

ALBERTA WATER COUNCIL

MEETING #29
October 28, 2010
Calgary, Alberta

Executive Summary

As a result of a Members meeting held just before the regular board meeting, the Crop Sector Working Group was welcomed to the Council, joining the Industry broad category and bringing the number of Members to 25. Neil Boyd and Sharon McKinnon will serve as the director and alternate, respectively.

Several administrative items were addressed, including the approval of Jay White, Rob Pritchard, and Al Kennedy as NGO, Government and Industry Vice-Presidents respectively. The two-year terms for the NGO and Government Vice-Presidents end in October 2012. Al is assuming the Industry Vice-President's position mid-term and this appointment runs until October 2011. The board also approved the 2011 core operating budget as well as meeting dates for next year; these are: March 24 in Calgary, June 16 in Edmonton, and October 20 in Calgary.

Following up on its work to complete a new three-year Business Plan, the board approved all but one of the proposed performance measures and targets, with revisions to two others. Additional work will be done to further refine and clarify this single measure, which will be revisited at the March 2011 meeting.

Two new statements of opportunity were presented to the board: Riparian Land Conservation and Management Policy, sponsored by the WPAC Collective, and River Valley Corridor Management, sponsored by Alberta Sustainable Resource Development. These were added to the list of potential projects compiled at the last board meeting. Board members selected the "Riparian Land Conservation and Management Policy" and will establish a Working Group to develop terms of reference for a project team. It was also decided to drop three projects from the list: Targeted Healthy Aquatic Ecosystems Education, Water Resource Information, and Knowledge Broker.

The board approved in principle the draft working definition for non-point source pollution, as developed by the Non-Point Source Pollution Project Team. This definition will guide the work of the team's consultant and will ensure consistency in the use of the term. A new quorum proposal was also approved for the Moving from Words to Action Project Team, which will assist the team in completing its work. Because this team is focused on process matters rather than content, it was agreed that representation from all four AWC broad categories was not required.

The CEP Project Team presented an update and described the progress and some of the challenges facing the major water-using sectors in completing their CEP plans. The forestry and upstream oil and gas sectors, including oil sands, are expected to be the next sectors to complete their plans. Board members also heard updates from Alberta Environment on several topics including wetlands, water allocation, the recently appointed water panels, and the work of the Partnerships group with respect to key initiatives in the *Water for Life Action Plan*. Finally, information was provided on the Bow River Project. This is a stakeholder-driven, interactive modeling exercise to determine the hydrologic possibilities for re-managing the annual flow of the Bow River system.

Summary of Discussion

Board Meeting

Jim Ellis convened the board meeting at 9:22 a.m. and thanked staff for arranging the special annual event for the board last night. Those present introduced themselves. Copies of the Consensus *Decision-Making Toolkit*, a joint project by CASA and AWC created as part of the Martha Kostuch Legacy, were distributed to the board.

Immediately prior to the board meeting was a Members meeting at which the Crop Sector Working Group joined the Council. The board welcomed Neil Boyd and Sharon McKinnon, the new director and alternate for the Crop Sector Working Group.

1 Administration

1.1 Welcome and Approve Agenda

The agenda was reviewed and approved by consensus.

1.2 Appointment of Executive Officers

The two-year terms for Council executive members are staggered so that not all members change at the same time. Each broad category selects its representative for the executive, who is then formally approved by the board. This year the terms for the NGO and Government vice-presidents are up. As well, the industry vice-president has resigned and that broad category has identified its new representative who will complete the two-year term.

Decision 29.1: The board approved:

- *Jay White as the Non-Government Organization Vice-President for a term ending in October 2012.*
- *Rob Pritchard as the Government Vice-President for a term ending in October 2012.*
- *Al Kennedy as the Industry Vice-President for a term ending October 2011.*

1.3 Summary Report from June 24, 2010 meeting

Decision 29.2: The summary report for the June 24, 2010 meeting was adopted by consensus and will be posted on the Council website.

