

South Saskatchewan River Basin Water Management Review – Phase #1 Red Deer Basin Advisory Committee Meeting Draft Meeting Minutes

Location: North Hill Inn, 7150-50 Ave., Red Deer, AB
Time and Date: 10:00 AM – 3:00 PM, Thursday November 01, 2001
Meeting Facilitator: Terry Krause

Attendees:

Vincent Fabian	County of Newell	Arthur Eckert	County of Newell
Ian S. Harvie	Mountain View County	Maurice Lewis	Red Deer & Kneehill Counties
Colin Kure	AB. Fish & Game Assoc.	Doug Thrusell	Alberta Environment
Art Grenville	Starland County	Peter Stevens	Alberta Environment
Jack Swainson	AB Conservation Tillage Society	Ian McFarlane	Ducks Unlimited
Al Kennedy	Nova Chemicals	Dug Major	Special Areas Board
Bill Shaw	PCPS	Milton Elliot	Clear Water County
Margaret Coutts	Red Deer River Naturalists	Jill Dyck	AB. Fish & Game

Guests:

David Lloyd	Alberta Environment
Larry Williams	Alberta Environment
Peter Pui	Alberta Environment

- 10:00 AM Introductions
- Terry Krause Introduces Guests:
 - David Lloyd, Regional Director, Parkland Region, Alberta Environment
 - Larry Williams, Approvals Manager, Parkland Region, Alberta Environment
 - Peter Pui, Surface Water Administrative Engineer, Parkland Region, Alberta Environment
 - The Basin Advisory Committee members introduce themselves
 - Terry Krause describes the process that the BAC is now embarking on, the tight time frame and focussed mandate of Phase I
- 10:10 AM Review of Proposed Agendas
- The agenda for today's meeting was approved. The two meeting overview agenda is to be altered to reflect three meetings rather than two.
 - ACTION: Doug Thrusell to make changes to the overview agenda.
- 10:20 AM Operating Procedures
- Chair of Meeting
 - Decision: It was agreed by all participants that Terry Krause continue in his role as Facilitator
 - Reporting to Sectors
 - Terry Krause recapped the important role that the BAC has to communicate to their various sector members about the process and getting feedback from them and presenting it at the BAC meetings
- Other?
- The Newspaper article in the Saturday, Oct. 27th, 2001 Red Deer Advocate was handed out and discussed. Bill Shaw and Al Kennedy both described their involvement in the article.

- Terry Krause described the list-server that will be available to BAC members to discuss issues among themselves and other sector (continued next page) representatives who wish to take part. Terry also described the Department's web page that will have all the reports online that are pertinent to the Management plan
- ACTION: BAC members and those of others in their sectors if they are interested and wish to participate in the list-server forum can subscribe via a web browser by connecting to:
 - <http://eid01.eidnet.org/guest/RemoteListSummary/rdrbac>

10:30 AM

Water Availability Evaluation

- Doug Thrussell presented the Water Availability Information package to the BAC members. Copies of it were handed out. The Key Finding relative to the Red Deer Basin in the evaluation is that there is water available for new licences, but just how much cannot be determined until instream objectives are set in Phase II

11:00 AM

Introduction to Water Allocation Transfers

- Peter Pui presented an "*Introduction to Water Licencing and Water Allocation Transfers*"
- ACTION: Doug Thrussell to provide a two slide per page handout of Peter Pui's Presentation to BAC Members and to place onto Red Deer Basin portion of the web page
- A Question and Answer session followed.
 - Q: Can we request a licence for a thirty year period that has enough allocation to meet the demands at the end of thirty years?
 - A: No, there is no reliable way we could accurately predict growth over 30 years so that would be speculation, although we do know that some municipal licences have excess capacity in their licences.
 - Q: What will happen to those who do not register their traditional agricultural use?
 - A: This question needs to be addressed in detail so it will be answered in writing and provided to the BAC members.
- ACTION: Doug Thrussell to get the Department's response to this question and provide it back to the BAC.
 - Q: Is an Irrigation District obliged to supply water to a non-irrigation project if the project has been given a water licence by the Province?
 - A: This question needs to be addressed in detail so it will be answered in writing and provided to the BAC members.
- ACTION: Doug Thrussell to get the Department's answer to this question and provide it back to the BAC
 - Q: How does the Department know that every licence holder is abiding by the conditions of their licence (enforcement and monitoring).
 - A: This question needs to be addressed in detail so it will be answered in writing and provided to the BAC members.
- ACTION: Doug Thrussell to get the Department's answer to this question and provide it back to the BAC

