



ALBERTA WATER COUNCIL

MEETING #60

June 14, 2022

Fort Calgary, Calgary

Executive Summary

The board received an update on the *Water for Life* Action Plan project team's work. The project team is partway through discussing progress and identifying actions. The team completed a workshop in May. The purpose of this activity was to share potential action ideas, identify gaps, and opportunities. The next workshop is scheduled for June to share progress towards refining and finalizing actions in preparation for creating the Action Plan.

The board received an update from the Improving Drought Resilience in Alberta Through a Simulation Project Team. The team hosted the simulation in June; it was originally planned to be hosted in November last year but was delayed due to COVID-19 restrictions on in-person gatherings. As a result, the team requested the board approve extending the timeline until February 2023. The board approved the decision request.

The board received a presentation from the Source Water Protection Phase 1: Risk Assessment Tools and Data Project Team. The project team selected a consultant to develop the web tool, however, ongoing maintenance costs are higher than expected. The team is gathering more information to determine how to proceed; the board suggested some avenues for the team to explore.

A presentation was delivered by Alberta Innovates (AI) on the Water Innovation Program (WIP). Updates were provided on the outcomes from completed projects and new investments being made in each area. The WIP is planning to release a call for proposals in late June to fund projects in several areas. More information can be obtained by getting in touch with a project advisor or by visiting the Clean Resources Programs on the AI website.

There was a discussion on the draft AWC Business Plan, which was developed based on the surveys and input at the last board meeting. The board agreed the themes of climate adaptation and strengthened partnerships should be included in the plan, and the discussion focused on how themes should be included. Andre will take the comments away and revise the plan for presentation at the next board meeting.

The board received the Executive Director's report and Government of Alberta (GoA) updates.

The next board meeting is on November 3, 2022.

Summary of Discussion

Board meeting convened at 9:20 a.m.

1 Administration

1.1 Approve meeting agenda

The meeting was confirmed to have quorum. Jay White chaired the meeting and reviewed the agenda. The agenda was adopted with consensus.

Decision 60.1: The board approved the agenda by consensus.

1.2 Review actions from last meeting

There were four actions from the previous meeting. All actions were complete. There were no questions or comments on the actions.

1.3 Approve Summary Report from February 22, 2022, meeting

Staff did not receive any edits to the meeting summary. There were no further questions or comments on the summary.

Decision 60.2: The board approved the February 2022 meeting summary by consensus, and it will be posted to the website.

2 Water for Life Action Plan Project Team

Andre Asselin, a co-chair of the project team, delivered a presentation with background information on the project, a progress update, and next steps for the team.

The project team was initiated in February 2022 with a targeted end date of November 2022. The goal is to identify actions AWC partners or Indigenous communities are committed to undertaking that contribute to advancing the goals and directions of *Water for Life*. This action plan will differ from the previous ten-year action plan in that the focus is not exclusively on the actions of the Government of Alberta, rather this project adopts a shared accountability approach to developing the action plan.

The project objectives are to:

- 1) provide planning guidance (i.e., a standardized approach for sectors to contribute to the action plan)
- 2) to guide and coordinate partners (to share ideas and collect feedback)
- 3) to describe collaboration opportunities among partners, and
- 4) to present a new action plan with partner and project team input.

The first objective is complete. A package was distributed to team members which included project background, background information on *Water for Life* and the 2009 Action Plan, a workbook to assist organizations in thinking about and identifying potential actions, and an action template.

Work on the second objective is ongoing. The project team is partway through discussing progress and identifying actions. The team recently completed a workshop in May. The purpose

was to share potential action ideas, identify gaps, and opportunities. The next workshop is scheduled for June to share progress towards refining and finalizing actions in preparation for creating the Action Plan. These workshops include both project team and Cross-Ministerial Coordinating Committee members.

Andre is an active member on the project team. It is not typical for staff to be team members, however the Action Plan is an AWC document and the Council is one of the partners contributing actions to the Plan. AWC's contribution will be through incorporating recommendations from recent projects and commitments from the business plan and will also be informed by the organization's goals and strategies.

The next steps are to continue meeting and hosting workshops through the summer and fall. The team is still on pace to present the new action plan at the November 2022 board meeting.

