

Topic: Provide information on department estimates on what Alberta’s emissions would have been without climate leadership action that had been implemented in the past four years? (Reference Transcript PA-83, Mr. Schmidt)

- This information is available in the *Climate Leadership Plan 2017-18 Progress Report* available on the Open Data Portal at <https://open.alberta.ca/publications/climate-leadership-plan-progress-report-2017-18>
- Specifically, this information can be located in the “Ultimate Outcomes: Reduced GHG Emissions section” on page 17 of the report, excerpted below:
 - The Climate Leadership Plan (CLP) reference case (Table 1) represents current expectations for future GHG emissions based on 2018 federal and CLP climate policies, and on economic growth as projected in 2018. Emissions are forecast to decrease through 2018, then remain at about the same level even with increasing population, economic growth and oil sands production. Table 1 include Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC)’s 2015 historical forecast (before the CLP) that is referenced in the Climate Change Advisory Panel’s Report to Government. The historical forecast is adjusted for ECCC data updates in 2018. Differences between the historical forecast and the CLP reference case include CLP’s projected GHG reductions, differences in economic growth and methodologies used to project emissions. The CLP reference case with potential reductions from innovation (Table 1) includes estimates of reductions funded through the CLP, but innovative technologies and processes make the projected reductions less certain.

Table 1: Actual and Estimated GHG Emissions for Alberta (Mt of CO₂e)

| Year and Considered Policy/ Economic Expectations | Reported Results | | | | Forecasted Results | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|------|------|------|--------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 2010 | 2012 | 2014 | 2016 | 2018 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2026 | 2028 | 2030 |
| Historical Forecast (ECCC 2015 Adjusted) | 239 | 256 | 269 | 263 | 279 | 291 | 296 | 301 | 306 | 310 | 314 |
| CLP Reference Case | — | — | — | — | 259 | 263 | 261 | 259 | 262 | 264 | 263 |
| CLP reference case with potential Reductions from Innovation | — | — | — | — | 259 | 262 | 256 | 250 | 248 | 245 | 238 |

Source (Figure 1 and Table 1): Reported Results (2010-2016) from 2018 National Inventory Report. ECCC. Historical Forecast based on Canada’s Second Biennial Report on Climate Change, ECCC (2015) with Government of Alberta adjustments. CLP reference cases from Government of Alberta analysis.
 Note: The reported results for 2010 to 2016 from the Historical Forecast are replaced by actual GHG emissions from the 2018 National Inventory Report

— Not Applicable

- It is important to note that a portion of the difference between the Historical Forecast and the CLP reference is due to some structural changes to the economy that are independent of the CLP implementation.

Topic: Provide information on the percentage of the parks in Alberta that have a co-management plan with Indigenous people. (Reference Transcript PA-86; Mr. Feehan)

- The Government of Alberta is exploring cooperative management opportunities with Indigenous groups in various areas of the province. In the Alberta context, cooperative management differs from co-management in that cooperative management includes involvement in decision-making in an advisory capacity, while a common interpretation of co-management includes decision-making authority. The GOA is not considering co-management at this time.
- Currently, there is a cooperative management initiative with the Piikani Nation in southern Alberta for the Castle Provincial Park and Castle Wildland Provincial Park. In northeast Alberta, a cooperative management initiative is under development for five wildland provincial parks (Birch Mountains, Birch River, Dillon River, Kazan and Richardson). In 2018-2019, the GOA engaged with 23 Indigenous groups in northeast Alberta to develop the program. This program is currently under review and AEP is exploring ways to move forward with a more fiscally prudent approach. These seven provincial parks encompass approximately 1.47 million hectares (2.2 per cent of Alberta).
- Additionally, AEP is exploring a cooperative management approach with multiple Indigenous groups for the Ronald Lake Bison Herd in northeast Alberta. Additional cooperative management opportunities may be explored in the future; such as in the recently established Kitaskino Nuwenéné Wildland Provincial Park.

Topic: Further to the pie chart on page 42 of the Annual Report, provide information on how much is generated for purposes other than grazing. (Reference Transcript PA-87; Mr. Roswell)