1.4 Action Items from June 24, 2010 Meeting

Gord Edwards advised that the first action item is complete and will be presented later in the meeting. The “Water for Communities” statement of opportunity has been referred to the GOA’s *WFL* Cross-Ministry Steering Committee for consideration. Dave Hill will advise the board later in the meeting regarding the Alberta Water Research Institute workshop with the AWC.

1.5 Executive Director's Report

Gord directed the board to his report in the briefing package, noting that the summer was very productive and some of the work will be presented later in the meeting. He reminded the board of the various responsibilities assumed by the executive committee, including overall board governance, finance, business planning, and communications. A sub committee looked at sustainable funding opportunities and reported back to the executive. The executive will now be considering that report in more detail and will provide updates at future meetings. Board members were encouraged to provide any feedback if they had questions or concerns regarding the executive's work.

1.6 2011 Core Operating Budget

Gord reviewed the core operating budget, which is expected to be about \$10,000-\$12,000 below budget for 2010. The biggest change for 2011 is human resources, as Terry Sly's secondment will end in May and new project management staff will likely be hired. It is expected that all project management for 2011 will be done by staff. Gord noted the following additional points:

- No staff raises or bonuses are planned.
- Funds will be needed to update computers and other equipment.
- Printing and design funds are for the annual report and project team reports.
- Staff now have the capacity to do most of the required communications work in house. A communications plan will be done in 2011 which will contain more details. Most of the Council's outreach and communications is with stakeholders rather than the public.
- The board will continue to receive financial updates at each meeting.

Decision 29.3: The board approved the 2011 core operating budget.

1.7 Signing Authority

Gord advised that due to changes in directors and staff, new signing authorities are needed. The current signing authorities (Keith Murray, Gord Edwards and Jennifer Beepat) will remain in place.

Decision 29.4: The board designated Jason Unger (Director) and Meredith Walker (Project Manager) with cheque signing authority for the Alberta Water Council, as follows:

- *All cheques up to and including \$25,000 require the signature of one of either Keith Murray, Jason Unger or Gord Edwards plus a second signature from any other designated director or staff.*
- *All cheques over \$25,000 also require two signatures including Gord Edwards plus either one of Keith Murray or Jason Unger.*

1.8 Meeting Dates for 2011

Decision 29.5: The board approved the following meeting dates and locations for 2011: March 24 in Calgary, June 16 in Edmonton, and October 20 in Calgary.

2 Business Planning – Performance Measures

At the June 2010 meeting, the board approved all components of the 2010 - 2013 Business Plan except for performance measures. Board comments at that meeting and subsequently were considered by the Executive Committee and the performance measures were revised based on that feedback. Gord Edwards reviewed the key definitions and presented the three goals (which were previously approved) as well as the revised performance measures and their associated targets. The Executive Committee requested the board to approve the Performance Measures report, which will be used to finalize the Council's 2010 -2013 Business Plan. It was noted that the goals can be revisited in the next business planning cycle.

The following points emerged in the board's discussion of performance measures (PMs):

- Goal 1, PM1 doesn't speak to the goal, and whether the recommendations are acted on is not necessarily within the control of the AWC. We may also want to add a timeline for review by the WFL Implementation Review Committee to ensure it is timely. Other sectors also have roles to play in implementation, and perhaps there should be a measure of the percentage of member sectors that are reporting implementation activity.
- Goal 2, PM1 is a measure of the quality of the recommendations being produced by the AWC; this is also a risk since the AWC does not control whether the recommendations are acted on. An auditor could judge that this is something AWC cannot influence.
- There is value in measuring how effective our recommendations are, even though we may not have control over how the GOA responds to them.
- The AWC is an advisory group and this goal and PM is the single most important way of measuring ourselves.
- The expectation is that all AWC consensus recommendations have GOA support because the GOA was represented on the teams developing them. If the recommendations are approved by the board, the implicit assumption is that the GOA agrees. If only 30% are acted on, then we should evaluate how we choose projects and make recommendations, as this affects our credibility.
- The PMs need to be measurable, timely, specific and focused. If we measure ourselves by someone else's actions, we should have only a few recommendations and focus on ensuring they are implemented. But with dozens of recommendations, we may be destined to fail.
- Alberta Environment noted that some of the Council's recommendations respond to GOA requests, while others are things the Council thinks the GOA should be considering.
- On topics for which GOA asked the AWC for advice, 90% success is reasonable, but on the others, it may not be. If we can't generate a product that is acceptable and implementable by those who ask for it, we need to reflect on that.
- Stakeholders other than the GOA may take AWC recommendations forward.
- Goal 2 doesn't talk about the GOA response; the PM is measuring something that is not reflected in the goal.

