CASA will draft an abstract for the OMCTS and receive co-chair approval for submission prior to the deadline.	Amanda	April 30, 2015
16.2: Alberta Health will review the pdf of the health symptom tracking tool to address usability and report back to the OMT.	Zaher	ASAP

1. Administrative Items

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

The agenda and meeting objectives were approved.

The minutes from meeting #15 were reviewed and approved with minor editorial changes. The status of action items from meeting #15 were updated as follows:

Action Item	Who	Status
15.1 – Amanda will send the updated budget that was reviewed at the meeting to the OMT.	Amanda	Complete, email sent.
15.2 – The secretariat will obtain quotes/proposals for the OMT final report from the suggested writers and send that information to the co-chairs who will make a recommendation to OMT group.	Robyn/Amanda	In progress. Update under item 7 below.
15.3 – Amanda will send the complaints’ task group guidance booklet to the AUMA representative for review.	Amanda	Complete. Sent to AUMA, no comments received.
15.4 – Amanda will send the OMT all of the task groups’ deliverables (i.e. consultant reports) for their information.	Amanda	Complete, email sent.
15.5 – The secretariat will review previous OMT meeting minutes and provide more detail around the groups’ discussion to name the document a “Good Practice Guide” and report back to the OMT.	Amanda	Complete. Discuss under item 7 below.
15.7 – The secretariat will update the draft Communications Plan based on discussion.	Amanda	Complete. Discuss under item 8 below.
15.8 – Amanda will poll for dates for upcoming Meetings #16, #17 and #18 in April, May, and June.	Amanda	Complete. Meetings scheduled for April/May/June.

2. CASA Update & Other

- Robyn provided an update on the start of CASA’s new executive director, Keith Denman on March 30th, 2015.
- The last Board Meeting was on March 12, 2015. During the meeting, presentations were made by the Performance Measures Committee and the Electricity Framework Review team on their work.
- The EFR project presented their final report to the board at the March meeting. There were 11 consensus recommendations. The board granted a 1 month extension for the team to complete work on Control Technologies and PM Management. The team will be disbanded after that time.
- After an organized discussion within the government caucus prior to the meeting, Richard Skarkey from ESRD will act as government co-chair for the OMT replacing Keith Denman.
- The group discussed the Odour Management Conference and Technology Showcase that was circulated to the group by email. This conference is occurring September 14-15, 2015 in Toronto, ON, and has applicability to the OMT project work. Several members requested a

presence at this conference to present or attend. The team agreed to submit an abstract. Alberta Agriculture confirmed it is likely one of their representatives will be attending. The deadline for abstracts is April 30th and the team requested the secretariat prepare the abstract for the conference. It was noted this would be an excellent opportunity to increase the profile of the OMT work and good practice guide.

Action Item 16.1: CASA will draft an abstract for the OMCTS and receive co-chair approval for submission prior to the deadline.

- The group was informed that RWDI requested approval to present aspects of their odour enforcement/role of regulation consultant report at the CPANS Annual Conference being held May 26-27, 2015 in Edmonton. The OMT co-chairs have agreed that RWDI can present their work. However they were given stipulations and requirements for the presentation to ensure consistency with CASA's mandate and the odour project goals and deliverables.

3. Task Group Updates

Complaints Task Group (the update was provided by Ann):

- The task group is very satisfied with the quality of their final products.
 - The group is finalizing their user guide for handling complaints (Odour Complaints in Your Area), which targets a wide range of audiences including all government levels (specifically municipalities) and industry. The booklet also includes various tools; the 1-page public handout will be especially useful. Forms are customizable according to each organization implementing aspects of the booklet.
 - The group previously completed their Backgrounder that provides information on their review of the complaints landscape.
- The group is currently working on their Task Group Final Report and are preparing to provide their final presentation to the OMT at the May OMT meeting.

Enforcement / Role of Regulation Task Group (the update was provided by Richard):

- The task group consultant report is complete and accepted by the group.
- The task group has begun to develop their task group final report and is discussing content and reviewing drafts. This work will occur from mid-April to mid-May. The group is preparing to provide their final presentation to the OMT at the May OMT meeting.

