

OKANAGAN WATER STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL
A Technical Advisory Body to the Okanagan Basin Water Board
MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD November 12th, 2020,
VIRTUALLY THROUGH THE ZOOM PLATFORM

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Present

Emeritus, Chair	Denise Neilsen
BC Ground Water Association	Marta Green (Alt)
BC Wildlife Federation – Region 8	Lorne Davies
Regional District of Central Okanagan	Brittany Lange
Okanagan Shuswap Natural Resource District	Tony Zanotto
Canadian Water Resources Association	Brian Guy
Agriculture & Agri-Food Canada	Kirsten Hannam
UBC Okanagan	Bernard Bauer
UBC Okanagan	Craig Nichol (Alt)
Ministry of Agriculture	Andrew Petersen
City of Kelowna	Rod MacLean
Engineers & Geoscientists BC	Mike Nolan

OBSERVER:

UBCO	Joanne Taylor
------	---------------

OBWB:

Director	Sue McKortoff
----------	---------------

STAFF:

OBWB, Office and Grants Manager	James Littley
OBWB, Policy and Planning Specialist	Kellie Garcia
OBWB, Special Projects Coordinator	Carolina Restrepo
OBWB, Executive Director	Anna Warwick Sears
OBWB, Water Stewardship Director	Nelson Jatel
OBWB, Communications Director	Corinne Jackson
OBWB, Technical Writer and Researcher	Farah Kanani

GUESTS:

Municipal Natural Assets Initiative (MNAI)	Roy Brooke
UBCO	John Janmaat
Westbank First Nation	Krista Derrickson
District of Peachland	Shawn Grundy
Independent	Adrian Arts
Independent	Renee Clark
Okanagan Collaborative Conservation Program (OCCP)	Scott Boswell
OCCP	Chery Demulder
Ministry of Forest Lands and Natural Resource Operations (MFLNO)	Ryan Whitehouse
MFLNO	Sheena Spencer
Okanagan Shuswap Natural Resource District & MFLNO	Jeff Nitychoruk
MFLNO	Ray Crampton
Town of Osoyoos	Sue McKortoff
Ministry of Agriculture	Stephanie Tam
Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen	Zoe Kirk
Eternal Consultants	Scott Smith
UBCO	Marni Turek
Environment Canada	Doug Lindquist
Interior Health Authority	Rob Birtles
BC Agriculture Council	Hans Buchler
Northwest Hydraulic Consultants	Joel Trubilowicz

Northwest Hydraulic Consultants
Fruit Grower (Independent)
BC Fruit Growers Association
Irrigation Industry Association BC
CARO Analytical Services
Independent
Country Life in BC

Piotr Kuras
Lorraine Bennest
Glen Lucas
Bruce Naka
Monika Sajdak
Glenn Sinclair
Tom Walker

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Denise called the Zoom meeting to order at 1:03 pm by welcoming members and guests and acknowledging that we are meeting on the unceded territory of the syilx people, the original inhabitants of the Okanagan. Introductions commenced around the table. This is the third Zoom meeting of the OWSC.

2. APPROVE AGENDA

Agenda was approved as presented.

Moved by: Scott Smith

Seconded by: Kirsten Hannam

"That the agenda for the November 12th, 2020

meeting of the Okanagan Water Stewardship Council be approved."

No objections.

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Moved by: Brian Guy

Seconded by: Bernie Bauer

"That the minutes from the October 8th, 2020 meeting of the Okanagan Water Stewardship Council be approved."

No objections.

4. BUSINESS ARISING (from previous meeting):

a) Sub-committee updates

b) Other

a) Sub-committee updates

Source Water Protection committee (Renee Clark):

Had a meeting October 28th and one today. Completing position paper with recommendations, working on the call to actions. Hope to have a draft version to the WSC at our next meeting. Kellie is leading the toolkit. Had a presentation on at the October 28th meeting on forest practice codes. Expecting a draft from the source toolkit in early December to review.

Policy committee (Brian Guy):

Closed the loop on two out of three initiatives we discussed in the last meeting: climate ready initiative. Policy committee completed its review on the provincial PowerPoint slideshow. Provided a memo to the OBWB on this on October 18th and Anna has forwarded that to Tina Neale of the province. Created a sub-committee comprised of Marta Green who is

leading it, Dave Hutchison, Denise and Renee which produced a memo

for the policy committee and was sent to Anna on November 3rd for input to the federal government on the role and mandate and structure of the new proposed Federal Canada Water Agency. Thirdly on the dataset sub-committee: Nelson has someone looking into using the earth observation data and they will be finalizing a white paper in January. The other group that is looking at ensuring we have long-term access to government research datasets, we still haven't got the ball rolling on that but should be getting on the way soon.