A group of board members crafted an alternative for Goal 1, PM1 that was brought back to the board for consideration.

Decision 29.6: *The board approved the Performance Measures report with the following changes:*

- a) *Goal 1, PM 1 is changed to say “percentage of AWC members contributing to the WFLIR report, which is due 18 months after the period under review.” The target will be 90% participation of AWC members.*
- b) *PM 1 and associated targets for Goal 2 will be revised and brought to the board at the March 2011 meeting.*
- c) *PM 2 and associated targets for Goal 2 will be revised and brought to the board at the March 2011 meeting to address the concern with the use of the word “resolved”, as it does not match the intent of the performance measure.*

Action 29.1: Executive Committee will revise the Performance Measures report and present it at the March 2011 board meeting for approval.

3 Statements of Opportunity

Gord reviewed the purpose of a Statement of Opportunity (SOO) as well as the Council’s decision-making process for SOOs. Two new SOOs will be presented and the board will decide if these should be added to the existing list of projects, from which the board will then select a new project. Staff also maintain a list of SOOs submitted to the Executive Director for analysis but which do not come to the board. To date, only one has fallen in that category, Groundwater Aggregate Mining. Gord noted that the process for submitting a SOO is described on the Council’s website.

Board members made the following comments regarding this item:

- The board needs a process for taking topics off the list to ensure its work remains timely and manageable.
- The board may want to consider a tool, such as a matrix, that could be used to help each member screen the proposed topics and decide which one(s) they support.

Riparian Land Conservation and Management Policy

Dug Major presented a SOO for a “Riparian Land Conservation and Management Policy,” directing the board to the background in the briefing binder. This SOO is sponsored by the WPAC Collective sector. He described the issue, the benefits to be derived from such a policy and why it is appropriate for the AWC to work on this issue. This policy could serve as a companion to the wetland policy.

The following points were made during the board’s discussion of this SOO:

- AWC needs to make sure this does not creep into work being done under the Land-use Framework. On the other hand, this could be a useful tool for the Regional Advisory Committees and for both urban and rural municipalities.
- Riparian lands are influenced by water, so this project belongs with the AWC. It could lead to a provincial policy and assist municipalities.
- There are big gaps in watershed management plan for non-point sources, and a riparian policy would help get tools in place for that work.
- Most rural municipalities are involved with riparian issues and it would help them to have an overall consistent coordination mechanism in place.

- The GOA will need to address riparian issues in some way, and this work could be useful for the RACs.

River Valley Corridor Management

Scott Millar presented a SOO to develop a coordinated management approach for major river valley corridors in Alberta, referring to the background in the board briefing book. This SOO is sponsored by Alberta Sustainable Resource Development (SRD). It provides an opportunity to develop a provincial collaborative approach to the management of river corridors. He noted that SRD can contribute funds to this project as long as there is a link to the Land-use Secretariat.

The following points were made during the board’s discussion of this SOO:

- Would it be more appropriate for this to be done at a watershed level rather than for the province as a whole, to ground the planning in the regional context?
- Another planning process creates potential for overlap with WPACs’ watershed management planning activities.
 - The GOA is seeking guidance on how to properly manage these corridors consistently throughout the province and on how the regions can work together. The SOO has tried to avoid the term “planning” and the hope is that a working group could more fully scope the work needed as it develops terms of reference.
- A number of municipalities and other players are developing river corridor management policies and approaches, so consistency is important. Rivers cross jurisdictional boundaries and we don’t want a patchwork of approaches.
- It would also add value if this work could be scalable to the second level of rivers and streams, many of which actually need more management than the large ones.

