

Minutes



Odour Management Working Group, Meeting #5

Date: Thursday, February 28th, 2013

Time: 11:00am to 4:00pm

Place: CASA Office, Edmonton

In attendance:

| Name | Stakeholder group |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Keith Denman | Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development |
| Lance Miller | Devon Canada Corporation |
| Al Schulz | Chemistry Industry Association of Canada |
| Janis Seville | The Lung Association |
| David Spink | Prairie Acid Rain Coalition |
| Merry Turtiak | Alberta Health |
| Angella Vertzaya (from 12:45pm) | City of Edmonton |
| Celeste Dempster | CASA |
| Robyn Jacobsen | CASA |

With Regrets:

| Name | Stakeholder group |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Carolyn Kolebaba (by phone) | Alberta Association of Municipal Districts & Counties |

Action Items:

| Action Items | Who | Due/Status (update as of 4 March 2013) |
|---|---------|--|
| 5.1: Al will provide an update on the Odour Management Project Charter (using version 11) to Brian Ahearn (Vice-President, Western Division) and John Skowronski (Director, Environmental Affairs, Western Division) of the Canadian Fuels Association. | Al | In advance of Board meeting on 27 March. |
| 5.2: Working group members should email Celeste any editorial comments on the project charter (version 10). | All | Complete. |
| 5.3: Celeste will update the project charter (version 11). | Celeste | Complete. Sent to group 1 March. |
| 5.4: Working group members will contact their corresponding Board members to update them on the project charter and prepare them to participate in the upcoming Board discussion. | All | In advance of Board meeting on 27 March. |
| 5.5: Celeste will follow-up with Carolyn Kolebaba to update her on today's meeting and the adjustments made to the project charter. | Celeste | Complete. |

1. Administrative Items

The meeting began at 11:10am. Participants introduced themselves and were welcomed to the meeting. Quorum was achieved.

The agenda and meeting objectives were approved.

The minutes from meeting #4 were reviewed and approved.

The action items from meeting #4 were updated as follows:

| Action Items | Who | Due |
|--|---------|---|
| 4.1: Celeste will investigate how impacted communities were selected for membership on the Electricity Project Team. | Celeste | Completed. See below. |
| 4.2: Celeste will update the project charter (version 10). | Celeste | Completed. Sent out to group 17 February. |

Additional Information, Action Item 4.1:

Celeste reported that the minutes from the Electricity Working Group show that the NGO members were asked to bring forward names of people who could represent impacted communities on the Electricity Project Team. In regards to CASA’s work on odour management, it was noted that the Electricity Project Team was looking at a very specific issue, while the Odour Management Project Team would have a much broader focus.

2. Feedback Roundtable

At the last meeting, the working group members were asked to use the updated project charter (version 10) to obtain feedback from stakeholders and work towards gaining provisional approval to bring the project charter before the CASA Board. The group was asked to alert the Secretariat to any ‘showstoppers’ in preparation for today’s meeting.

Working group members were asked to share the feedback they received from stakeholders in terms of providing support for the project charter. Overall, there were no showstoppers and there was general support for the project charter. A universal comment was brought up around timelines and the amount of work to be done. This was discussed under agenda item 3.

- Government:
 - Merry shared that there were no major concerns within Alberta Health. Alberta Health Services expressed concern about how the outcomes of this work would impact service delivery (ie. the complaints process). This was a teachable moment to explain that recommendations arising from a CASA process apply to everyone equally and are agreed to by consensus. There were no concerns from Health Canada (First Nations and Inuit health, Safe Environments Group). Alberta Energy had some clarifying questions about the CASA process but no major concerns. The Natural Resources Conservation Board had one comment (discussed later, under Project Scope) but no major concerns. Merry shared that she has not yet been able to touch base with Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development but will be contacting Sandi Jones.
 - Keith shared that Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development was broadly supportive of the project charter and did not identify any showstoppers. Their concerns were around securing funding and the amount of work described.
 - Angella shared the project charter with Rachel Bocock from the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association. There was overall support for the project charter and no showstoppers were identified.