Discussion

- **Q:** Have any themes or are any themes emerging from the work so far?
A: Fundamental to the work is the Alberta Water Futures Project Team's work which identified four themes. It is a difficult task since not all actions fit under one theme.
- For the Environmental sector, lack of resources is a challenge. It is also not as coherent as some other sectors on the board. The Environmental sector would appreciate the opportunity to be engaged early to find opportunities to enhance the actions being considered.
 - It has been a challenge as to how to include the Environmental sector (and other Non-Government Organizations (NGOs) as some are more directly engaged as water managers. An invitation to contribute and review the goals can be passed along.
 - Barriers to NGO participation have been discussed by the project team at length. Many NGO groups are already doing as much as they can to steward *Water for Life* goals. It is recognized that without addressing barriers to implementing actions for NGOs, it becomes difficult for them to add value here.
- The idea is not to make a laundry list of actions, but instead to identify tangible actions from each sector. If sectors are putting an action on the table, it must be something your sector is accountable for or can deliver on. There has been lots of discussion at the workshops and at the project team table about this.
- GoA has re-assembled a committee to recreate its governance to support the *Water for Life* strategy and Action Plan. Key ministries are part of that committee. GoA identified about 70 actions initially, but they are being refined.
- Wanted to recognize the significant contribution of former Project Manager Scott Millar – he led the team and cross-ministry strategy team. GoA has backfilled his position.
- **Q:** With Scott gone from AWC, who is taking his place?
A: Katie is taking on the role of project manager. She will be supported by other staff as needed.
- **Q:** Is everyone clear on why this project is being undertaken?
A: This will be covered as part of the business planning agenda item.

3 Improving Drought Resilience in Alberta Through a Simulation Project Team

Pamela Duncan, City of Calgary, and Nicole Pysh, AEP, the co-chairs of the project team, provided an update on their work and requested approval for an extension to the timeline to complete their work.

The purpose of this team was to host a drought simulation to assist GoA, municipalities, and other groups in planning for drought preparation and response, including mitigation, monitoring, decision making, and communication. The team began meeting in May 2020.

The first objective was to conduct a literature review to gather information on the type of exercise that was needed and tools to support it. That review was completed by consultant WaterSMART.

The next objective was to run the simulation. The simulation covered the South Saskatchewan River Basin using real data. The purpose of the simulation was to use modelled changes to assess risks and vulnerabilities in the region, identify stakeholder influences and vulnerabilities, opportunities for stakeholder collaboration, and educate stakeholders on the impacts of drought on basin operations. The simulation was held on June 10 in Calgary. Participants included irrigation districts, Watershed Planning and Advisory Councils (WPACs), municipalities, NGOs, GoA, industry, and the Blood Tribe Agricultural Project. The presentation provided an overview of the workshop setup, the modelled scenarios, and details on how the simulation model ran (e.g., decision points in the model).

The next step for the project is to report on the project outcomes and lessons learned. The consultant is going to provide a report on the simulation and the project team will develop recommendations based on the exercise results.

The exercise was originally scheduled in November 2021 but was delayed until June 2022 as the team thought an in-person exercise would be more effective than a remotely held simulation due to the impacts of COVID-19. Due to this delay, the team sought approval to extend the project timeline until February 2023, where the team will present their final results.

Discussion

- An error in the presentation was noted - the presentation states that the modelling timestamp was weekly, but the timestamp is monthly.
- About 40 people attended the simulation. It went well and participants enjoyed it. Congratulations to the team and the consultant for hosting a successful exercise.
- It was a wise decision to delay the event to host in-person. Hosting online would not have been as effective.
- **Q:** In the strategic intent of the project – the views about mitigation – what are the things the team has discussed about mitigation moving forward?
A: Some options of management actions that were part of the simulation (e.g., municipal demand reductions) impacted modelling results. The consultant report will include more information around the effectiveness of those measures. Information about who to talk to in different situations was also valuable.
A: Specific to mitigation, the measures were not influencing the model outcomes. Mitigation is actions that are taken outside a drought situation (e.g., exploring groundwater as an option for water supply for some users, options to increase water

storage on the landscape). The workshop did not get into detail on those measures, but some broad mitigation measures were discussed that could be taken prior to the next drought.