Dams and Reservoirs committee (Bernard Bauer):

Working on a white paper which we have finished a complete draft of and have circulated amongst ourselves several times and past it over to Nelson for additional technical editing and to make the document into a production form. Once we have that back we will circulate it with WSC for additional comments and potential revisions. We will finalize the document and that will bring to conclusion the activities of this committee. There is one outstanding piece we are working on which will be one of the appendices which will provide details on the information we can get from the province regarding the water licenses that have storage attached to it with estimates of how much storage there is in the valley and seems like a fairly simple exercise however it can be complicated. We have several estimates of those numbers and what the appendix will do is report some of the numbers that are published elsewhere in particular the Dobson report that was part of the 2008 water supply and demand project.

Flood and Drought Management committee (Scott Boswell)

We have been talking about hosting this public event to raise the awareness of the flood mapping and flood story website that we have put in a lot of resources into. We are targeting the general public more e.g. insurance brokers, bankers and the broader community. Hoping to host that week of January 11th. We will have a panel discussion of 3-4 speakers that talk about different aspects of flood planning and flood story and preparedness. We have sent this out to a lot of other technical committees and elected officials but this is our opportunity to reach out to the broader community.

Corrinne: We can connect regarding promotion of that.

Scott: Hoping to set up another meeting in the next week so I will loop you in on that.

Agriculture and Water committee (Kirsten Hannam):

We had an excellent meeting on 15th October to draw all our thoughts on groundwater licensing into one document. We tried to identify four main concerns that we felt really needed to be addressed. There are concerns about the agriculture water tool and the data driving it, the licensing to crop, questions and concerns about the adjudication process and the communication between applicants and the province. We sent a draft of that document to Ray Crampton and his team at the end of October and then had a follow up meeting on November 5th about what we are hoping to achieve.

(b) Other

Anna: Those of you who attended the flood collaboration workshop last week will have heard that the folks from Emergency Management BC can be sent a list of shovel ready projects. They want to use it to make more money for existing grant programs and potentially release separate money from the existing grant programs. Kellie is going to be sending an email to everyone who attended that workshop. There might be some this that might be relevant for some of you. If anyone wants to follow up with me on this or Kellie and Nelson about different projects that relate to EMBC particularly about flooding.

5. BOARD REPORT (Anna Warwick Sears):

- We got our budget passed which is the largest one we have had - 5% increase related to funding in the new service of expanding the hydrometric monitoring programme.
- Review of the Okanagan Lake Regulation System: recommendation for review of the OLRs was a big part of the technical report associated with the flooding maps that were done by Northtech Hydrolics. The issue was then picked up by the District of Peachland which was concerned about three years of flooding and they pushed the point with OBWB and RD of Central Okanagan who want the OBWB to have a letter writing campaign with all of the local governments and Indigenous communities in the valley. This was approved by the board and we will start working on that.
- Shawn Reimer was able to get some end of year funding and initiate a gap analysis which is the first thing that needs to be done for this review: what studies have been done in recent years, what ones have been completed that relate to this operation of lake levels and what are the big gaps: risk analysis, impacts of change in the lake level particularly on

irrigation, what are the relative risks of drought side, economic impacts on the drought and flood side. A lot of work needs to be done on the impact of changing lake level management related to fisheries. Shawn Reimer is going to provide funding to the OBWB and we are going to draw a contract with Brian Guy to conduct the gap analysis which should be done in the next 3 months.

- Sent in the climate strategy letter to the Tina Neale's group and also on the verge of sending in the memo for the Canada Water Agency and just need to finish my review and edit and send it over next week.
- Released our call for application for the water conservation quality improvement grants with February 26th deadline. James Littlely is the manager of this programme so if you have any questions please contact him.
- Request from RD of North Okanagan to support permission from the ALC to allow them to irrigate a large quantity of land in the North Okanagan with the treated wastewater from their new wastewater treatment plant which is in early construction phase. OBWB will be encouraging that to happen.

Scott Boswell: Do you have a list started for the funding opportunities?

Anna: We have a list started but we definitely need more projects from the community.

Scott Boswell: Is this earlier than normal to release the OBWB funds?

Anna: This is typically when we release the call during the board meeting.

