

ALBERTA WATER COUNCIL

MEETING #43

April 7, 2016

McDougall Centre, Calgary, Alberta

Executive Summary

The board meeting convened immediately following the 2016 AGM. James Guthrie representing the mining sector, Mark Brostrom representing the large urban sector, and Dan Moore, the alternate representing the forestry sector, were welcomed to the board. Andre Corbould will serve as the new director for Alberta Environment and Parks but was unable to attend this meeting.

Rick Blackwood provided a detailed update on GoA activities related to water, with reference to a number of current policy initiatives, and Brett Purdy provided a short update from Alberta Innovates – Energy and Environment Solutions. Ernie Hui, Special Advisor to Environment and Parks on Water Quality, summarized the work being planned in two key areas: improving sustainability of drinking water systems in indigenous and small rural communities, and future direction and support for WPACs.

The board made three key decisions at this meeting:

1. It approved the proposed 2016 AWC Operational Plan, recognizing that the plan could change if and when new projects are identified later this year.
2. It approved the final report and communications plan from the Water Literacy Project Team and agreed to disband the team. This work was done in parallel with the GoA's development of an interim Water Literacy Strategy, and the team developed five recommendations to improve water literacy in Alberta. Its report will be released in the next few months.
3. Upon receiving a recommendation from the Source Water Protection Working Group, the board agreed to disband this group as its work has been taken back into government for more research and consideration.

The board heard updates from two project teams and from the *Water for Life* Implementation Review Committee, as well as a report on implementation progress of AWC recommendations.

- The Lake Management Project Team is focusing on lake watershed management because lakes cannot be managed in isolation from the surrounding land. Key findings were summarized and the team has developed 13 draft recommendations organized under six themes. A final report will come to the board in November.
- The Evaluating Water CEP Project Team will use a combination of qualitative and quantitative results in its evaluation and will define criteria for measuring success in meeting the various CEP goals. Draft recommendations will come to the board in November.
- The *Water for Life* Implementation Review Committee is reviewing progress from 2012–2015. Recommendations are being developed in 11 theme areas. Sector engagement will occur later in April and the team will ask the board to approve its report in June.
- Of the 245 recommendations made by AWC, 31% have been implemented, 62% are in progress, and 5% are not under consideration at this time. Updates are based on information provided by the implementer(s). The board asked staff to review the implementation tracking process and suggest improvements.

Summary of Discussion

Keith Murray convened the board meeting at 9:21 a.m. immediately following the AGM. At the AGM, two new directors were welcomed to the board. James Guthrie will represent the mining sector and Mark Brostrom will represent the large urban sector. Dan Moore will represent the forestry sector as an alternate. Andre Corbould will join the board as the new director for Alberta Environment and Parks but was unable to attend this meeting.

1 Administration

1.1 Approve Agenda

The Chair reviewed the agenda, which was approved by consensus.

1.2 Summary Report from October 29, 2015 Meeting

Decision 43.1: The summary report for the October 29, 2015 meeting was adopted by consensus and will be posted on the AWC website.

1.3 Action Items from October 29, 2015 Meeting

There were no action items from the last meeting.

1.4 Management Report

Gord Edwards referred the board to his management report in the briefing package, drawing attention to several items: the AWC has brought on a part-time administration assistant, Alyssa Valentine; AWC and CASA continue to explore potential efficiencies in operations; and the Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) report will likely be released in early-mid May as the new inspection season is launched, possibly through a press conference with the Minister. Staff will continue to monitor the overall budget and seek improvements in efficiency. Board members noted that the AUMA and AAMDC have been in touch with their Saskatchewan counterparts regarding the AIS recommendations and are encouraging that province to adopt similar policies and processes.

1.5 Operational Planning

Andre Asselin presented an overview of the 2016 operational plan, which describes the major pieces of proposed work for the year, guided by the 2014–2016 business plan. Several projects are expected to wrap up in 2016, putting the AWC in a position to take on new work with the intent of maintaining three projects through 2016–17. Andre identified several challenges including funding capacity, volunteer burnout, evolving priorities in water management, and client needs.