- **Q:** Would drought management in other jurisdictions be included in the final report, and would there be a summary of what was found in the literature review vs. the identified mitigation measures?
A: Unsure, would have to go back and check the mitigation measures. The team has not compiled the recommendations yet. It would be interesting to see if that is possible.
- **Q:** Can you speak to how the modelling identifies the impact on the healthy aquatic environment?
A: One of the performance measures in the model is Water Conservation Objectives (WCOs). Some people were asking to see those results during the workshop. The team was undertaking the exercise based on that information. That information will be included in the final report.
 - There were a lot of questions around how actions that were being taken were impacting environmental flows beyond WCOs. That should be noted in the consultant's report as well.
 - The Oldman basin table in particular was looking at the WCO during the exercise.
 - Yes, but when WCOs were not met, it was because there was no water in the reservoirs and the river was dry.
 - The workshop participants recognized that WCOs are limited in their representation of environmental health.
- How that mitigation policy or a regulatory approach could take place is something to explore further.
 - Following a drought last year, AEP identified 34 recommendations on how to improve resilience to water shortage.
- It is important to be prepared for these drought scenarios and understand the associated actions so that when it comes time for a drought, the province will be ready. This type of scenario work is useful for the provincial government.
- The plan is to have the draft final report available for the November board meeting for review and finalized for the February 2023 meeting. While it is a 6-month delay, it is only one further meeting from the AWC board perspective, with the benefit of getting comments on the draft final report.
- **Q:** Was the Platform Calgary venue ideal environment to run multiple workstations that are running simulations? They brand themselves as an innovative space.
A: For plug and play, it worked well. The room was not a great space to facilitate three concurrent discussions with some remote participants.. The ventilation was loud, and in a big room with hard surfaces, so you couldn't always hear the facilitators at the table.

Decision 60.3: The board approved amending the Improving Drought Resilience in Alberta Through a Simulation Project Team ToR to extend the project timeline until February 2023.

4 Source Water Protection Phase I: Risk Assessment Tools and Data

Co-chair Steph Neufeld of the Alberta Lake Management Society presented an update on the teams' work on the source water protection (SWP) project and some of the challenges the team has encountered.

The goal of the project is to develop a SWP platform and educational resources to assist drinking water providers with the risk assessment process. The tool would support integration and encourage greater collaboration among water users. The project would eventually develop recommendations for an implementation phase to support mitigation of risks to source water and a future strategy for SWP.

The project team first met in April 2021. Since then, the team has identified the scope of the tool and investigated options for who could develop the tool (government, non-profits, and consultants). Only consultants could complete the tool within the timeline and budget available. A request for proposals was issued, three consultants bid on the work, and the project team selected a winning bid.

The issue is that consultants all incur an ongoing maintenance fee to keep the platform running, and the AWC has no funding set aside for long-term maintenance. Before proceeding to sign a contract with the consultant, the team is gathering more information on how to support maintenance costs.

Discussion

- It is hard to decide how to move forward without knowing the features, capabilities, and limitations of the tool.
 - There was \$250,000 set aside for the web tool. The board has already approved that money in theory. The team has found a consultant who can develop the tool within budget. The problem is the ongoing maintenance costs were not budgeted for initially.
 - The current cost to develop the tool is under \$200,000. Funds already allocated towards the project could pay for maintenance for 2 years according to the cost estimates provided.
 - The team is raising the issue of the ongoing maintenance as potentially cost-prohibitive, not the cost of the tool itself. The project team has already identified a group that can develop the tool that meets the outcomes within budget.
 - The presentation at the last board meeting was dedicated to outlining the features of the platform.
- The AWC board recently received a presentation on the Alberta Water Tool. The developers of that tool shared a learning that to be successful, a tool needs to have government buy-in and dedicated users.
- EPCOR has also developed a tool for the North Saskatchewan watershed. One option is to see what the user uptake is on that tool. If there are few users or if there is low interest in government to commit to the tool, there may be little value.
- As a sector that would be using this tool, municipalities have little capacity to add new tools. If there were no cost to municipalities to use the tool, there would be some uptake, but smaller communities would not likely see the value. If there were a cost added to that, uptake would drop significantly.
- There was some discussion about options to potentially reduce cost (e.g., having the consultant develop the tool and another group maintain it for lower cost).
- If there is no policy lever around SWP, that makes moving ahead challenging. The provincial government has a role in advocating for SWP.

Action Item 60.1: Project managers and co-chairs will gather more information on the potential user base, follow up with the developers on the Alberta Water Tool on lessons learned in rolling out their tool, and determine the uptake of the North Saskatchewan EPCOR tool.

5 Alberta Innovates Water Innovation Program Update

Alberta Innovates (AI)'s Water Innovation Program (WIP) is a flagship program for GoA focused on advancing knowledge and innovation to support the *Water for Life* Strategy and Alberta's Water Research and Innovation Strategy.