Scott Smith: With respect to the lake water management I heard locally in our media that one option was to widen the channel between OK lake and Skaha Lake. Have you heard anything about this?

Anna: This is something Shaun Reimer has mentioned a number of times in his presentations. He believes that we need to have some kind of engineering study that would look at rapidly moving water out of OK Lake down the OK river channel. This would allow him to respond quickly as conditions change rather than lowering the lake in the winter to a lower level than he normally would, given the past operating guidelines. The issue with this you would have to widen the channel all the way down south of the US border toward the Columbia River - talking about a major infrastructure project that would be extremely

expensive. Shaun wants this study to consider this and if they can find the funding it wouldn't be a terrible thing to have has a contrast to the other approach of balancing lake levels.

Scott Smith: A huge opportunity to do something with that entire floodplain of the OK River coming out of the lake - it builds a ditch in the 1950s and cuts off extensive wetlands. There would be tremendous opportunity on a whole number of issues in terms of refurbishing the Riparian ecological function, fisheries, recreational, aspects. I hope there is more thought going into this and using more of a natural ecological function on this part of the river.

Anna: I think everyone is super committed to having a public dialogue with these issues going forward and WSC would definitely be involved in that. We need input and ideas even with respect on what are the options on the gap analysis.

Bernie: Commend you on the 5% and the board directors. I would suggest that the WSC provides really good value. The input is a long time coming and I think they will be well spent.

Anna: It has to do with the staff that provide good feedback.

6. PRESENTATIONS and DISCUSSIONS:

Introduction provided by Denise.

Presentation – Jeff Nitychoruk (District of Okanagan Shuswap) Groundwater Licensing for Irrigation in BC

- Two pathways for groundwater licensing: transitioning users (prior to 2016) and new use applications (used post 2016) which takes into account new uses, practices etc. including climate change projection.
- Bulk number of users to date have been the transitioning users.
- BC Agriculture Water Calculator is not being appropriately applied – specifically built for the purpose to help determine a demand for a water license and helping to adjudicate water licenses.
- Building climate change component was considered but ultimately not pursued.
- Anna: Can you say again why you think the tool was being used inappropriately?
- Kristen: Quite a bit of discussion about the tool in our committee. One of the biggest concerns is that the climate data that are used to drive the Ag calculator is based on data from 2000-201 so cover a very short period of time and do not include climate projections. We are concerned that the water requirement recommendations are based on a very small window and they don't build in flexibility for extreme weather or climate change. Concerned that the water calculator is not going to provide growers with resilience to these kinds of extremes and increase in demands in the future.
- Anna: Seemed like there was something that Jeff was saying it was designed to help determine a demand for water license.
- Jeff: There wasn't a tool designed to make allocation decisions.
- Kristen: Originally, it was designed for growers to help them design their irrigation systems so that they could accommodate their water requirements. We did not think it was designed to adjudicate water licenses but it may have but there is some uncertainty if it was designed to apply to licensed to crop.
- Bernie: Some of the ambiguity w.r.t to the water calculator has to do with people applying for groundwater licenses that did not have them before but have demonstrated use. What's been happening is FLNRO has said what kind of crops are you growing and someone may say grapes or apples whereas the previous allocation may have been in fact 2.5 feet for that acre. Had there been a system for licensing 30-40 years ago I would have received that 2.5 ft/acre allocation but now I am only receiving 0.5ft because of what I am growing and that's where some of that tension lies.
- Jeff: Water licenses are attached to land parcels and the practice of licensing to ground would be to say that what is the most water intensive crop. The assertion is traditionally water licenses were issued for a forage crop like grass and it allowed flexibility for agriculturalists who changed their crops as they see fit whereas now we want to license to a specific crop and giving them the specific amount of water.
- Section 30 of the WSA – beneficial use – if we were to issue a license that was for maximum allocation for forage regardless of what was being grown, we would be setting people up for non-compliance of section 30.
- Spirit of the Water Sustainability Act – maximizing water equity amongst the population.
- Licensing to ground has not been the norm. What we have now is a complicated system where the people who hold the licenses now are those who were allocated historically but the volume of water is the same.