Discussion

Board members noted that the AWC has been a good advisory body to the GoA. There is still a role for board members to bring forward ideas for new work, but we need to ensure we align with the priorities and needs of the GoA when deciding what to take on.

The GoA noted that it has had similar discussions with CASA and it is important for the GoA to identify pressing issues for which it needs advice and assistance, particularly in a multi-stakeholder context. The GoA agreed to work with the AWC executive to determine a path for identifying pressing new issues for consideration. Although CASA and the AWC

are not part of the GoA's review of agencies, boards and commissions, the same lens is being used to look at their work to ensure there is good value for the funds provided. The current government has indicated water is a high priority, particularly with respect to flood and drought, but is still sorting out specific details.

Decision 43.2: The board approved the proposed 2016 AWC Operational Plan.

2 Government of Alberta (GoA) Update

Rick Blackwood provided an update on GoA activities related to water, focusing on the key points noted below. AEP will provide a written description for the board in a separate document.

- Andre Corbould has been named Deputy Minister of AEP; he previously worked on the Flood Recovery Task Force and served as Deputy Minister in other departments after his retirement from the Canadian Armed Forces.
- A new Climate Change Office has been established, headed by DM Bill Werry, to lead implementation of the province's climate change strategy.
- Ernie Hui has been appointed Special Advisor on Water Quality.
- The federal government's Disaster Financial Assistance Agreement new funding formula transfers more financial liability for new flood events to local taxpayers. The intent is to discourage building in high risk areas and increase community understanding and preparedness. The Alberta Emergency Management Agency is largely responsible for implementing this agreement.
- Water Policy Updates:
 - Water Conversation
 - Water Reuse
 - Wetland Policy Implementation
 - Surface Water Quantity Management Framework for the Lower Athabasca River
 - Tailings Management Framework Implementation
 - Water Conservation Policy for Upstream Oil and Gas Operations
 - Drinking Water and Wastewater (Ernie Hui addressed these items in his later presentation to the board)
 - Groundwater Strategy
 - Load Management
- Alberta Health Update (draft Recreational Water Management Protocol)
- AEMERA (transition of function back to AEP over the next 3-4 months)

Brett Purdy provided a short update from Alberta Innovates – Energy and Environment Solutions, noting that funding decisions are expected shortly on new research and development related to water supply, conservation, efficiency and productivity, and other areas. Announcements will be made in the fall regarding investments in five key technology areas. AI-EES recently held its annual forum to showcase projects, and also had a conference with COSIA to focus on oil sands and water issues. John Zhou is now acting CEO. The GoA may announce changes to the innovation system in the near future.

Discussion

Board members asked various questions to which GoA representatives responded.

Q: Where are things at in terms of federal infrastructure funds, as these could be used for wastewater and drinking water treatment facilities?

Rick Blackwood (RB): Alberta Infrastructure is leading this work for the GoA, but AEP has been asked to start developing business cases for some flood-related elements. Ideas are being fleshed out and we may be able to provide more information on the status.

Q: First, I'd like to commend Forestry for holding two very good science-based workshops, including one on wet area mapping using LiDAR. This is a very powerful tool. Second, can you give us more details on the groundwater strategy and how it might tie to a potential review of the Agricultural Operation Practices Act (AOPA)?

Jamie Wuite: The degree to which AOPA will be reviewed is still being decided by the GoA. Research is looking to fill knowledge gaps noted by the Natural Resources Conservation Board, but a decision on AOPA review has not yet been made.

Q: Is Alberta looking at other jurisdictions such as the Netherlands and the work done there by Deltares to inform the groundwater strategy?

RB: Yes, we are doing a cross-jurisdictional review to learn from others.

Comment: Implementation of the Wetland Policy in the White Area has been problematic for the agriculture sector; e.g., consistency in approvals, compliance, clarity around the rules for producers. The sector would like to see AEP work more closely with Alberta Agriculture and Forestry on stewardship and implementation.

Comment: In the Oldman basin, we have noticed gaps between implementation and policy in terms of groundwater protection and AOPA. We hope those gaps will be addressed.

Q: What is the status of the development of floodway regulations?

RB: We are seeking approval to bring a new regulation out for wide consultation, and that should happen later this year.

Q: Where are things at with land use planning?

RB: The review of the Lower Athabasca Regional Plan did hold other plans up a bit as we dealt with specific issues. That plan was the first one done and was very complex, so there was reluctance to continue the process until those things had been addressed. Renewed activity should be underway shortly.

Comment: There has been some suggestion that Water Conservation Objectives should be set for all basins as part of the land use planning process.

RB: We do want to get a better connection between regional planning and other pieces, and this is also related to the monitoring, evaluation and reporting work.

3 Water Literacy Project Team

Kim McLeod presented the draft final report and communications plan from the Water Literacy Project Team. She reviewed the background of the project and its strategic intent to enhance knowledge of the state of water literacy in Alberta and improve water literacy in the province. The team's work was done in parallel with the GoA's development of an interim Water Literacy Strategy. The team did a survey and inventory of existing water literacy

programs, products and assessment in Alberta and then looked at program best practices to identify gaps. A consultant was hired to assess the water literacy of 100 Albertans on six different topics. Kim shared highlights of the assessment noting that the level of awareness and knowledge varied with the topic. The team developed five recommendations to improve water literacy in Alberta, the rationale for which was presented to the board.

Discussion

Board members provided the following comments:

- The report is well done and easy to read with good information. In some places, there are references to environmental literacy rather than water literacy and it would be helpful to also note the need for economic and social literacy in this context, to round out the three pillars of sustainability. Presumably the GoA would consider all three components in its strategy. The report should be reviewed to ensure the terms "water literacy" and "environmental literacy" are being used in the appropriate context and as the team intended, without undermining the team's discussions and considerations. It seems that when environmental literacy is used is it referring to natural resources more broadly and could encompass all three aspects.
- It is often hard to separate water literacy from land use literacy and we should be careful that the terms don't become too restrictive.
- Is there an opportunity to refer to and acknowledge existing tools (e.g., water CEP) when communicating about this work?
 - The communications plan is intended to focus on this report. The timelines for release will depend in part on the Minister's interest in and availability for a press conference after the report is printed.

Decision 43.3: The board agreed to:

- 1. approve the report Recommendations to Improve Water Literacy in Alberta,***
- 2. approve the communications plan, and***
- 3. disband the Water Literacy Project Team.***

4 Source Water Protection Working Group

Andre Asselin presented the background for this project, noting its initial launch in response to a Statement of Opportunity from the GoA. A similar idea emerged from the Water Conversation, and then a new government was formed with its priorities. The working group met three times and held wide-ranging discussions but was unable to agree on the scope of source water protection. The group did identify a potential project that was very large in scope; however, many concerns remained, including limited resources, the fact that much of the work would need to be done by GoA, and a feeling that this was not an appropriate project for the AWC. The group sought direction from GoA, which ultimately suggested that the work be taken back into government for more research and consideration, and the working group agreed. The group is thus requesting that it be disbanded.

Discussion

Board members provided comments and Andre and Rick Blackwood responded as needed.

- Part of the AWC's value is the ability to evaluate GoA policies and programs. Was that intended to be part of the work?
 - AA: Gathering all of the information was not considered good use of AWC time since most of this work would need to be done by GoA.

- RB: The GoA wants to further consider this issue and make the question more precise.
- The Water Conversation Action Plan says that the GoA will develop tools and guidelines regarding source water protection. I can support the logic to disband the team, but will these guidelines be developed?
 - RB: That is still the intent but we need clarity on the definition of source water because the language is very loose at present and veers into land use. We need to be clear as to what we are trying to accomplish.
- Is the existing work available so we know what is being done?
 - AA: The working group minutes can be shared, but there is a great deal of information and the group does not have a comprehensive list of all materials.
- How do we ensure this topic doesn't fall off the table and disappear?
 - AA: The GoA has said it will follow up and can provide an update to the board.

Action 43.1: AEP will provide an update to the board on its work related to source water protection by the November 2016 meeting.

Decision 43.4: The board agreed to disband the Source Water Protection Working Group.

5 Lake Management Project Team

Sharon McKinnon provided an update and presented the themes for the team's draft recommendations. The team is focusing on lake watershed management because lakes cannot be managed in isolation from the surrounding land. She summarized key findings in four areas: science and knowledge; governance; lake watershed management planning; and stewardship, education and tools. The team has developed 13 draft recommendations organized under six themes and has received extensive feedback through the first round of review. A final report will come to the board in October.

Discussion

During discussion with board members, it was further noted that under theme 4, the team envisions that an existing local authority would be identified to lead development and implementation of lake watershed management plans, not that a new body would be created.

Board members provided comments and Sharon and others responded.

- Lake watershed management is a multi-jurisdictional issue, but did the team talk about establishing Water Conservation Objectives for lakes and where they fit into lake management?
 - This would be complicated because objectives for one lake would be very different from another.
 - We first need to determine which lakes need a lake watershed management plan.
- Is the intent to integrate the lake inventory and the management so that science of land and water use can be brought to bear on management?
 - Yes, the intent is to link lakes and their watersheds.
- Where does this work fit with the Land-use Framework and regional plans? That is where the power rests to change legislation and do integration.
 - We see lake watershed management plans being one of many sub-regional plans.

- A big challenge is scale. Regional planning does not typically get to this level of specificity. The regional planning process could take broad guidance from this work but would not get to this scale.
- Have you discussed fish-bearing lakes with federal authorities?
 - The team has talked about this and did try to engage the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. The AWC is re-opening lines of communication with the federal government given their renewed interest in environmental matters.
- Analysis could also look at biodiversity, which may affect the potential involvement of the federal government.

6 Water for Life Implementation Review Committee

Kristen Lorenz and Gordon Thompson provided background and described the purpose of the Implementation Review Committee (IRC). AWC has done four reviews of implementation progress, the last one being for the period 2009–2011. This review is looking at 2012–2015. The components of the IRC’s work were noted and the information gleaned from document review, the sector survey, interviews and guest speakers was summarized. Overall, the *Water for Life* strategy has been resilient and relevant, but gaps and weaknesses need to be addressed, and integration with the Integrated Resource Management System, Land-use Framework and regional planning is needed as well as increased adaptability, and better tracking and communication of progress. The IRC is developing recommendations in 11 theme areas under the three goals and three key directions of WFL. Sector engagement will occur later in April and the team will ask the board to approve its report in June.

Gordon Thompson distributed copies of a new document published by the North Saskatchewan Watershed Alliance called *Living in the Shed*.

7 Presentation from the Special Advisor to Environment and Parks on Water Quality

Ernie Hui’s presentation focused on the proposed recommendations in the AWC’s current review of implementation progress on *Water for Life*. He noted two proposed recommendations then described the work that is planned to implement them. The first component involves the GoA working with partners to improve sustainability of drinking water systems in indigenous and small rural communities. The GoA intends to focus on three elements:

1. The need for one drinking water regulatory standard that applies to all public delivery systems. This will be coordinated with Alberta Health. The intent is to put appropriate tools in place in 2017.
2. Ensure the sustainability of the system, which has tended to focus on grant funding in the past. Other system supports are being examined to determine the best way forward to address gaps.
3. Provide a supportive environment to enable long-term sustainable operation of drinking water and wastewater services in indigenous communities, recognizing the GoA’s support for the UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

The second component is GoA commitments to *Water for Life* partnerships and continued support for these partnerships. Work planned in this area is focusing on WPACs with the goal of obtaining clarity on water management planning and affirming the value and benefits of WPACs, in particular achieving a good understanding of roles, responsibilities and functions. WPACs have been asked to provide their feedback in three main areas:

- What they see as their future role(s)
- What support they would need to achieve success in these roles
- What are their thoughts regarding governance

Ernie has met with most of the WPACs already and had enthusiastic and engaging discussions. Feedback on the three areas is expected by early May. It will be reviewed by AEP and the hope is to have a plan for the Minister by fall.

Discussion

Board members engaged in a brief discussion with Ernie.

Q: Can you comment on water management plans in terms of mandatory content and hierarchy and how they fit with the broader plans?

Ernie Hui (EH): We've started talking about sub-regional plans, but in situations like Pigeon Lake and its blue-green algae problem, for example, who should do a water management plan? And who does it go to in AEP? The thinking on things like this is not clear yet. These are some of the issues we need to talk about as we look at roles and responsibilities. The intent of WPACs was to create a collaborative approach to water management in the basins.

Q: Who are you a special advisor to and are there other water quality interests in AEP?

EH: Both the Minister and the Deputy Minister need to be kept informed. Part of my role is to pull together efforts inside the department.

Q: How do you know what success looks like until we know what the roles and responsibilities are? Doing state of the basin reports is different from doing a plan that has a lot of trade-offs. WPACs are not the right decision-making forum for tough decisions.

EH: Initially we envisioned four primary functions for WPACs: to bring up local issues, do water management plans, prepare state of the watershed reports, and undertake public engagement and outreach. These functions are still the foundation. There has been some discussion about going even further—maybe not picking up decision making, but taking on the role of implementer. Some WPACs have raised this as a potential role, but we don't have clarity on what this might mean for them.

Q: How large a scope do you envision when talking about water quality of individual wells?

EH: The drinking water work pertains to systems that provide water to the general public. We don't intend to get to the level of dealing with one well for one household.

Q: What if a household with a well has tenants?

EH: I'm not sure how that type of situation would be handled, but the intent is to focus on places where the public would expect to get drinking water (e.g., restaurants, campsites).

8 Evaluating Water Conservation, Efficiency and Productivity Project Team

Kim McLeod and Rob Hoffman reviewed the AWC's involvement in water CEP work. The team will report on the progress of the seven major water using sectors and their contributions to meeting the *Water for Life* goals and the specific outcome of a 30% improvement in overall efficiency and productivity from 2005 levels by 2015. To date, three

sectors have reported improvements in efficiency and five sectors reported improvements in productivity. It seems unlikely that the team will be able to “roll up” the results to a single number due to the constraints that have been identified in terms of methodology and reporting. The team will define criteria to measure success. How to measure water conservation has been a challenge throughout the CEP work, as water saved is not necessarily being conserved for environmental benefit. Although many sectors saw improvement in efficiency and productivity, they did not necessarily see a reduction in water diversion. The team will use a combination of qualitative and quantitative results and will provide another update to the board in November along with draft recommendations.

Discussion

Board members offered comments and questions, and the presenters and staff responded.

- I suggest removing reference to CEP or HAE improvements due to regulatory requirements. Also, when assessing these contributions, it’s important to describe what they are and how they were achieved; e.g., there are two measures noted for urban municipalities. What do they describe and how were efficiency improvements achieved?
 - These improvements were likely related to metering and reduced leakage for the Large Urban sector.
- This approach does not address regional differences. If we are trying to do better we need to understand the regional context. Also, this work does not include fracking.
 - The project team did consider regional issues, but the intent of the work was to look at CEP from the perspective of major water using sectors. The data we have will not allow regional breakdown.
- AI-EES is supporting some regional work to look at supply and demand issues and timing at the regional and sub-regional levels. This information is not yet ready but it will advance the CEP work once it is available.
- I acknowledge that this isn’t a comprehensive update, but it might be more balanced to acknowledge challenges as well as achievements contributing to the goals rather than just include qualitative ways sectors have improved. Qualitative approaches are only part of the picture.
 - The team is looking at how to address this.
- I hope there will be more numbers and more rigor so we get some measurable data. Also, what information will be derived from net use? Change in return flows doesn’t necessarily reflect improvement. I also have concerns about giving credit for return flows if it is a requirement.
 - We are trying to find a common metric that can be applied across sectors.
- There are a lot of challenges with return flows as some sectors (e.g., mining) are not allowed to return water to the river.
- We may not be able to find the perfect single metric for things that are in fact quite different. The terms of reference were to do the best job we could. This hasn’t been done before, so we should put out the effort and what we learn will be important for the next time.