Decision 29.7: The board agreed to add both the “riparian policy” SOO and the “river corridor” SOO to the list of projects to be considered.

4 Project Selection

Gord reviewed the AWC’s project selection process and Meredith Walker briefly summarized the projects that the board had previously discussed and which were already on the list for consideration. With the addition of the two new projects, the full list includes:

- Targeted Healthy Aquatic Ecosystems Education
- Best Management Practices
- Instream Flow Needs Assessment Guide
- Headwaters Protection Strategy
- Groundwater Management Framework
- Knowledge Broker
- Water Resource Information
- Riparian Land Conservation and Management Policy
- River Corridor Management

Gord reviewed the AWC projects already in progress, noting that staff has capacity to manage up to six projects simultaneously. One new project will be added at this meeting and another new one likely in the first half of 2011, which will be a full project complement. He also noted that every project on the list serves the Council's mission and mandate, although members may have different ideas about which ones are more or less important for their sectors.

Gord then reviewed the voting process; each sector had one vote but could indicate both a first and second choice. Staff tallied the results, and the "Riparian Land Conservation and Management Policy" emerged with the most votes, finishing well ahead of the second choice. Three projects were ranked much lower than all of the other projects.

Decision 29.8: The board agreed to

- a) ***move ahead with the project on "Riparian Land Conservation and Management Policy," and***
- b) ***drop the three projects that received the fewest votes (Targeted HAE Education, Water Resource Information, and Knowledge Broker).***

Action 29.2: Staff will contact board members to determine sectoral interest in participating in a Riparian Working Group to develop terms of reference for a project team.

5 Alberta Environment Update

Sharon Willianen from Alberta Environment (AENV) provided an update on the work of the Partnerships group in the department, focusing on four initiatives in the *Water for Life Action Plan*:

1. **Sustainable funding for partners.** AENV is gathering perspectives on the value received by the GOA and other stakeholders from their participation in WPAC partnerships, and is examining potential sustainable funding mechanisms as well as existing and potential future roles for WPACs within the Cumulative Effects Management System (CEMS). This work is well underway and the intent is to have a sustainable funding approach developed by the end of March 2011. AENV is taking a similar approach with airshed zones.
2. **Framework for Watershed Management Planning.** The intent is to integrate watershed management planning with the regional planning being done under the Land-use Framework. The product will be a watershed management planning framework and guide for implementation. The Council has provided 12 recommendations on this topic and these are being implemented. A draft is now under review, although a few outstanding items remain (e.g., water allocation management system, CEMS and regional planning). This work is expected to be completed by April 2011.

3. **Watershed reporting tools.** This work is to develop core indicators and reporting tools for watershed and regional planning. These are needed to allow comparisons within and across watersheds and over time, provide an opportunity for roll up or roll down of information, optimize information for numerous end uses, and provide guidance to partners on indicators and format. AENV has developed a number of indicators in broad categories. A draft document is nearly ready for review. The target date for completion is April 2011.
4. **Establishment of other WPACs.** The Athabasca WPAC was formed in February 2010, based in Hinton. A workshop was held in late October to begin work to establish the Peace WPAC.

She reviewed the activities being undertaken for each initiative as well as their status and expected completion date, then responded to questions from the board:

Q: How will the new framework for watershed management planning and all the other pieces being done by various GOA departments come together?

A: We have identified the different initiatives and we have a cross-ministry WFL group which is the vehicle the GOA is using to ensure coordination. The framework is the overarching piece and the cross-ministry group will vet the framework before it is finished. Watershed plans will have many components and these can be aligned when a regional plan is in place.

Q: Will watershed plans be sub-regional plans recognized by the GOA and decision makers?

A: The GOA will be a partner at the table and will use and recognize the plans. They are not envisioned as sub-regional plans at this point. Once the seven regional plans are done, elements of a watershed plan could be incorporated.

Q: We have no clear idea yet how CEMS will roll out. The pilots (e.g., Industrial Heartland) are being led by AENV and supported heavily by the department. Will that continue?

A: We don't know now. There will be opportunities for legislative change but we have to look at the whole toolbox and this is a collaborative process.

Q: The presentation referenced flow commitment; what is that? Where in the plan is Instream Flow Need (IFN) as a core indicator?

A: Where it is a commitment in a plan or elsewhere with respect to water quantity, the water conservation objective and IFN are indicators for watershed health. The plans will ask if there are objectives, are they being met, etc. If not, something would be initiated. IFN is being considered. We would also have to determine if we have the information.

Jim Ellis provided a short update, focusing on several areas of current activity for AENV:

- **Wetlands.** AENV has continued to meet with stakeholders and on October 29 will be presenting results of the work done to date. A new wetland policy has not yet been developed. Cabinet and caucus are looking at this issue very closely and the Minister is very keen to get a policy in place
- **Water allocation.** A number of groups, including the AWC, have done considerable work on this issue. However, it is very complex and the level of understanding varies from region to region. The GOA is planning to hold meetings around the province to increase Albertans' knowledge and awareness of water generally, after which the discussion on water allocation will begin.
- **The recently-appointed water panels.** The federal environment minister has announced a water panel to look at water science and monitoring in the Lower Athabasca Region (LAR), focusing on the federal government's role. They will be working with AENV and the GOA to get a good understanding of the issues. Their report is due December 15, 2010. The other panel was appointed by the GOA to look at data in the LAR from GOA, industry and the work done by Dr. David Schindler, and how the data are interpreted. Three of this panel's six members, all scientists, were chosen by Dr. Schindler and three by the GOA. Their report is due February 15, 2011.
- **Knowledge base for CEMS.** A solid knowledge base is a main pillar for CEMS, across air, water, land and biodiversity. A panel will be established to look at options for a third-party, peer-reviewed system across the province to support data and information gathering and analysis. This work is in the very early stages.

6 Bow River Project

Mike Kelly presented an overview of this project, which is exploring options for re-managing the annual flow of the Bow River as an integrated system rather than reach by reach, as is the current approach. A multi-stakeholder group is using an interactive model to determine an optimum management regime for all users. The results will be taken to the GOA with estimates of associated costs and benefits.

Mike responded to questions from the board.

Q: How will improvements in the various river segments be assured?

A: The GOA will be negotiating with TransAlta regarding the upper reach of the river. The Bow River Project (BRP) is optimistic that the economic work done to date has presented some significant overall benefits, and we are trying to build all that in. We don't know how the GOA-TransAlta negotiations will proceed, but we are just looking to see what is possible and realistic. In terms of management, there could be a longer term watershed commission.

Q: Is the model a flow model?

A: Yes. When this part is done in December it will be run through AENV's water quality model. We think because of way the flows are being modified, water quality won't be affected.

Q: What happens to the group after December?

A: We are still working on that. Once the report is done, we'll get to the next steps. It will also depend on what the scenario and recommendations look like. Some of the same people and organizations may be more involved in another phase.

Q: How does this work affect discussions on water allocation licences and markets?

A: We think the results will lower the cost of transfers and enable trading to happen in a more open manner. This project tackles all of the WFL objectives and improves the discussion that will inform future policies. The legacy tools, especially the model, are significant.

Q: Do they expect this project to answer questions around the value of enhanced storage?

A: Yes, for the Bow. Increased storage in one of the reservoirs is something we're looking at. The environmental issues to do that will be small in relation to the benefits. But we still have to look at the costs.

Q: Do they foresee a tool for GOA to manage water?

A: No, we don't think the GOA should manage all of this but they should be a key player in the governance board. But there are always emergency powers. In an emergency, the GOA can step in and they have that power today.

Q: Are they suggesting that the current process for managing the river before we get to the emergency stage will be changed?

A: Others will decide that. We will put forward an option.

7 Sector Planning for CEP Project Team

John Skowronski presented an update on the work of the CEP team. He reviewed the progress that the major water-using sectors are making in developing their CEP plans, noting the various challenges that sectors are facing. The board was advised that the AUMA in collaboration with the AWC and AENV has prepared a video to inform municipalities about how to get started using AENV's online water use reporting (WUR) system.

Board members made the following comments in discussing this item:

- These plans should be called "efficiency and productivity" plans. The definition of conservation contemplates beneficial changes for both people and the environment, and we haven't seen much description of environmental benefits. Perhaps this aspect of conservation needs more rigor.
 - It was noted that some plans will not address conservation; rather they will focus on efficiency and productivity. In some sectors, it will be necessary to get all members moving in the same direction to get a good information base before they can look at conservation opportunities.
- With respect to the upstream oil and gas sector plan (for oil and gas and oil sands sectors), a draft will go out to WPACs after it receives internal approval. They will have time to review and a presentation will be arranged for each WPAC in their timelines. This is expected to start as early as November.

8 Non-Point Source Pollution Project Team

Stephanie Neufeld and John Englert presented background on the Non-Point Source Pollution Project Team and its work to date. A number of GOA departments and agencies are on the team, and the GOA also has a cross-ministry support group that ensures team members have the information they need to represent the GOA. A key task for the team was to develop a working definition of the term “non-point source pollution.” This was to ensure consistency in use of this term and also to define the scope for the consultant doing the work. Team members have provided the funds to cover the consultant budget and have also applied for a grant of \$100,000 from Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada. If successful, the additional funds would enable a broader call for proposals, expanding the pool of potential consultants out of province, thus enabling the team to increase the detail of the project and create a higher quality product. This expansion could extend the project from a completion date of October 2011 to March 2012, in which case the team will come back to the board to request a change in their terms of reference. A decision on the grant is not expected before December. The team recognized the importance of groundwater but did not want to take on too much. Once the tools have been explored and developed in this project, the scope could be expanded further in future.

Decision 29.9: The board approved in principle the project team’s draft working definition for non-point source pollution.

9 Moving from Words to Actions Project Team

Terry Sly presented an update as co-chair of the Moving from Words to Action Project Team. He provided background on the project, noting the purpose, and also summarized the work plan. AWC teams typically require that at least one member from each of the four broad categories be present to achieve quorum. This team is unique in that its focus is communication and coordination among and between the WFL partnerships, and not a water management issue as is the case for most of the Council’s teams. As such, the team proposes that its quorum rule be different. The change would not be viewed as a precedent and would be specific to this group. The quorum requirement that 55% of the team’s members be present, as well as one member from each of the groups listed will be maintained.

Decision 29.10: The board approved the proposed quorum requirement for the Moving from Words to Action Project Team, by substituting the current quorum requirement of “one representative from each broad category” with:

“One representative from each of the following groups:

- ***Alberta Water Council***
- ***WPACs (collectively)***
- ***Watershed Stewardship Groups/Alberta Stewardship Network***
- ***Government of Alberta***
- ***Other (includes Lake Environment Conservation sector, Environmental sector, and Rural sector).”***

10 New or Other Business

There was no new business.

David Hill provided an update on the proposed one-day workshop to be organized by the Alberta Water Research Institute (AWRI) to share information with the Council about AWRI research projects and give board members a chance to ask questions and speak with the researchers. They are looking for a date in the last two weeks of January in either Edmonton or Calgary. WPACs have expressed an interest in attending, and it was agreed that two people from each WPAC should be invited to attend, along with the Council's directors and alternates. It was suggested that four projects be included in the approximately six hours available. Dave will review the 32 projects underway and consult with the Council about which ones to include at the workshop. He also advised that the AWRI will provide an electronic update on projects twice a year to the board.

The meeting adjourned at 2:58 p.m.

Attachment 1: Meeting #29 Attendees

Council Directors and Alternates

Peter Aku, NGO (Fisheries Habitat Conservation)
Maureen Bell, NGO (Environmental)
Neil Boyd, Industry (Cropping)
Mark Brostrom, Government (Large Urban)
Carolyn Campbell, NGO (Environmental)
Deanne Carson, Industry (Power Generation)
Jim Ellis, GOA and Provincial Authorities (Alberta Environment)
Chris Fordham, Industry (Mining)
Lisa Maria Fox, NGO (Environmental)
David Hill, GOA and Provincial Authorities (Alberta Water Research Institute)
Les Gammie, NGO (WPACs)
Pat Kehoe, NGO (Wetland Habitat Conservation)
Al Kennedy, Industry (Chemical and Petrochemical)
John Kolk, Industry (Livestock)
Stuart Lunn, Industry
Dug Major, NGO (WPACs)
Sharon McKinnon, Industry (Cropping)
Ron McMullin, Industry (Irrigation)
Dave Middleton, Industry (Oil and Gas)

Dwight Oliver, Government (Rural)
Rob Pritchard, Government (Large Urban)
Richard Quail, Government (Small Urban)
Doug Sawyer, Industry (Livestock)
John Skowronski, Industry (Chemical and Petrochemical)
Jennifer Steber, GOA and Provincial Authorities (Alberta Energy)
Judy Stewart, NGO (Lake Environment Conservation)
Jeff Surtees, NGO (Fisheries Habitat Conservation)
Jason Unger, NGO (Environmental)
Jay White, NGO (Lake Environment Conservation)
Evelynne Wrangler, GOA and Provincial Authorities (Alberta Sustainable Resource Development)
Jamie Wuite, GOA and Provincial Authorities (Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development)
Gord Edwards, AWC Executive Director

Presenters:

Gord Edwards, *Executive Director's Report; 2011 Core Budget, Business Planning, Statements of Opportunity, Project Selection* (Items 1.5, 1.6, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0)
Dug Major, *Riparian Statement of Opportunity* (Item 3.0)
Scott Millar, *River Valley Corridor Statement of Opportunity* (Item 3.0)
Meredith Walker, *Review of Projects Previously Considered* (Item 4.0)
Sharon Willianen, *Alberta Environment Update* (Item 5.0)
Mike Kelly, *Bow River Project* (Item 6.0)
John Skowronski, *Sector Planning for CEP Project Team* (Item 7.0)
John Englert and Stephanie Neufeld, *NPS Pollution Project Team* (Item 8.0)
Terry Sly, *Moving from Words to Action Project Team* (Item 9.0)

Guest:

Kelly Ness, Alberta Environment

AWC Staff and Contractor Support

Andre Asselin, Terry Sly, Kim Sanderson, Meredith Walker

Absent with Regrets:

Darlene Carifelle, Government (Métis Settlements)
Colin Jeffares, GOA and Provincial Authorities (Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development)
Alex MacKenzie, GOA and Provincial Authorities (Alberta Health and Wellness)
Eric McGhan, GOA and Provincial Authorities (Alberta Sustainable Resource Development)
Keith Murray, Industry (Forestry)

Attachment 2: Meeting #29 Action Item Log

Action	Who	By when
29.1: Executive Committee will revise the Performance Measures report and present it at the March 2011 board meeting for approval.	Executive Committee	Feb. 2011
29.2: Staff will contact board members to determine sectoral interest in participating in a Riparian Working Group to develop terms of reference for a project team.	Staff	Dec. 15, 2010

Attachment 3: Decision Log

Decision 29.1: The board approved:

- *Jay White as the Non-Government Organization Vice-President for a term ending in October 2012.*
- *Rob Pritchard as the Government Vice-President for a term ending in October 2012.*
- *Al Kennedy as the Industry Vice-President for a term ending October 2011.*

Decision 29.2: The summary report for the June 24, 2010 meeting was adopted by consensus and will be posted on the Council website.

Decision 29.3: The board approved the 2011 core operating budget.

Decision 29.4: The board designated Jason Unger (Director) and Meredith Walker (Project Manager) with cheque signing authority for the Alberta Water Council, as follows:

- *All cheques up to and including \$25,000 require the signature of one of either Keith Murray, Jason Unger or Gord Edwards plus a second signature from any other designated director or staff.*
- *All cheques over \$25,000 also require two signatures including Gord Edwards plus either one of Keith Murray or Jason Unger.*

Decision 29.5: The board approved the following meeting dates and locations for 2011: March 24 in Calgary, June 16 in Edmonton, and October 20 in Calgary.