- Denise: The misconception actually came from Ted who has reported that that is how water licenses were given. How far in the past is another question and that had been the practice until recently.
- Licensee must make BU to be compliant with the act but no campaign at the district level to cancel water licenses.
- Hypothetically, recovered water allocations would go toward other purposes.
- Lorraine: Could you please explain licensing to ground?
- Jeff: This is the practice of issuing a water license for the most thirsty crop that could be grown on that land that would be forage in the Okanagan. It is essentially the inverse of licensing to crop.
- Lorraine: I am a farmer and I get my water through a purveyor so I am not too concerned about groundwater however I am noticing there is a series in equity occurring here and I take rather a long-term view. I noticed there is a large variability over the years in what kind of crop water demand we get and depends on weather and varies based on long term cycles. That is my concern with the tool as there needs to be a long-term view of climate and climate changes and what sort of crop water demand we might need. When it comes time to follow the spirit of the water act and spread as much water equitably the concern is you create an inequity in water supply. I am relying on fit for water rights when there is a drought however you are implying that they aren't enforced. Setting ourselves up for a lot of economic loss.
- Jeff: I agree with some of what you are saying I would like to clarify that it isn't that we don't enforce the fit for water, it is that there is no campaign to cancel unused water licenses at this point.
- Marta: It is the case that you don't allow people applying for water licenses to double dip so if they already have surface water license you will be asking them to take that back before you allow the groundwater license.
- Marta: Is there an active campaign to look at all of the surface water license holders and assess if they are also using the water for the benefit of society and to claw back theirs?
- Jeff: No I would say that is not something we are doing regardless of source. In the future we will be targeting specific watersheds that are chronically underperforming things like EFN.
- Marta: So that practice will be used more for surface water right?
- Jeff: Potentially as a by-product of them interacting with us daily trying to get their license.
- Hans: I am a grower of grape crops but I have grown forage and livestock in the past. If I get a license now that is based on the grape crop this will completely restrict my future options, I will not be able to change from grapes. You would limit my freedom of choice on what I can do on my land and this has serious implications and the response was getting an amendment to the license but getting one in an environment that is water short is not realistic. I have been pumping groundwater for 40 years and I have rights to groundwater and I did not break any laws. In the spirit of grandfathering would mean that you allow the withdrawal as it is done in the past and this is a serious difference and this needs to be addressed.
- Jeff: I am in the business of executing the law therefore I am unable to advice anything else.
- Kirsten: From a landscape perspective, if the goal of licensing crop is to make sure as many agricultural users as possible can use irrigation water and then in 10 years we have a higher demand due to climate change and there is less interest in growing highly water efficient grapes because of food security issues and more growers want to switch to fruit or vegetable or forage crops that require more water and all these growers across the landscape have access to small amounts of irrigation water then we are spreading insufficient irrigation water across the landscape and nobody is going to have enough water. While this may be the way the law is being translated, we need to think the purpose of the law is to ensure water is allocated effectively and in part to protect food security. Food security is not protected if growers don't have water to adapt to change in climate and change in crop demands.
- Jeff: The direction we are being taken by the WSA is not sustainable in the face of projections of climate change in the future.
- Kirsten: Yes projections for climate change and inevitable changes in food demand to protect our food security. If the water has been allocated very lightly across a large number of growers in the landscape no one is going to have enough water or adapt to climate change or contribute to our BC food security.
- Jeff: It is hard to know what that is going to look like. Will people be going back to growing forage? Potentially the way out of this bind would be a creation of some sort of water sustainability plan for the watershed.
- Kirsten: Do you know if the province is considering committing to developing or supporting the collection of data to do