- Industry:
 - Lance met with Elise Bieche, Manager for National Air Issues for CAPP, to discuss the project charter. Her main concerns were related to deliverables and timelines. Elise met with the formal committee for feedback on Wednesday, February 27th and will follow-up with Lance on Friday. At a brief check-in prior to this meeting, Elise shared that there were no showstoppers and in general few comments.
 - Al shared that his stakeholders did not identify any showstoppers and he has briefed the CIAC Environmental Committee. Relating to the general concern identified concerning the amount of work to be done, there was concern identified around regulatory overlap. The working group provided some additional wording to the scope section to address this concern which is described under agenda item 3.
- NGO:
 - Janis passed the project charter internally to staff, including CASA Board member Leigh Allard, who were pleased to see that health was identified as an underlying driver of the work. Janis also shared the project charter with certain key doctors. Comments received so far indicate interest in the record-keeping tool described under the Health objective. Janis is still waiting for comments from one doctor who is on holiday.
 - David met with the Alberta Environmental Network's Clean Air and Energy Caucus. They did not identify any showstoppers and there was overall support for the project charter. There was a concern about the capacity to provide ENGO participants to participate in the project team and that the team could consider prioritizing their work.
- CASA Executive Committee:
 - Robyn noted that the Executive Committee had met the preceding Thursday and were generally supportive of the project charter. However, the Executive did identify a concern regarding funding, which has been discussed by the working group on several occasions. They also feel that any provision for public engagement should be proportionate to the limited scope of the committee's work. The working group referred to the phased approach described in the project charter and the need to manage expectations identified in the risk analysis section of the project charter.

The working group noted that, while there is some overlap in membership between the Canadian Fuels Association (CFA) and the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers (CAPP)/Chemistry Industry Association of Canada (CIAC), the CFA should be provided with an update on the project charter in advance of the March CASA Board meeting.

Action Item 5.1: Al will provide an update on the Odour Management Project Charter (using version 11) to Brian Ahearn (Vice-President, Western Division) and John Skowronski (Director, Environmental Affairs, Western Division) of the Canadian Fuels Association.

3. Final Adjustments to Project Charter

The group reviewed any comments from stakeholders that required a shared discussion and made adjustments to the project charter as necessary. These changes will be reflected in version 11 of the project charter.

Action Item 5.2: Working group members should email Celeste any editorial comments on the project charter (version 10).

The group began with a discussion about scope (and amount of work) and timelines which was identified under agenda item 2 by all participants as a general concern. The Board has provided direction that

project teams should be more nimble and timely. The group agreed that although the work described in the project charter is ambitious, it is achievable. The group referred to the phased approach described in the project scope and discussed that the project team will have time to go into more detail on certain topics of work than others. The project team will need to discuss this as they design their workplan. The group decided to add some wording in the Deliverables section to this effect. The group also added additional wording to the scope section to address the concern brought forward by AI's stakeholders about regulatory scope to read:

- The project team should be aware that *existing regulatory processes, including facility approvals and associated emissions limits, frequently address odour-related emission sources and/or chemicals. These processes potentially represent an effective source control and preventative approach to odour management.* However, this does not preclude evaluating the effectiveness of the regulations. The project team should focus on odourous compounds as a whole and stay at a high level.

The group agreed that the timeline for the Task Group Work (previously termed subgroups) should be lengthened from 8-10 month to 8-12 months. This will not affect the overall 18-22 month timeframe for the project team as the four phases will overlap. The group agreed to update the timelines graphic in the Project Structure and Schedule section to show the overlap between the phases. The group again stated that a risk to the timelines is acquiring the appropriate funding.

The working group then reviewed the project charter section-by-section to check for any comments that required a group discussion. These changes will be reflected in version 11 of the project charter. The highlights are outlined below:

Introduction:

- Addition: Recognition that the members of the working group obtained regular feedback from their membership which was incorporated into the project charter.

Vision:

- The group recognized that a framework includes implementation. No changes were made, as it was felt that this was implied by using the term "framework".