Decision 29.6: The board approved the Performance Measures report with the following changes:

- a) *Goal 1, PM 1 is changed to say “percentage of AWC members contributing to the WFLIR report, which is due 18 months after the period under review.” The target will be 90% participation of AWC members.*
- b) *PM 1 and associated targets for Goal 2 will be revised and brought to the board at the March 2011 meeting.*
- c) *PM 2 and associated targets for Goal 2 will be revised and brought to the board at the March 2011 meeting to address the concern with the use of the word “resolved”, as it does not match the intent of the performance measure.*

Decision 29.7: The board agreed to add both the “riparian policy” SOO and the “river corridor” SOO to the list of projects to be considered.

Decision 29.8: The board agreed to

- a) move ahead with the project on “Riparian Land Conservation and Management Policy,” and*
- b) drop the three projects that received the fewest votes (Targeted HAE Education, Water Resource Information, and Knowledge Broker).*

Decision 29.9: The board approved in principle the project team’s draft working definition for non-point source pollution.

Decision 29.10: The board approved the proposed quorum requirement for the Moving from Words to Action Project Team, by substituting the current quorum requirement of “one representative from each broad category” with:

“One representative from each of the following groups:

- Alberta Water Council*
- WPACs (collectively)*
- Watershed Stewardship Groups/Alberta Stewardship Network*
- Government of Alberta*
- Other (includes Lake Environment Conservation sector, Environmental sector, and Rural sector).”*

ALBERTA WATER COUNCIL
AGENDA, MEETING #29

October 28, 2010
McDougall Centre – Calgary

NOTE: Broad Category caucusing from 8:00 to 9:00 am followed by Members meeting from 9:00 to 9:15 am
MEMBERS MEETING

- 9:00 1.0 Administration – Chair 15 min**
1.1 Welcome, introductions and approve agenda
1.2 Approve new member

GENERAL BUSINESS OF COUNCIL

- 9:15 1.0 Administration – Chair 15 min**
1.1 Welcome and approve agenda
1.2 Appointment of Executive Officers – Non-Governmental Organizations, Government and Industry
1.3 Approve Summary Report from June 24, 2010 meeting
1.4 Review of actions from last meeting
1.5 Executive Director’s report
1.6 Approve proposed 2011 AWC Core Operating Budget
1.7 Signing Authority
1.8 Approve meeting dates for 2011
- 9:30 2.0 Business Planning – Performance Measures 30 min**
Approve performance measures to finalize the Council 2010 – 2013 Business Plan
- 10:00 3.0 Statements of Opportunity 30 min**
Consider Statements of Opportunity.
- 10:30 Break 15 min**
- 10:45 4.0 Project Selection 45 min**
Select a new project and review a draft 2011 Operational Plan.
- 11:30 5.0 Alberta Environment Update 30 min**
Hear an update from Alberta Environment on a number of topics.
- 12:00 Lunch (provided in the room) 45 min**
- 12:45 6.0 Bow River Project 30 min**
Hear a presentation on a stakeholder-driven, interactive modeling exercise to determine the hydrologic possibilities for re-managing the annual flow of the Bow River system.
- 1:15 7.0 Sector Planning for CEP Project Team 45 min**
Receive an update on sector plan development, hear a presentation on the team’s findings in their “What We’ve Learned” report, and see a video developed in partnership with AUMA and AENV to assist municipalities in using the Water Use Reporting System.
- 2:00 8.0 NPS Pollution Project Team 30 min**
Approve the NPS pollution working definition.
- 2:30 9.0 Moving from Words to Actions Project Team 15 min**
Approve the quorum proposal for this project team and review the proposed survey and potential workshop process.
- 2:45 10.0 New or Other Business 15 min**
New items of business or other items of information for Council
- 3:00 Adjournment**