- agricultural reserves across the province?
- Jeff: I cannot speak to that, the language I am familiar with is dedicated agricultural water – that is a provision that exists under the WSA as part of a water sustainability plan and agricultural water reserve is not something, I am aware exists.
 - Ray: To speak to the comment of the water sustainability plan – there is a pilot and there is an imperative to get things licensed before getting to far into the planning process. It's going to be a multi-decade process. There are a few pilots in the province: Nicola Water pilot that involves the five Nicola community Chiefs. It is a big project and once they meet with success it will serve as something that will blueprint for the future.
 - Marta: In the EFN conference we had a lawyer present on what is a law: WSA, the Act and regulations. We have to use the regulations and the Act to add substance to the law. Part of that is going to the environmental appeal board and part is developing policies. What truly is the law right now and what has not stood the test of time? What is the practice that is not concrete and come up with a policy and come to an agreement on how to apply this issue?
 - Jeff: The questions is, has anybody appealed about this and has there been a ruling yet and to my knowledge there hasn't been.
 - Bruce: I have run into circumstances where upon land that wasn't agricultural land and they had groundwater licenses. The amount of water they had was available was inadequate to facilitate what they wanted to grow. There was surface water available but they would have to give up the groundwater license. If between the two licenses you were able to come up with what you needed to facilitate your crop, I can't understand why there isn't any leeway for this.
 - Jeff: I think there is – the issue is not that you cannot have both licenses at the same time, the issue is that people who are applying are fully licensed for surface water source and now they are seeking another full license for groundwater source which is double the amount they need. If you were in a situation where you had a well or series of wells that supplied some quantity of water but not enough for your stated need and you were to make up the different with another license that is doable.
 - Lorraine: We have people who are interrupting the law and in doing the licensing and what we need to do we need to get another interruption on that. It will impede people who are thinking of applying for licenses. If Denise's numbers are correct, you have got 20,000 who should be registered and only 3000 have done so far. It is an investment and it doesn't make it worthwhile if the water has already been allocated elsewhere. I went through discussions for changes to the WSA and there was a lot concern in the farming community and there was reassurance that they would grandfather the existing users but currently that isn't happening and it is putting the EFNs at risk. If a farmer doesn't use the water, it's for the beneficial use for the environment. Sharing the water as broadly as we can is not economically viable.
 - Hans: I completely agree with Lorraine. There seems to be this understanding that having unused water on a license is a bad thing but I think this water is being kept in reserve and distributing this to new users it would guarantee that watershed would be in a drought situation every other year. It is time to discuss this with all ministry personnel so that everyone understands what the risks are. I have not made an appeal so far as I have not received the license yet as I have been waiting 3 years. If a transfer from surface water allocation to groundwater is permitted, what would the date be on that license? Would it be the date of the surface license or dated to today?
 - Jeff: There are a number of licenses that have delays because they have difficult component e.g. double allocation. The date on the groundwater license can be the same as the surface water license that is being replaced if a series of conditions are being met i.e. drawing from an aquifer that is hydraulically connected to that same surface source. An argument can be made that is connected water being drawn from the aquifer in that case the date can be transferable if there is no connectivity it is essentially a new water source and it would be given a new date.
 - I am sensing a little conflict in the argument that is being made. There has been some talk about EFNs and need to preserve water for the environment but at the same time to preserve water for dedicated agricultural use. If we were clawing back to use the terminology that has been presented, unused components of water licenses it would be returned to the bank and some of it could be dedicated to agricultural use if there was a WSA and some of it might go into EFN but I have heard the argument put forth that both of those are important but they are at odds with one another.
 - Hans: A lot of the water purveyors use only a

portion of their allocation but they are in the same boat. The argument of the whole 3-year beneficial use rule is not received positively. If that is the case will this be applied to water purveyors who do not use their full allocation?

- Jeff: It is a rule that applies to all licensees.
- Hans: If this is the rule would be enacted across the board, it would lead to chaos.
- Jeff: There isn't an across board campaign and nor do I foresee one coming into effect. We may be only targeting specific watersheds that chronically under perform during drought.
- Hans: But then you will be accused of inequitable treatment of individual purveyors. If you do enforce this, it would be wiser to do it across the board because accusations will be fairly strong.
- Bernie: Many of these issues are colloquially above Jeff's paygrade. These are big issues that are made in Victoria - WSA and Jeff is being put into an awkward position to defend things that he only administers so let's keep that in mind as we move this conversation forward. Hopefully Ray is taking notes and can think about these broader issues. One suggestion that came up a long time ago, especially w.r.t groundwater, why doesn't the province allocate the maximum forage quantity right now because in 30 years every license is going to have to be revisited? In that period, things will settle in and we will know a lot more about climate change and in the meantime we haven't allocated smaller watersheds. For those people applying for historical licenses to just fully allocate in the way that it was done previously and it gives them flexibility in terms of future management. The water they don't use is supporting EFNs. I don't necessarily always buy that argument because those EFNs will be in periods of drought and they are going to extracting their maximum value so I don't think there is much environmental benefit there. Maybe Ray those are the things you can push up the line where there may ought to be a corporate strategy that says let's get these licenses in place. At the moment people are not applying as there is fear out there and there is safety in numbers. We are not in a position to manage our resources properly because we don't know what we are managing. Jeff you are the receiving end of this and a lot of this is not directed at you personally.
- Jeff: I appreciate that and I am well aware. I liked the idea of excess water being used for EFNs is a fallacy because e.g. in a drought somebody who is licensed for a particular volume might want to use it in that moment.
- The 30-year review is a possibility however it

isn't guaranteed that all licenses will be reviewed as it is a demanding task.