Project Scope:

- 2nd paragraph updated to read: The working group considered these issues and agreed that the project team should only focus on detectable odour and *direct/indirect and perceived* odour-related health impacts.
- Added to 2nd last paragraph to address NRCB comment: It is recognized that in some instances, all reasonable efforts may have been made to manage a source of odour, but eliminating it many not be feasible. This language was taken from the Odour Statement of Opportunity that was brought before the Board in September 2012.

Project Objectives:

- Complaints, 1st objective:
 - 3rd Potential Outcome/Deliverable updated to read: *Guidance* for phone operators/respondents responding to complaints.
- Education/Communication/Awareness:
 - Added to 2nd last bullet: *as well as the process that the team undertook and the Good Practice Guide.*
- Although the seven topics of objectives are not listed in order of priority, the group agreed to list Health 3rd to reflect the importance of health concerns as a driver of odour management.

Project Structure and Schedule:

- Subgroups will be called Task Groups to reflect their more focused nature.
- The work of the Task Groups can begin in a staggered fashion as the timing of when information gathering is completed will vary.
- The Task Groups should have clear workplans to guide their work that can be used to help keep the overall project on track.
- The qualitative description should outline the overlapping of the phases. The timeframe starts from the date of the first meeting.
- The working group considered that it would be useful for participants to have an idea of how many meetings will be required over the life of the project team. The group asked Celeste to provide an estimate by looking at the CASA internal budget.

Risk Analysis:

- The group discussed emphasizing the capacity to staff the project team and task groups with participants.
- The group added four additional risks: project team prioritizes work and subsequently work is not undertaken under all seven topics of objectives; the timeline of 18-22 months is not met; the project team is unable to hire qualified consultants who can complete information gathering in a timely manner; task groups do not complete their work on time.
- The group discussed that the team may choose to prioritize work if they only get a portion of the funding that they need. The group also recognized the interconnected nature of the seven topics of objectives and the need for a phased approach.
- The group discussed the importance of identifying the best people with the right skill set to sit on the project team.
- The group discussed the importance of keeping timelines on track and wanted to reflect some of the possible ways that timelines could be disrupted. Overall, the group wanted the project team to recognize that there is a lot of work to do in a short period of time.

Appendix B:

- Celeste suggested, and the group agreed, to the addition of two articles to Appendix B:
 - New Zealand’s Good Practice Guide for Assessing and Managing Odour in New Zealand
 - Scottish Environment Protection Agency’s Odour Guidance 2010.

Action Item 5.3: Celeste will update the project charter (version 11).

4. Next Steps

The group reviewed and discussed the timelines to prepare the project charter for presentation at the March 27th Board meeting.

Using the updated project charter (version 11), working group members should secure approval to bring the project charter before the CASA Board by March 6th. The project charter will be accompanied in the Board book by a Decision Sheet. This is a one-page summary of the issue and decision being requested from the CASA Board. Celeste will draft the Decision Sheet and send it to the group for review. The working group is also responsible for giving a presentation at the Board meeting. Celeste will draft the presentation and send it to the working group for review. David and Merry volunteered to give the presentation at the Board meeting on the 27th. The timelines for the Board meeting are summarized in the table below:

| Task | When |
|------|------|
|------|------|

| | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| Working Group meeting #5 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewing feedback from stakeholders • Final adjustments | 28 February 2013 |
| Celeste updates project charter | No later than first thing 4 March |
| Getting final approval to bring project charter (version 11) before the Board Working group reviews and approves Decision Sheet | 4 March – 6 March |
| Celeste will incorporate any final tweaks and submit project charter to Board book for meeting on the 27th | 7 March |
| Powerpoint presentation due | 20 March |
| Report to Board (Calgary) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present Project Charter | 27 March |

The working group also discussed the need to prepare their corresponding Board members to participate in the Board discussion on the odour management project charter on March 27th. The Secretariat will provide support to help ensure that all Board members are prepared for the upcoming meeting.

Action Item 5.4: Working group members will contact their corresponding Board members to update them on the project charter and prepare them to participate in the upcoming Board discussion.

Action Item 5.5: Celeste will follow-up with Carolyn Kolebaba to update her on today's meeting and the adjustments made to the project charter.

The meeting adjourned at 3:20pm.