4. Prevention/Mitigation Final Report/Presentation

Kim Johnson from CAPP (Shell) presented on the Prevention/Mitigation task group final report and deliverables. The OMT had some questions for the task group work and discussed the following:

- There was a question in regard to the task group making any regulatory recommendations and the group confirmed they did not make recommendations of this nature.
- There was a comment regarding a reference to 'prevailing winds' in the consultant report (page 7) being from the northwest. Members of the team are unclear whether this statement is fully accurate but assume that the consultant has references to substantiate the statement, and therefore, they can live with it.
- A questions was asked about continuous improvement advice and who is going to do the review. The task group recommends a 5 year multi-stakeholder undertaking, which CASA could take the lead on if this is requested by the CASA board. The OMT will consider this as they develop their final report and recommendations.

- A question was asked about how a customizable communications plan would be implemented and what its intent was as a piece of advice. The group confirmed that their work main audience was government and industry and that it was important to note that, especially within government, it would be helpful in planning to have the P/M information at hand and readily available for comparisons (as a customized communications piece). The OMT can discuss this piece of advice further within their communications planning.

5. Health Task Group Submission

The OMT discussed the Health Task Group submission that was received by email. According to the process developed by the OMT, *'Acceptance of task group final reports and tools'*, this is the time to address any questions with the submission from any members/constituents. The process outlines non-acceptance of a submission if a member is not able to live with the submission, or there is identification of any concerns.

Highlights of the discussion included:

- A member asked about the timing of the submission review as they had not received comments/approval from their constituents yet. There was some confusion from the email of the submission of when the submission was going to be reviewed. The secretariat confirmed that in the future, they would provide exact dates of meetings that submissions will be reviewed.
- A member requested additional time to provide any comments/feedback at the next OMT meeting (May 20th). The group agreed.
- There were 3 members that indicated they were unable to open or review the tool itself. It appears that some systems cannot support the program and the pdf document/form does not open. Based on the print copy contained within the Appendix of the task group report there were no comments on the content of the tool itself, but it would be very unfortunate to have a percentage of people wanting to use the tool unable to open it. Alberta Health committed to trying to determine options to improve the usability of the tool. This must be worked out at the OMT level prior to publishing. Options include creating a simple PDF (printable version) without ability to 'add symptoms' for widespread use.
- Based on this discussion it was recommended that the OMT approve the submission 'in principle' under the condition that any outstanding issues will be addressed. Final feedback will be received by the next OMT meeting on May 20th. The group agreed.

Action Item 16.2: Alberta Health will review the pdf of the health symptom tracking tool to address usability and report back to the OMT.

6. Odour Assessment Final Report/Presentation

Kim Johnson from CAPP (Shell) presented on their task group final report and deliverables. The OMT had some questions for the task group work and discussed the following:

- The group requested clarification of logistical issues of the addendum. It was confirmed that the task group is developing a short (1-page) clear and concise listing of items where there is disagreement with the consultant report.

The task groups is working towards their final report being provided to the OMT very soon and would be reviewed/accepted at the next May OMT meeting.

7. Good Practice Guide/Final Report Updates

The secretariat provided an update on the progress of the GPG and Final Report.

Due to uncertainty in the size of the document, the secretariat proposed process forward to include a 2-phase contract with the selected editor (Lori Weltz) to begin work. The two phases include:

- Phase 1: An assessment of the scope of the work; the editor and CASA will meet with each task group, and the editor will provide outline options and approximate size for the GPG.
- Phase 2: Assemble the GPG once the size and subsequent costs have been agreed upon by the OMT.

Lori has completed Phase I of the contracting for the GPG and will be providing an outline of proposed length and content to the subcommittee. The secretariat arranged meetings and all task groups have met with Lori to discuss their deliverables. The task groups each discussed how their information can fit within the GPG.

Following a discussion with the subcommittee, the OMT will be asked to approve proceeding to Phase II of contracting with Lori via email.

The secretariat then provided the OMT an update based on Action Item 16.3, naming of the good practice guide. All meeting minutes were reviewed and there is no record of a consensus decision by the group to name the document “Good Practice Guide”. The first instance of the term “good practice guide” appears in the Project Charter and was used as a general term for describing the deliverable that was being produced. The name is open for discussion. The group went around the table for opinions or options on a name for the guide.