12 Noon

Working Lunch: continued with the Transfers presentation

- 12:30 PM Workbook
- Matters or factors for consideration in making a decision on a transfer of an allocation of water under a license were described, discussed and decisions as to their recommendation were made.
 - See workbook discussion synopsis below
- 2:50 PM Next Meeting and Follow –Up
- It was agreed that there would be two more BAC meetings to address the issues and questions in Phase I of the SSRB: Water Management Plan.
 - November 23rd @ 9:00AM. North Hill Inn, Red Deer
 - November 30th @ 9:00 AM. Best Western Jurassic Inn, Drumheller
- 3:00 PM Meeting Adjourned

Workbook Discussion Synopsis

Must a Matter or Factor be Considered When Making a Decision on an Application for Transfer of an Allocation Under Licence?				Requires further discussion of specifics
<u>Matter or Factors Discussed</u>	Yes	Different Views	No	
Rate (including diversion, consumption, return flow, environmental effects, allocation of water historically used)	•			
Timing (including diversion, consumption, return flow, environmental effects, allocation of water historically used)	•			
Location	•			
Change in water quality	•			
Existing, potential or cumulative effects on the aquatic environment (including riparian areas)	•			
Existing, potential or cumulative effects on any applicable water conservation objective	•			
Existing, potential or cumulative hydraulic, hydrological, and hydrogeological effects (including the linkages between surface and ground water)	•			
Existing, potential or cumulative effects on household users, traditional agriculture users and other licensees	•			
Effects on public safety (including fire protection and effluent dilution)	•			
Other matters that the director considers relevant	•			•
Not allowing those with “excess” allocation (i.e., allocation acquired for future needs) to transfer their excess allocation	•			•
Water conservation (including irrigation rehabilitation)				•
Monitoring and enforcement: How do you make sure the water gets to the person who bought the allocation?			•	•

- **General Discussion/Parked Items for further discussion:** Many ideas and issues were raised by BAC members and are summarized below (note: these were only expressed by one or several individuals; the BAC has neither endorsed, nor rejected these statements):
 - Although water transfers will address short-mid term needs we should be cognizant of the necessity for longer-term solutions as we move through this process.
 - The Department should know, or they should determine, what level of water needs/demands will trigger building of water resource infrastructure (i.e., look at longer-term supply issues).
 - There is a philosophical objection to the commodification of the water resource where the richest project proponents can get water, but equally deserving people/projects cannot afford it.
 - The Province should look at the different uses of water and prioritize them.
 - There was discussion of reserving allocations of water for agricultural purposes to avoid sterilization of tracts of agricultural land due to a lack of available allocable water.
 - The Government should stay out of water allocation transfers (i.e., providing funding for them).
 - There should not be uncontrolled market forces driving water allocation transfer costs.
 - The Department should revisit public notification requirements in light of water allocation transfers. Advertising should be over the entire SSRB if the transfer(s) are significant enough.
- **Other Questions for Follow –Up:**
 - What is a licence in “good standing”?
 - What are the NAFTA implications for water allocation transfers?
 - Transfers between sub-basins, are they possible? Will they be permitted?
 - How much of a licence’s total volume can you transfer if the historical use has been less than the total volume?
 - How much of a licence’s total volume can you transfer if the net diversion has been much less than the gross diversion?
 - What are the FOIP issues surrounding licences and transfers (e.g., what information is available for public scrutiny?)