9 Tracking Implementation Progress of Council Recommendations

Andre Asselin reviewed how the detailed implementation progress reports and updates are compiled. Both documents are available on the AWC website. Of the 245 recommendations made by AWC, 31% have been implemented, 62% are in progress, and 5% are not under

consideration at this time. Wetland Policy recommendations accounted for 87 of the total of 245, and of these 84 are in progress with three not under consideration. Andre reminded the board that the updates are based on information provided by the implementer(s).

Discussion

Board members offered comments and questions, and Andre responded as needed.

- Use of the “in progress” category is not especially helpful; e.g., most of the non-point source recommendations have been rejected because AEP is doing other work; it’s not that nothing is happening, but the AWC recommendations are not being implemented.
- Can we break down timelines to different time frames (e.g., short, medium or long-term)? Some may be things that will be in progress in perpetuity.
 - Teams have moved in the direction of setting timelines, but we are still reporting on some recommendations made before that transition.
- Riparian recommendations do specify a one-two year timeline. What is their status? If they don’t meet the timeline, what is our assessment?
 - This is not an assessment, just what the implementer says they are doing.
- These recommendations do reflect on the AWC. Some recommendations from the 2009 WATSUP report, for example, were quite specific but it appears they will not be implemented. Minister Renner asked us to look at intra-basin water movement, then the GoA did nothing. Sometimes it’s not possible to determine whether the issue is with GoA or AWC. These reports are not helping us or the public understand the status of important policy recommendations.
 - GoA: If GoA has decided not to implement some recommendations from AWC that have consensus support, we need address those. It looks like we should go back and do more work on this. We may still be supportive, but it’s not the right time to act. Language is important and we need to be clearer.
- Maybe we are not asking the right questions or don’t have enough boxes for answers to come back.
- What is the difference between the recommendations addressed in this update and those from the *Water for Life* Implementation Review (WFLIR)?
 - WFLIR is about progress to implement the *Water for Life* strategy. We could perhaps incorporate more self-analysis in the update, but we can’t have a performance measure that measures us against something we can’t control.
- Staff and GoA should revisit the process for assessing implementation progress to ensure we are asking the right questions and doing the right analysis.

Action 43.2: AWC staff will examine how the process for tracking implementation progress of AWC recommendations could be improved and bring a proposal to the executive prior to the June board meeting.

10 New or Other Business

There was no new or other business. Board members were reminded that they would be asked to participate in the *Water for Life* implementation review and should watch for details. Information will be emailed regarding the Statement of Opportunity process and board members with ideas for new projects should contact Andre Asselin or Gord Edwards.

The board meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

Attachment 1: Meeting #43 Attendees

AWC Directors and Alternates

Maureen Bell, NGO (Environmental)
Rick Blackwood, GoA and Provincial
Authorities (Alberta Environment and
Parks)
Mark Brostrom, Government (Large Urban)
Carolyn Campbell, NGO (Environmental)
Cheryl Fujikawa, NGO (WPACs)
James Guthrie, Industry (Mining)
Jim Hackett, Industry (Power Generation)
Rob Hoffman, Industry (Chemical and
Petrochemical)
Al Kemmere, Government (Rural)
Perry McCormick, NGO (Wetland Habitat
Conservation)
Sharon McKinnon, Industry (Cropping)
Ron McMullin, Industry (Irrigation)
Dan Moore, Industry (Forestry)

Keith Murray, Industry (Forestry)
Brett Purdy, GoA and Provincial Authorities
(Alberta Innovates – Energy and
Environment Solutions)
Hugh Sanders, NGO (WPACs)
Nancy Stalker, Government (Large Urban)
Melodie Stol, Government (Small Urban)
Stuart Thiessen, Industry (Livestock)
Jason Unger, NGO (Environmental)
John Van Ham, Industry (Oil and Gas)
Jamie Wuite, GoA and Provincial
Authorities (Alberta Agriculture and
Forestry)
Gord Edwards, AWC Executive Director

Presenters:

Gord Edwards, *Management Report* (Item 1.4)
Rick Blackwood and Brett Purdy, *GoA Update* (Item 2)
Kim McLeod, *Water Literacy Project Team* (Item 3), and *Evaluating Water CEP Team* (Item 8)
Andre Asselin, *AWC 2016 Operational Plan* (Item 1.5), *Source Water Protection Working Group*
(Item 4), *Tracking Implementation Progress of AWC Recommendations* (Item 9)
Sharon McKinnon, *Lake Management Project Team* (Item 5)
Kristen Lorenz and Gordon Thompson, *Water for Life Implementation Review* (Item 6)
Ernie Hui, *Presentation from Special Advisor on Water Quality* (Item 7)
Rob Hoffman, *Evaluating Water CEP Team* (Item 8)

Guests:

Sharon Willianen, AEP
Tara Payment, CAPP

AWC Staff and Contractors:

Andre Asselin, Anuja Ramgoolam, Marie-Claire St-Jacques, Petra Rowell, Kim Sanderson

Absent with Regrets:

Dave Burdek, GoA and Provincial Authorities (Alberta Agriculture and Forestry)
Andre Corbould, GoA and Provincial Authorities (Alberta Environment and Parks)
Deanna Cottrell, Industry (Oil and Gas)
Silvia D'Amelio, NGO (Fisheries Habitat Conservation)
Mary Onukem, Government (Métis Settlements)
Al Sanderson, GoA and Provincial Authorities (Alberta Energy)
Merry Turtiak, GoA and Provincial Authorities (Alberta Health)
Jay White, NGO (Lake Environment Conservation)

Attachment 2: Meeting #43 Action Item Log

Action 43.1: AEP will provide an update to the board on its work related to source water protection by the November 2016 meeting.

Action 43.2: AWC staff will examine how the process for tracking implementation progress of AWC recommendations could be improved and bring a proposal to the executive prior to the June board meeting.

Attachment 3: Meeting #43 Decision Log

Decision 43.1: The summary report for the October 29, 2015 meeting was adopted by consensus and will be posted on the AWC website.

Decision 43.2: The board approved the proposed 2016 AWC Operational Plan.

Decision 43.3: The board agreed to:

- 1. approve the report Recommendations to Improve Water Literacy in Alberta,*
- 2. approve the communications plan, and*
- 3. disband the Water Literacy Project Team.*

Decision 43.4: The board agreed to disband the Source Water Protection Working Group.

ALBERTA WATER COUNCIL
AGENDA, MEETING #43
April 7, 2016
McDougall Centre, Calgary
8:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

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

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

9:00 1.0 Administration 15 min

- 1.1 Welcome, review health and safety and approve agenda
- 1.2 Approve Summary Report from March 19, 2015 AGM
- 1.3 Approve AWC membership
- 1.4 Approve 2015 audited financial statements
- 1.5 Select auditor for 2016

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

9:15 1.0 Administration 15 min

- 1.1 Welcome and approve agenda
- 1.2 Approve Summary Report from October 29, 2015 board meeting
- 1.3 Review of actions from last meeting
- 1.4 Management Report
- 1.5 Operational planning

9:30 2.0 Government of Alberta Update 30 min

Hear an update from the GoA.

10:00 3.0 Water Literacy Project Team 30 min

Approve the team's final report and disband the team.

10:30 Break 15 min

10:45 4.0 Source Water Protection Working Group 15 min

Hear an update and disband the working group.

11:00 5.0 Lake Management Project Team 30 min

Hear an update on the team's progress

11:30 6.0 Water for Life Implementation Review Committee 30 min

Hear an update on the committee's progress

12:00 Lunch 60 min

1:00 7.0 Informative Presentation from the Special Advisor on Water Quality 45 min

Hear a presentation about this new position and its work.

1:45 8.0 Evaluating Water Conservation, Efficiency and Productivity Project Team 30 min

Hear an update on the team's progress

2:15 9.0 Tracking Implementation Progress of Council Recommendations 15 min

Hear a presentation on the detailed and update reports.

2:45 10.0 New or Other Business 15 min

New items of business or other items of information for Council

3:00 Adjournment