The following highlights the comments from the group:

- Some members noted that from an industry perspective there is generally a higher regard for the work if it is considered “best”.
 - The definitions for both good and best are very similar but noting the comprehensiveness of the guide and the information, “best” seems most appropriate..
 - ”Best” would draw more attention and make people more likely to pick up the guide.
- Some members still felt the terminology of “good” practice guide was more appropriate than “best”. “Best” seems to imply that the practice is superior to all others. However, since our guide states it may not be applicable to all industries, we can’t really say “best” practices. A compilation of “good” practices provides options and people can make decisions themselves for what is “best” for their specific situation.
 - The guide will provide several approaches that have not been tested or demonstrated. We probably shouldn’t reference these as “best”.
 - There are many aspects that are customizable within the guide, and will be modified as an organization sees fit.
 - If we are going to stipulate that these are “best” practices then we should also feel confident enough to recommend that they be regulation. The team has discussed that this is not in their mandate.

Their discussion continued and there were comments of not naming ‘good’ or ‘best’ at all. The document could be called an “odour practice guide” or “beneficial practice guide” as it will pertain to

more than just “management”. Or use one of the 7 topics of the project to pull something there. The group wanted to discuss further but noted that it would be beneficial to have a summary and/or a comparison of general titles (or criteria) as the naming will be more of semantics. The secretariat agreed that there should be some administrative work to determine that we are choosing an appropriate name that would best explain the last few years of the groups work. The secretariat will facilitate a discussion on naming at the next meeting. The group resolved to address the naming of the guide then.

The secretariat provided an update for the Final Report. There were 2 proposals received for writing of the OMT final report that are being reviewed by the co-chairs. The co-chairs will provide a recommendation for a preferred contractor to the OMT for electronic acceptance. If there are any objections to the chosen writer the secretariat requires notification immediately. Contracting and work will begin to create the final report once approved.

8. Education/Communication/Awareness - Plan

The secretariat began drafting a communications plan outline using previous projects and based on previous OMT work (target audience matrix) to organize main sections.

The OMT previously reviewed and accepted the outline including the following sections:

1. Background and Overview
 - a. Notes to Reader
 - b. Project Objectives
2. Communications Objectives
3. Key Messaging
4. Targeted Stakeholders
5. Strategies and Tactics
6. Timelines and Milestones
7. Evaluation and Assessment

This meeting objective was to review the draft plan provided by the secretariat and work on the strategies table. In its draft, the first sections (1 and 2) of the plan are from the Project Charter (and previously developed workplan) and identifies communications objectives.

Two sections were highlighted as main pieces requiring further work:

- Target Stakeholders (Section 4)
- Strategies and Tactics (Section 5)

These sections identify main target audience(s) and specific strategies (or methods) to communicate the work of the OMT. The secretariat provided a draft of each of those sections (presented as tables) for the OMT to review and comment. The group was previously asked to break out target audiences into categories and identify any other strategies for communications.

At this meeting, the group provided any additional target audiences or edits to the Section 4 – Stakeholders table. Edits were discussed as follows:

- The 311 call centers (for Edmonton and Calgary) should be added to Government – Cal Centres.

- For Non-Government – Airshed Zones are not “call centres”. Remove Call Centres. Add Airshed zones as their own Target group, with the AAC as a Group, and individual airshed as a sub-group. Remove “program managers” as this does not apply to the Airshed zones.
- Add the University of Lethbridge (U of L) under Academia.
- SPOG is a synergy group within Synergy Alberta. Remove from Industry Associations as a separate listing.
- Add Mutual Aid Alberta (Emergency Mutual Aid groups) to the Non-Government listing. They are groups that share resources with each other in the case of emergencies.
- Add the Planning and Bylaw departments under the sub-groups for Municipalities.

The group was divided into 3 smaller working groups for the purposes of working on the Table 5 – Strategies and Tactics table. Each group was provided 2-3 identified strategies/tactics and were asked to compile information in the table (including what is required for roll-out, timing, budget considerations, and lead). All groups presented their information for each of the strategies: Presentations, Webinars, Workshops, Newsletters, GPG Highlight Sheet, Individual Consultation & Training, Media Coverage, and Online Content & Exposure, after the exercise.

The secretariat will compile this information and bring back to the OMT for identification of priority strategies and target audiences at next meeting.

8. Meeting Wrap-up

The next meeting is on Wednesday, May 20th in Edmonton at the CASA office.

We still require someone to offer hosting for the Calgary meeting on June 18th. Please let Amanda know if you can host.

The objectives for the next Meeting #17 are to:

- Receive the final 2 task group presentations.
- Review task group(s) final reports (submissions).
- Good practice guide update from editor.
 - Naming of the GPG
- Final report update from contractor/review draft table of contents.
- Review communications plan. Complete strategies table with priorities and audience(s).

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm.