



Minutes

Prevention/Mitigation Task Group, Meeting #6

Date: December 10, 2014
 Time: 10am-3:30pm
 Place: CASA office, 10035 108 Street, 10th floor, Edmonton

In attendance:

Name	Stakeholder group
Atta Atia	Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development
Ike Edeogu	Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development
James Jorgensen	Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development
David Spink	Prairie Acid Rain Coalition
Imai Welch (until 12:30pm)	City of Edmonton
Andrew Chan	Pinchin Ltd.
Mike Shaw	Pinchin Ltd.
Celeste Dempster	CASA
Michelle Riopel	CASA

Action Items:

Action Items	Who	Due
6.1: As quorum was not achieved, Celeste will touch base with industry representative Kim Johnson after the meeting.	Celeste	ASAP.
6.2: Kim and James to provide additional information on SPOG.	Kim, James	ASAP.
6.3: Celeste send D60 to Pinchin referring to section 7.1.1 and 7.1.2.	Celeste	ASAP.
6.4: Imai will review the updated discussion on the interaction between provincial and municipal regulation once it is prepared and provide feedback to Pinchin.	Imai	As requested.
6.5: Ike and Atta will check if there is any "first-in-time, first-in-right" as well as setbacks, encroachment, and relaxation wording as pertains to municipal facilities in AOPA.	Ike, Atta	ASAP.
6.6: James will check if there is any setbacks, encroachment, and relaxation wording as pertains to municipal facilities in EPEA	James	ASAP.
6.7: Celeste will send Pinchin the definitions of odour and odorant used by the Odour Assessment Task Group.	Celeste	ASAP.
6.8: Ike to provide high-quality version of figure 9 from the draft Pinchin report.	Ike	ASAP.
6.9: Celeste will send editorial comments to Pinchin.	Celeste	ASAP.
6.10: Celeste will send the content-related feedback developed at meeting #6 to Pinchin.	Celeste	ASAP.
6.11: Celeste will populate the draft table of contents to create draft 1 of the task group's final report to the OMT using currently available documents and note where content still needs to be developed.	Celeste	ASAP.

6.12: All task group members should come prepared to meeting #7 to provide feedback on the draft final report to the OMT and develop content as required.	All	Meeting #7.
6.13: Celeste will poll for dates for meeting #7 in February 2015.	Celeste	ASAP.

1. Administrative Items, Part 1

David chaired the meeting which began at 10:05am. Participants introduced themselves and were welcomed to the meeting.

Quorum was not achieved. In advance of the meeting Celeste touched base with co-chair and industry representative Kim Johnson to this effect.

Action Item 6.1: As quorum was not achieved, Celeste will touch base with industry representative Kim Johnson after the meeting.

The agenda and meeting objectives were approved.

2. Review Draft Report and Prepare Feedback

The purpose of today's meeting was to prepare specific feedback on the draft report for Pinchin as they develop the final version of the report. At meeting #5, the task group developed a list of items that they would like to discuss with Pinchin. This list provided the basis for today's discussion and task group members also had the opportunity to bring forward any additional content-related comments. The task group reviewed and discussed each comment and prepared specific content-related feedback for Pinchin – see Appendix A.

The task group noted that there are links between land use planning and the Enforcement/Role of Regulation Task Group.

The task group noted that ESRD's Air Quality Model Guideline (2013) includes some definitions for source types (ex. area, line, volume). The task group agreed to keep the current wording describing sources types as in the Pinchin report, but will flag this matter in their final report to the OMT for the OMT to consider as they develop the Good Practice Guide.

Action Item 6.2: Kim and James to provide additional information on SPOG.

Action Item 6.3: Celeste send D60 to Pinchin referring to section 7.1.1 and 7.1.2.

Action Item 6.4: Imai will review the updated discussion on the interaction between provincial and municipal regulation once it is prepared and provide feedback to Pinchin.

Action Item 6.5: Ike and Atta will check if there is any "first-in-time, first-in-right" as well as setbacks, encroachment, and relaxation wording as pertains to municipal facilities in AOPA.

Action Item 6.6: James will check if there is any setbacks, encroachment, and relaxation wording as pertains to municipal facilities in EPEA.

Action Item 6.7: Celeste will send Pinchin the definitions of odour and odorant used by the Odour Assessment Task Group.

Action Item 6.8: Ike to provide high-quality version of figure 9 from the draft Pinchin report.

Action Item 6.9: Celeste will send editorial comments to Pinchin.

Action Item 6.10: Celeste will send the content-related feedback developed at meeting #6 to Pinchin.

3. Discuss Next Steps to Finalize Report

The task group outlined next steps to finalize the draft report from Pinchin as follows:

- Pinchin will deliver the final version of the report on January 16, 2015 in pdf and word.
- The task group will have one week to review to ensure that the feedback from today’s meeting has been satisfactorily incorporated. This is not an opportunity for new feedback.
 - At this time, task group members may provide overarching feedback to Pinchin about their experience on the report as a whole.
- If any feedback from today’s meeting has not been satisfactorily incorporated, those comments will be sent to and addressed by Pinchin.
- The contract with Pinchin will then be closed.

4. Administrative Items, Part 2

The minutes from meetings #2, #3, #4, and #5 were reviewed and approved. The action items from meeting #2, #3, #4, and #5 were updated as follows:

Action Items	Who	Status
2.1: Celeste will email the OMT with the successful RFP bid candidate and provide one week for the OMT to comment on the selection.	Celeste	Complete.
2.2: Once the OMT has had the opportunity to comment on the successful candidate, Celeste will notify the consultant on September 12, 2014.	Celeste	Complete.
2.3: Celeste will arrange a 2 hour kick-off teleconference with the consultant.	Celeste	Complete.
2.4: Members should review the proposed Table of Contents from Pinchin and provide comments to Celeste no later than September 11, 2014.	Celeste	Complete.
2.5: Celeste will poll for meeting #4 in early December.	Celeste	Complete.
3.1: Celeste will provide Pinchin with task group commentary regarding alternate headers for section 2.	Celeste	Complete.
3.2: Celeste will provide Pinchin with the wording on source types from the Odour Assessment Task Group.	Celeste	Complete.
3.3: Celeste will provide Pinchin with task group commentary regarding odour management plans.	Celeste	Complete.
3.4: Kim will provide Celeste (who will provide to Pinchin) information on ambient air monitoring in Alberta.	Kim, Celeste	Complete.
3.5: Celeste will provide Pinchin with the Odour Management Team’s Project Charter.	Celeste	Complete.
3.6: Kim will provide Celeste (who will provide to Pinchin) information on terms and conditions around EPEA.	Kim, Celeste	Complete.
3.7: Members will provide Celeste (who will provide to Pinchin) any documents that speak to Alberta-specific prevention and mitigation practices.	All, Celeste	Complete.

3.8: Celeste will poll for meeting #4 (2 hour teleconference) at the end of October.	Celeste	Complete.
3.9: Celeste will poll for meeting #5 in early December.	Celeste	Complete.
4.1: Celeste will provide Pinchin with documents on CASA's CFO Project Team.	Celeste	Complete.
4.2: Celeste will send Pinchin the feedback on interim materials developed at meeting #4.	Celeste	Complete.
4.3: Celeste will request that Pinchin respond to the feedback on interim materials developed at meeting #4.	Celeste	Complete.
4.4: Celeste will poll for a 2 hour teleconference in the week of November 24th, 2014.	Celeste	Complete.
5.1: Celeste will send Pinchin the list of items for discussion so that they can prepare in advance of the December 10, 2014 meeting.	Celeste	Complete.
5.2: Members should send any editorial comments on the draft report to Celeste in track changes.	All	Complete.

5. Task Group Debrief and Meeting Wrap-up

The task group reviewed the action items from today's meeting.

The task group determined that they should begin work on their final report to the OMT at their next meeting. In preparation the task group developed a draft table of contents, based on the final report from the Health Task Group, as follows:

- Executive summary
- Introduction
- Overview of tasks
- Methodology
- Advice on Education/Communication/Awareness
- Advice on Continuous Improvement
- Links to other task groups
- Lessons learned
- Recommendations
- Appendix (report from Pinchin)

Action Item 6.11: Celeste will populate the draft table of contents to create draft 1 of the task group's final report to the OMT using currently available documents and note where content still needs to be developed.

Action Item 6.12: All task group members should come prepared to meeting #7 to provide feedback on the draft final report to the OMT and develop content as required.

Action Item 6.13: Celeste will poll for dates for meeting #7 in February 2015.

The task group aims to submit their final report to the OMT by the end of February 2015.

The meeting adjourned at 3:35pm.



Minutes

Appendix A

Item for Discussion	Feedback from Prevention/Mitigation Task Group for Pinchin Developed at December 10, 2014 Meeting
<p>Including more oil and gas examples, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sundre Petroleum Operators Group (SPOG) • Use of stack incineration to remove total reduced sulfur • Generally, showing how the oil and gas industry is involved in prevention & mitigation 	<p>Including more oil and gas examples and references throughout the report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add additional oil and gas related case study (SPOG) – Action Item: ask Kim and James to provide additional details on SPOG. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As both a complaint line and a tool • Section 5.3: reference Sundre Petroleum Operators Group (SPOG) in second list of bullets • Section 5.8, bulleted list under thermal, and table 1: include oil and gas processes (sour gas upgrading, incinerator stacks, flaring) • Use of stack incineration to remove total reduced sulfur <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Action Item: Celeste send D60 to Pinchin referring to section 7.1.1 and 7.1.2. • Generally, showing how the oil and gas industry is involved in prevention & mitigation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If see other appropriate places to add references and examples, do so.
<p>Section 5.8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes lots of specific examples, but there could potentially be others. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Discuss appropriate level of detail for this section, possibly adding wording that not limited to these categories. 	<p>Section 5.8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five categories not four • Include under thermal: stack incineration and flaring • Include qualifier “including but not limited to” in reference to five categories • Add wording that there are hybrid systems
<p>Section 5.1 (pg. 17):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "modification permitting" is problematic. This is generally not an option in Alberta planning, unless the operator is expanding, changing the official use classes for the operation, or facing enforcement proceedings. 	<p>Section 5.1 (pg. 17):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Second bullet: Change “modification permitting” to “specialized permitting requirements” negotiated on a first permit basis where possible <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Usually try to put these specialized permitting at the very beginning. ○ Development permits can be an effective tool when a facility wishes to expand or change. ○ If facility is changing or expanding, can change permit if they already have a permit. If there is no permit, negotiations can occur but it can often become political quickly. • Add new bullet:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Discretionary powers for development officers should be included within zoning by-laws to manage nuisance odours
<p>The report discusses the basics of the Alberta planning and zoning processes. The report does not include various details about those processes that could provide useful commentary about how to use land use planning to promote odour mitigation. For example, consider discussing the role of Development Permits and Business Licences (for those municipalities that use the latter) in planning and their potential implications for odour management.</p>	<p>Section 5.1/5.2 (broader ideas that need to be included in the section):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Development permits can be a core way for urban and rural municipalities to manage potential nuisance odours ● Business licenses can be used to manage nuisance issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Can be revoked on nuisance or community standards basis ○ Not all municipalities use business license ○ Regulations vary from municipality to municipality ● Change 5.1 to “Land use and Development Planning” ● Change 5.2 to “Site Management”
<p>Land use planning: -interaction between municipal and provincial regulation</p>	<p>Section 5.2.4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Include concise discussion on interaction between provincial and municipal regulation <p>Examples of considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provincial authorizations may take precedence over municipal by-laws <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Example: Can put a condition in a development permit that need to comply with NRCB/AOPA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Then need to get an approval for the operation <p><i>Action Item: Imai will review the updated discussion on the interaction between provincial and municipal regulation once it is prepared and provide feedback to Pinchin.</i></p>
<p>Discuss adding in some guidelines that Development Officers should consider when reviewing applications for odour-producing operations.</p> <p>Discuss including questions of site design within the land use planning sections of the report, as site design is a key part of the development planning process.</p>	<p>Add as Appendix (new A1) and reference in introduction to Section 4 & 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Include bulleted list of key considerations that Development Officers and potential facility operators should consider when reviewing applications for odour-producing operations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Most of these considerations are already in the report, combine into a list ○ Examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Setbacks ▪ Where is the nearest residence or sensitive receptor ▪ Topography ▪ Stack height ▪ Prevailing wind direction ▪ Precedence ▪ Nature of odour ▪ Size of operation
<p>The report does not discuss the question of</p>	<p>Add to Section 5.1 or 5.2:</p>

<p>nuisance and "first-in-time, first-in-right". This is a very important issue for land use planning and odour management in urban areas, particularly in those cases where residents and other businesses move closer to an odour-producing facility that was there first. Normally we cannot revoke or take enforcement action against someone's permit just because someone moves in and takes issue with the odours. Discuss including some planning and legal commentary on how to address this issue</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include some discussion/legal commentary to describe and acknowledge the issue • Include some of the considerations that facility operators should be prepared to deal with, including mechanisms (ex. Hearing, be aware of new developments around a facility) • Need to double check AOPA and EPEA for related wording: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Action Item: Ike and Atta will check if there is any "first-in-time, first-in-right" as well as setbacks, encroachment, and relaxation wording as pertains to municipal facilities in AOPA. ○ Action Item: James will check if there is any setbacks, encroachment, and relaxation wording as pertains to municipal facilities in EPEA.
<p>Section 2.3.3 (pg. 7):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there other sensitivity issues that should be included? 	<p>Section 2.3.3 (pg. 7):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add paragraph on differences in receptors sensitivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sensitization due to chronic exposure ○ Changes in sensitivity due to medical conditions ○ Acceptance vs familiarity with odour • Use Bull <i>et al.</i> 2014 (has some information on sensitivity) • Add NIMBY effect
<p>Section 2.3.3 (pg. 7/8):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FIDOL: pg. 7 vs. pg. 8 – define the ‘O’ as odour offensiveness and odour unpleasantness 	<p>Section 2.3.3 (pg. 7/8):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use ‘offensiveness’ for the ‘O’ in FIDOL for consistency with odour assessment task group report
<p>Section 2.3.2 (pg.7):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Canadian Shield represents a small percentage of the Alberta landscape. Should it be highlighted? 	<p>Section 2.3.2 (pg.7 – bulleted list):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include ranges for types of landscapes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Use Government of Alberta map if possible
<p>Section 5.7.1 (pg. 29):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss combustion and raising the temperature of flue gas. 	<p>Section 5.7.1 (pg. 29, 1st paragraph):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May consider temperature vs height stack changes depending on the situation • Reword - This is one option that could be considered in certain cases, but maybe not “most cases”. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “In certain cases it may achieve...and in some cases may improve oxidation of odour sources...caveat direct combustion in gas stream” ○ Relate to thermal treatment option <p>Section 5.8 (thermal treatment)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add: Partial combustion/conversion can sometimes create more toxic chemicals and/or odorants

<p>Section 5.1 (pg. 18):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buffers are also defined by the Municipal Government Act. 	<p>Section 5.1 (pg. 18):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add to the list: The Subdivision and Development Regulation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Section 13 (2), (3), (4)
<p>Figure 5 (pg. 18):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not sure how the figure illustrates safety and risk management buffer. 	<p>Figure 5 (pg. 18):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legend not very clear: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Add a rectangle to outline safety and risk management buffer ○ Add label to rectangle that there is a high density of industrial sources
<p>Consistent use of the term ‘odour’ and ‘odorant’ throughout the report</p>	<p>Make sure that the term ‘odour’ and ‘odorant’ are used consistently (and spelled consistently) throughout the report (especially first two pages of report)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Odour: what people smell (sensory response to a chemical) • Odorant: what makes the smell (chemicals) <p>Action Item: Celeste will send Pinchin the definitions of odour and odorant used by the Odour Assessment Task Group.</p>
	<p>Use ‘odorous’ spelling</p>
	<p>Glossary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add odour and odorant
<p>Section 4.1 (pg. 12):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Weight of evidence’ approach is not explained. 	<p>Section 4.1 (pg. 12):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add explanation of ‘weight of evidence’ approach
<p>Section 5.2.4 (pg. 20):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fourth bullet – Should this read ESRD or EPEA rather than AER? 	<p>Section 5.2.4 (pg. 20):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fourth bullet – change to EPEA instead of AER
	<p>Section 5.2.4 (pg. 20):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fifth bullet – include abbreviation of AOPA
<p>Section 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentioning at the very beginning of the section if can be applied to source, pathway or receptor. 	<p>Section 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highlight at the beginning of each section if it can be applied to source, pathway and/or receptor
<p>Appendix A2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include arrowheads on the horizontal lines in the peach and blue sections to increase readability. 	<p>Appendix A2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include arrowheads on the horizontal lines in the peach and blue sections to increase readability.

<p>Appendix A2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review title – does it reflect the content of the flow chart? 	<p>Appendix A2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update title to better reflect content of flow chart (which in addition to planning includes implementation) Change title to “Prevention and Mitigation Cycle” <p>Section 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change title to “Prevention and Mitigation Cycle”
<p>Section 5.6 (top of pg. 27):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is Alberta Air Quality Index meant to read Alberta Air Quality Health Index? 	<p>Section 5.6 (top of pg. 27):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change to read Alberta Air Quality Health Index
<p>Figures 9 and 10 (pg. 30 and 31):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are not properly cited in-text. AARD can provide the appropriate references as well as a higher quality version of Figure 9. 	<p>Figure 9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action Item: <i>Ike to provide high-quality version of figure 9.</i> <p>Figure 10:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change in-text reference to: Photo courtesy of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada.
<p>Figure 4 (pg. 10):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is it necessary to include in text and as an appendix? <p>Section 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendices are listed without describing them or relating them to the report. 	<p>Section 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove section 3 Describe and introduce A1 (new A1 is list of considerations – see above), A2, and A3 in the introduction to section 4 and 5 (and can refer to them further whenever they come in those sections) <p>Keep in old A1 (Plan-Do-Check-Act) in text and remove from appendices</p>
<p>Section 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can we make the Benefits/Considerations summaries into tables? 	<p>Section 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make the Benefits/Considerations lists into boxes (with a border) so they stand out from the text
<p>Figure 1 (pg. 3):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> General quality of figure 	<p>Figure 1 (pg. 3):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The font in the figure is difficult to read. Add reference – St Croix?
<p>The task group noted several spelling errors, typos, etc. The task group would like to ensure that the report will be thoroughly edited to remove these.</p>	<p>Editorial comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action Item: <i>Celeste will send editorial comments to Pinchin.</i> The document will be reviewed by Pinchin’s technical writer.
<p>Anything other comments that require a group discussion?</p>	
<p>Section 5.8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add general comments about tools (ex. Cost effectiveness) 	<p>Section 4.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expand second paragraph: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe selection criteria Questions you might consider to determine what tool would be best

Alternative Title for Report	Title of Report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change to “Review of Odour Prevention & Mitigation Tools for Alberta”
<p>Section 2.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add persistence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The task group discussed and noted that it is importance. Pinchin shared that it is not usually used as a parameter for odour abatement programs. Relates to the character of the odour – dissipates vs doesn’t dissipate. <p><i>The task group decided not to include as relates more/is more relevant to the research side of things.</i></p>	
<p>Section 2.1, top page 4, 2nd sentence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include a reference to the work of the Health Task Group 	<p>Section 2.1, top page 4, 2nd sentence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add a reference that the CASA Health Task Group has developed a background document summarizing current knowledge about the relationship between odour and human health.
<p>Section 2.1, top page 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supplement definition of adverse odour with Bull <i>et al.</i> 2014 	<p>Section 2.1, top page 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporate Bull <i>et al.</i> 2014 to supplement definition of adverse odour.
<p>Section 2.3.1 (pg 6):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Definitions of source types Alberta has some definitions: ESRD, Air Quality Model Quidelines (2013) <p><i>The task group decided to continue with the source type definitions as outlined in the Pinchin report. The task group will flag this issue (including multi-source) for the OMT in the task group final report.</i></p>	<p>Section 2.3.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add wording to the definition of ‘multi-sources’: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relates to places where there are multiple sources operating (cumulative effects) - could be same or different industries You may need to keep this context in mind as you develop your prevention & mitigation approach
<p>Section 2.4, pg 8, Figure 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicate where the cycle starts 	<p>Section 2.4, pg 8, Figure 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicate where the cycle starts
<p>Section 4.3, pg 14, 2nd paragraph:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include that this work may be done internally 	<p>Section 4.3, pg 14, 2nd paragraph:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include that this work may be done internally

<p>Section 4.3, pg 15, last paragraph:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does this include contingency plans? • Could we make some suggestions? 	<p>Section 4.3, pg 15, last paragraph:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include some wording about contingency plans as an interim measure should your first plan not work while you develop an alternate plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The contingency plan could be a number of things ○ Part of ‘Check’ is what will you do if your plan doesn’t work, think about this early in the process (part of risk management)
<p>Section 5.2, pg 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Siting in accordance with prevailing winds can be useful <p><i>The task group determined that this with be covered in new AI.</i></p>	
<p>Figure 8 - Section 5.7.1, pg 29:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the figure relevant? <p>The intent of the figure is to illustrate that stacks are a tool that are being used in Alberta. The task group agreed to include the figure.</p>	<p>Figure 8 - Section 5.7.1, pg 29:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change title of figure 8 along the lines of ‘Example of elevated stack for improved dispersion’