The WIP started in 2009. The program themes are:

- water supply/ watershed management
- water use conservation, efficiency, and productivity,
- healthy aquatic ecosystems, and
- water quality protection.

Climate change adaptation and resilience are considered as important issues for each theme. Updates on the outcomes from completed projects and new investments being made in each area were noted.

The WIP is planning to release a call for proposals late June / early July, 2022. Proposals for the funding opportunity should achieve one of the following:

- Develop/ implement new water policies, practices, and strategies
- Accelerate water technologies toward commercialization
- Share/ mobilize water knowledge
- Create/ retain jobs
- Develop highly qualified personnel

There are three funding streams as part of the call for proposals: integrated approaches to water management; management of climate change impacts; and water and wastewater management in rural, Indigenous, and/or remote communities.

More information on funding can be obtained by getting in touch with a project advisor or by visiting the Clean Resources Programs on the AI website. The website also has information on a quarterly webinar series hosted by the WIP with presentations in areas of their work.

Discussion:

- **Q:** Did any of the work of the programs develop a monetary value of wetlands?
A: There is not a specific number available. AI has explored this area before but there is not a definitive answer. There are a range of tools available which together can be used to estimate costs.

6 AWC Business Plan Conversation

The purpose of this item was to receive input on the draft business plan and determine next steps for finalizing it.

The business plan process was approved in June 2021. Board surveys took place between September 2021 and January 2022; results from those surveys were shared at the February 2022 meeting. The draft business plan was prepared for this meeting.

The first survey results were that the core businesses, goals, and strategies from the 2019 business were still relevant, and a workshop was not needed to rescope them. The second survey looked into the support for each of the goals, strategies, and performance measures, and what changes the board would like to see. Six themes emerged for additional consideration to be included in the business plan. The most highly supported themes were “strengthened or renewed partnership” and “climate change adaptation”. Both themes are closely related to work completed in the Alberta Water Futures project and the current *Water for Life* Action Plan project.

AWC staff updated the business plan based on the surveys and previous board meeting discussions. Andre asked the board for input on whether the draft business plan was appropriate as is, needed minor changes, or major revisions.

Discussion:

Climate change adaptation

- Climate change has revolutionized the energy sector. It would be interesting to look into the potential water impacts of the energy transition. The introduction of hydrogen, carbon capture and storage, changes in the energy distribution network could impact water use.
 - There is a role for AWC in the energy transition sphere for specific opportunities like hydrogen. But there are related issues such as land and biodiversity, the nature value approach, wetlands, aquatic ecosystems, all of which are integrated in energy activities. Looking at these issues in isolation could result in missed opportunities.
 - There is a big push towards nature-based solutions (e.g., carbon neutrality). There could be co-benefits for water management in some of these areas.
- Another opportunity is how contemporary society is measuring environmental changes (e.g., flood, drought, wildfire, pests). Some Albertans are experiencing the impacts of these and there are estimates for how much these adverse events cost. All areas are water-related (e.g., wildfires are drought-related, pests are experienced when ecosystems are under stress). In general, climate change needs to be in the business plan.
- Being proactive on climate change is ideal.
- There is a need for government policy and regulation to set the stage so that the AWC can be proactive and not reactive.
- Many AWC projects are already talking about climate change and the future. Drought resiliency featured it prominently. It is more about enshrining climate change through the business plan, not coming up with ideas on carbon reduction strategies, for example, which is being done through many other initiatives.
 - Climate change has not been the focus of a particular piece of work, but it is a part of many projects. There is no shortage of other aspects of climate change to discuss.
- There was an Athabasca River Basin project a few years ago which modelled changes in allocations, use, etc. That model allowed different scenarios of rainfall, for example. A similar provincial scale modeling project could be helpful.

- Does incorporating climate change affect the organization's value proposition for the water community, and integration across the province? There is such a transition taking place (e.g., biodiversity, energy transition). Does it shift the role and identity of AWC? And is it more of a leadership role in that conversation?
 - That is a broad philosophical question without an easy answer.
- Adaptive management, adaptive regulation, or adaptive governance is at the heart of the challenge. Climate change is an opportunity it is hard to say whether it should be a specific goal for the next few years or a strategy.
 - There was significant discussion about where and how climate change should be included in the strategy. The board felt it was not a goal - goals are broader and are relevant over time. Climate change will be incorporated under some of the strategies of goal 2 and in the looking forward section. The board felt it was important to put it in more than one place so that it would not be overlooked.

Strengthened or renewed partnership

- With time, the AWC has shifted towards being more of an advisory body instead of one of shared accountability.
 - It has become less as an advisory body, at least in policy. There is a lot of discourse around challenging issues that the Council has moved away from.
- There are fundamental questions around strengthening partnerships: what does strengthening partnerships mean? An evaluation of power dynamics or the capacity of partners? Another issue is members do not have any ways of holding others accountable around the table. Engaging partners more effectively requires resources.
 - Historically, the AWC table was populated with senior leaders and decision makers. Eventually those people left the table. Shared governance would require decision makers in the room who hold each other accountable. If the minister can make decisions that this table is not participating in, it devalues the table.
- Policy assurance and clarity needs to be in place for proper investment for industry. There is a role for AWC to be more of a thinktank.
- When the *Water for Life* strategy was developed, water was the top issue, but water has since been overshadowed by climate. The role of the organization may have changed because of that. The Canada Water Agency (CWA) sees themselves as a coordinating body at the watershed level. The AWC board would benefit from having federal government as a member to avoid any duplication or competition.
 - That goes back to the earlier conversation around having federal membership at the board level.
 - The CWA is more an opportunity than a threat. The opportunity is around partnerships and management at the watershed level.
- An issue with the multi-stakeholder forum is that not all the initiatives are relevant to every sector. For example, for SWP, that's important to Albertans, but not to every sector, depending on where you get your water supply.
- A huge strength of the organization and teams is to hear different perspectives.
- There is a need and role for AWC to encourage engagement from Indigenous peoples. There was good participation on the Alberta Water Futures project.
 - Indigenous participation is included in the mission. Developing these relationships is ongoing but a slow process.
- For Goal 1 – review and provide integrated advice – to who?

- It depends on the project but not always GoA.
- The value of this table is the integration piece – balancing different perspectives.
- Is consensus needed instead of integrated?
 - Integrated information does not need consensus.
 - Integrated needs a definition – it could mean integrated input from different partners or integration of information in different topic areas.
- Throughout the business plan, “partners” could be used instead of “sectors” to be more inclusive of Indigenous Peoples.
- One of the AWC’s actions to be included in the *Water for Life* Action Plan is tied to recommendation 14 of the recent *Water for Life* Implementation Review report which is about striking a team to review the *Water for Life* partnerships system.
-
- The board would like Andre to update the draft text for board review and approval. Most of the changes can be added to the introduction section or looking ahead section to provide cross-cutting context to all elements of the business plan.

Action Item 60.2: Andre will update the business plan and send it to the executive committee, then the board for approval at the November meeting.

Decision 60.4: *The board approved the business planning path forward by consensus.*

7 Information Reports and Questions

Several information reports were included in the board package, and board members were asked for any questions or feedback.

Discussion:

- The board recognized the contributions made by Jacqueline and Scott to the AWC; they will be moving on to other opportunities.
- **Q:** Is there any information on the next multi-year grant for AWC? Having a multi-year grant was a benefit for stability of the organization.
A: There are no definitive answers yet. Conversations to move that forward are happening soon.
- **Q:** For biodiversity indicators, who is the proper person in AEP to address that?
A: Sarah Depoe.
- **Q:** Who has been retained to review the wetland policy?
A: Fiera Biological Consulting Ltd.
- **Q:** Does the watershed adaptation group that was within GoA still exist? If so, is there something with adaptation that they could share?
A: No, Marilea Pattison-Perry’s group (airshed science and watershed stewardship) is probably the closest to that. There is a grant program administered through watershed resiliency. That group could provide a presentation to the AWC.
- **Q:** For the Surface Water Quality Frameworks that are coming out in the summer, is there an opportunity for final engagement or conversation?
A: The final engagement opportunity was closed last fall. There is not another round of public engagement.

- **Q:** Does the SWQMF include regulatory details on what happens in absence of a land use plan?
A: Sarah Depoe can answer those questions.

Action Item 60.3: AWC staff will follow up with Marilea Pattison-Perry regarding a potential presentation to the board on watershed adaptation.