- Ray: Thank you Bernie for your comments. Jeff is probably going to be taking my position soon he needs this experience and we appreciate your comments.
- Lorraine: I want to follow up on what Bernie said. I think there is a lot of merit in doing this as a information gathering exercise rather than the regulation exercise.
- Issue 3: Groundwater license adjudication process is unclear. This has been an on-going issue for a while. There are sections where the wording is not clear e.g. Sec 12; Sec 13 - notify other parties; Sec 14 - creates the most debate as it gives us broad discretionary authority to do various things with licenses; Sec 15 - EFN; Sec 16 - mitigation measures for instream works; Sec 17 - sensitive stream (none in our region).
- Inconsistency in decision making - 1. Discretionary authority is fundamental to realization of the Act; 2. B.C. is not homogenous in decision making context. Identical water licenses however taken from two different regions can be entirely different.
- Decision making process is hard to map out and difficult to explain w.r.t to the difference between existing and new use groundwater licenses. The majority of decisions regard existing licenses. EFNs don't have to be considered in making existing use groundwater (EUGW) decisions because it was recognized we are not willing to deny someone who has been operating a license for 40 years in order to protect an EFN. Whereas some of the other gates that don't necessarily determine if a license is issued (yes/no) but might affect how it takes shape as an example might be a requirement to measure and keep records of your water consumption are still in play for existing use groundwater regardless of the precedent that exists with old licenses going back 100 years.
- For new use groundwater licenses (NUGW), it all changes, the yes/no gates are required.
- Issue 4: active communication between groundwater license adjudicators and applicants is needed. EUGW is one thing, its unlikely a NUGW license will be issued without some communication. Province estimated 20,000 GW users requiring a license.
- As of October 31, 2020: 3953 applications submitted, 2129 accepted, 1079 decisions > 95% approved. We at the OK-Shuswap have handled approx. 346 of those.
- Turnaround times for applications - 140 days remains the goal. Common reasons for delay:

administrative, structural (already licensed), consultation in the interest of reconciliation and NUGW – insufficient technical analysis i.e. fails to address the big 3 questions:

1. Is the withdrawal sustainable according to the well and provide the water that is requested?
 2. Will withdrawal from this well affect any nearby users?
 3. If this aquifer is hydrologically connected to a surface source, can the EFNs in that source support the issuing of this license?
- Hans: In reference to the Ag. Calculator – specifically in grapes there is a new disease – Red Blotch virus that reduces sugar in the grape. If you double the irrigation, there is some level of mitigation. Under the calculator how could a grape grower who is affected by this disease react to it and still be able to make adequate use of the crop and stay in business? We don't exactly know how this disease is spreading and no other option to mitigate this in the field.
 - Jeff: There is a practice of growing groundcover in between the grape rows to improve soil conditions which is a relatively new practice and something that a lot of grape growers want to do in the future. As these new best practices are shared online and become standard and applied, one of the limiting factors is the water available to address the disease or to begin irrigating a groundcover crop in between the grape rows. The fact is that we live in a water scarce area so and it might not be possible.
 - Hans: The cover crop over the long-term actually enhances the water holding capacity of the soil substantially and will allow the crops to go through drought better. The short-term and long-term thinking needs to be coordinated.
 - Ray: Well done Jeff. We will take all these comments back and de-brief and continue to have the on-going dialogue at the agricultural table. I appreciate everyone's comments and it

helps us make better decisions and influence downstream policy and legislation.

- Denise: Thanks Ray and thanks Jeff for the presentation and being in the hot seat.
- Kirsten: I am particularly excited about is the consensus that the water sustainability plans within which agricultural water reserves and a good understanding of EFNs is necessary. The discussion around what is the law vs. practice is a valid question and having on-going dialogue is important to work together to identify data gaps and develop licensing practices that achieve the goals that the WSA is meant to do which is to ensure we are using our water carefully and effectively and we have a resilient water management system for the province. Thank you so much Jeff for coming to talk to us and Ray and Tony for supporting him. These issues have been a topic of discussion for the WSC and Ag. Water committees for quite some time and I am hopeful that we can work together to find some good solutions.

7. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting date of the OWSC is to be confirmed for Thursday, December 10th, 2020.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by Denise at 3pm.

***“That there being no further business,
the meeting of the Okanagan Water
Stewardship Council of November 12th be
adjourned.”***

***Moved by Scott Boswell and seconded by
Kirsten Hannam.***

CERTIFIED CORRECT:

Chair

Executive Director