

The meeting adjourned at 3:00pm.

<p>the application of animal waste-based nutrients for crop production, which is often associated with odour complaints. Facilities that do have an animal husbandry operation (e.g. hog farms) will obviously generate waste over time, which must be collected and stored for some period of time, which has a significant odour generation potential. Given the large areas of Alberta dedicated to agriculture, odorants from these operations can best be described as both ubiquitous sporadic and relatively de-centralized.</p>	
<p>Section 2.4 “Facilities that have no animal husbandry component will typically still rely on the application of animal waste-based nutrients” Should this read often, in many cases, or similar instead of typically? Many operations use chemical fertilizer only, not sure the actual percentage that uses animal waste.</p>	
<p>Section 2.7 “This is due to, for the most part from hydrogen sulfide” get rid of “From” or change to ‘for the most part this is due to hydrogen sulfide.’ “Also the cutting of the wood” could just be ‘the cutting of wood’.</p>	
<p>Section 4.11.2. Page 20 - s/b Many jurisdiction IN EUROPE that have ... (it’s the jurisdictions, not the development that is in Europe) - Mid-paragraph “pleasant odours are therefore treated differently” No need for the two commas.</p>	
<p>Section 5.1 last couple of lines “with the assumption that health effects associated with odorous compounds covered by” should be ‘are covered by’</p>	
<p>Section 5.2. Page 22 s/b Very few have associated frequency criteria, (e.g. observed concentrations must be less than the criteria value 98% of the time), and. therefore, ...</p>	
<p>Section 5.6. Page 25. Comment, not correction. Was there any indication of how field staff determine Odour Units in the field? Clarify if there is any training for staff and what kind. How does the field staff make assessments? What tools are used? Are there specific monitoring devices/instrumentation.</p>	
<p>Section 7.1 – Page 29. In the last paragraph, don’t agree that ambient monitoring would be a solution to reducing odorous</p>	

emissions (just a monitoring tool) – agree that best management and best available technology could be helpful. Provide an Explanation of the application of ambient monitoring criteria for ambient monitoring being a solution (presume ambient for specific chemicals or specific odor measurement technologies).	
Page 31 Last paragraph – an dour s/b an odour	
Section 7.11 – Page 32. What is an odour impact assessment guide? Are the predicted ambient concentrations of odour generated through dispersion model of some kind? Provide a definition/introduction for Odour impact assessment guidelines and any kind of specific chemicals with dispersion model.	
Page 32 third paragraph line 4. There are many technologies that exist but that are not economically feasible for industry. Should <i>best economically available technology</i> be used?	
Section 7.1.3. Page 34. Comment: I agree that “We were here first” carries little weight but is there any reference to back this up? This is a big issue in Alberta where people are moving out into the urban fringe and bumping into existing industry. Is there a legal reference or legal precedent in Alberta/Canada?	
Section 7.1 – Page 36. 2 nd sentence. The AER decision clearly identifies gaps - enforcement actions related to odours (so what is AB missing?) and the need for ambient odour objective based on a perception threshold and this is strong support for that approach. Integrate with AER- take recommendations from AER and consider in section 7.1. How does this influence their recommendations. Also, who decides, and on what criteria, if the approval conditions are adequate. I suspect the complainant does not agree. This is a big issue in Alberta.	
Page 37 Section 8.2.1 Be careful of wording that describes the issue as ‘nuisance odours’. In some areas this is a great source of friction as they understand this issue as an emissions problem. Can wording be revised?	
Table 6.1 - Middle column, first page fourth bullet s/b <i>nuisance</i> . - First column, second page. Is it modelling or modeling? For consistency. - Section on minimum separation distance – In Alberta this applies to some oil and gas activity	

as well as agriculture.

Middle column, section on sample degradation. The sentence “Window of optimal testing and may factor into cost” needs some sorting out.