New Business

Board members shared updates from their sectors:

- The Environmental Law Centre is hosting a webinar on June 23, titled “Water law and policy: gaps, opportunities, and law reforms”. That webinar will be about providing a perspective on how the *Water Act* could be improved. Further information is available on the Environmental Law Centre website.
- Alberta Innovates is hosting a webinar on June 16 on Water Reuse: Risks, Regulations, and Rewards. Further details are available on their website.
- A focus of CAPP’s advocacy on water for the last several years has been on enabling alternative water sources to be used for hydraulic fracturing. The AER is working on removing the regulatory barriers for water reuse, and has recently completed the Centralized Fluid Storage project to enable longer-term storage of alternative water sources (through updates to Directives 055 and 058). The AER has also drafted requirements to enable alternative water sources to be moved via temporary surface pipelines, which will be posted for public comment in July (i.e., updates to Directive 077).
- There are roughly 40 new lake water reports available on the ALMS website.

Participants were thanked for joining the meeting.

The next board meeting is in Edmonton at Government House on November 4, 2022.

The board meeting adjourned at 2:54 pm.

Attachment 1: Meeting #60 Attendees

In Attendance

AWC Directors and Alternates

Ahmed Idriss, Industry (Power Generation)
Angela Duncan, Government (Small Urban)
Brett Purdy, GoA and Provincial Authorities
(Science and Research)
Brian Deheer, NGO (Environmental)
Che-Wei Chung, Government (Small Urban)
Craig Werner, Industry (Forestry)
Dan Moore, Industry (Forestry)
James Guthrie, Industry (Mining)
Jamie Curran, GoA and Provincial Authorities
(Alberta Environment and Parks)
Jamie Wuite, GoA and Provincial Authorities
(Alberta Agriculture, Forestry, and Rural
Economic Development)
Jason Unger, NGO (Environmental)
Jay White, NGO (Lake Environment
Conservation)
Jim Hackett, Industry (Power Generation)
Margo Jarvis Redelback, Industry (Irrigation)

Maureen Bell, NGO (Environmental)
Merry Turtiak, GoA and Provincial
Authorities (Health)
Nevin Rosaasen, Industry (Cropping)
Paul McLoughlin, Government (Rural)
Rawnauld Axelson, Industry (Livestock)
Rob Hoffman, Industry (Chemical and
Petrochemical)
Ruth Mitchell, GoA and Provincial
Authorities (Alberta Health)
Steph Neufeld, NGO (Lake Environment
Conservation)
Steve Meadows, NGO (WPACs)
Tara Payment, Industry (Oil & Gas)
Vicki Lightbown, GoA and Provincial
Authorities (Science and Research)
Andre Asselin, Executive Director (ex-
officio)

Guests:

Brian Free, Alberta Environment and Parks
Cam Lane, Alberta Environment and Parks
Jaclyn Schmidt, Alberta Environment and Parks
Jason Schneider, Rural Municipalities of Alberta
Marilea Pattison Perry, Alberta Environment and Parks
Martina Krieger, Alberta Environment and Parks
Morna Hussey, Alberta Environment and Parks
Nicole Pysh, Alberta Environment and Parks
Pamela Duncan, City of Calgary

AWC Staff and Contractors:

Alec Carrigy, Jacqueline Noga, Katie Duffett, Anuja Hoddinott

Absent with Regrets:

Bev Yee, GoA and PA (AEP)
Darren Calliou, Métis Settlements General Council
Deanna Cottrell, Industry (Oil and Gas)
Jason Hale, Industry (Livestock)
John Conrad, GoA and PA (AFRED)
Lesley Peterson, NGO (Fisheries Habitat Conservation)
Morris Nesdole, NGO (WPACs)

Nancy Mackay, Government (Large Urban)
Tracy Scott, NGO (Wetlands Conservation)

Attachment 2: Meeting #60 Decision Log and Action Items

Decisions

Decision 60.1: The board approved the agenda by consensus.

Decision 60.2: The board approved the February 2022 meeting summary by consensus, and it will be posted to the website.

Decision 60.3: The board approved amending the Drought Simulation ToR to extend the project timeline until February 2023.

Decision 60.4: The board approved the business planning path forward by consensus.

Action Items

Action Item 60.1: Project managers and co-chairs will gather more information on the potential user base, follow up with the developers on the Alberta Water Tool on lessons learned in rolling out their tool, and determine the uptake of the North Saskatchewan EPCOR tool.

Action Item 60.2: Andre will update the business plan and send it to the executive committee, then the board for approval at the November meeting.

Action Item 60.3: AWC staff will follow up with Marilea Pattison-Perry regarding a potential presentation to the board on watershed adaptation.