| Disposition Category | Actual Revenue in \$ '000 |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Agricultural | |
| Cultivation Permits | 32 |
| Farm Development Leases | 1,508 |
| Forest Grazing Licenses | 60 |
| Grazing Leases | 3,592 |
| Grazing Permits | 46 |
| Hay Permits | 81 |
| Head Tax Permits | 1,349 |
| Commercial | |
| Non-Oil and Gas Miscellaneous Lease | 1,727 |
| Oil and Gas Miscellaneous Lease | 1,056 |
| Oil and Gas Miscellaneous Permit | 66 |
| Pipeline Installations Lease - Department managed activities | 299 |
| Recreation Lease | 10 |
| Surface Material Exploration Licence | 92 |
| Surface Material Lease | 40,709 |
| Surface Material Licence | 552 |
| Industrial | |
| Easement | 411 |
| Non-Oil and Gas Licence of Occupation | 366 |
| Non-Oil and Gas Mineral Surface Lease | 100 |
| Oil and Gas License of Occupation | 2,976 |
| Oil and Gas Mineral Surface Lease | 39,530 |
| Pipeline Agreement - Department managed activities | 128 |
| Pipeline Agreement - AER managed activities | 1,051 |
| Pipeline Installation Lease - AER managed activities | 4,104 |
| Right of Entry Lease | 1,323 |
| Temporary Field Authorization | 12 |
| Vegetation Control Easement | 17 |
| Parks | |
| Parks Cottage and Commercial Lease | 1,046 |
| Parks Easements | 49 |
| Parks License of Occupation and Permits | 251 |
| Parks Mineral Surface Lease | 1,114 |
| Other | |
| Assignment fees for leases transfer | 245 |
| Camp Wainwright Lease - GOC National Defence | 1,100 |
| Other Lease Fees | 480 |
| Total Land and Grazing Revenue | 105,482 |

Topic: Provide information on the difference between a grazing reserve and a grazing lease and if there is cost to keeping them separate. (Reference Transcript PA-87; Mr. Roswell)

- Grazing reserves (otherwise known as provincial grazing reserves or PGRs) are established using section 107 of the *Public Lands Act*.
 - This section states, “When the Minister is satisfied that the interests of the farmers or ranchers in any area demand it, the Minister may establish, maintain and operate a community grazing reserve.”
- Grazing leases are a formal disposition where grazing is considered to be the best long-term use of the public land.
 - The leaseholder on a grazing lease is the sole operator authorized to graze. A grazing lease term is usually 10 years but could be up to 20 years for some leases.
- Historically, grazing reserves were completely government owned and operated, with individual grazing patrons applying to the government to graze their cattle on the grazing reserve.
- In the late 1990s, the government mandate changed, resulting in semi-privatization of the grazing reserve program. The changes, which remain today, include:
 - Shifting the responsibility for livestock management and day-to-day operations to the patrons, which formed PGR associations. The Government of Alberta collects rental for grazing fees and use of government owned assets. Grazing fees are set at the applicable grazing zone lease rate.
 - Grazing on grazing reserves is authorized to PGR associations via an annual grazing disposition called a head tax permit.
 - Government owned assets on grazing reserves were negotiated to be either:
 - full ownership taken over by the PGR association,
 - remain under government ownership with the PGR association contributing to maintenance, or
 - remain under government ownership with government committing to maintaining the asset when budget is made available.
- PGR associations do not have the ability to control recreational access and do not receive surface compensation for industrial access and impacts.
 - PGR associations are not considered occupants under the *Surface Rights Act* due to the annual term of the grazing disposition used to authorize their use of public land.
 - Revenue from industrial use, including seismic and oil and gas, is received directly by the Government of Alberta.
 - Recreational access is managed by department staff.
- Grazing leaseholders are considered occupants under the *Surface Rights Act* and receive compensation for access of industrial operations.
- The Recreational Access Regulation is legislation that provides grazing leaseholders with the ability to assign reasonable restrictions for recreational access on the grazing lease.

- Department staff are responsible for maintaining grazing lease contact information and access conditions and dispute resolution. Leaseholders are responsible for the management of recreational access as per the Recreational Access Regulation.
- PGR associations do not pay municipal taxes on the grazing reserve lands; taxes are paid by the Grant In Place of Taxes program (GIPOT) within the Ministry of Municipal Affairs.
- Grazing leaseholders pay the municipal taxes for their dispositions.

Topic: Provide information on if there is cost to keeping grazing reserves and grazing leases separate. (Reference Transcript PA-87; Mr. Roswell)

- There are numerous types of dispositions on public lands, including grazing reserves and leases, which require government staff time and resources to manage. The extent of staff time and cost required to administer each type of disposition varies based on the type of land use, disposition term, outcome of use, amount of rights granted to the disposition holder, and the unique characteristics of a specific parcel of land.
- A comprehensive comparison of operational expenses related to each type of disposition, including grazing resources and grazing leases, has not been completed to date.
- In general, there are some different considerations for administrative costs for PGRs compared to grazing leases.
 - Staff time is required to manage additional responsibilities linked to grazing reserves including:
 - Management of recreational access on the grazing reserve
 - Oversight and contribution to livestock allocation planning
 - Contributions to government owned asset maintenance and annual maintenance plans
 - Administration of annual head tax permits
 - Payment of municipal taxes on grazing reserves through Municipal Affairs' Grants in Place of Taxes program.
 - Maintenance of government owned assets (i.e. fences).
- While grazing leases may require less disposition administration time because leases are set for 10 to 20 year periods compared to annual dispositions associated with grazing reserves, there may be some additional administrative time required for grazing leases for other issues. This could include activities such as dispute resolutions between leaseholders and Albertans seeking recreational access to a grazing lease area.
- Transitioning a grazing reserve to a grazing lease model would trigger government revenue loss due to:
 - Loss of revenue from surface rights compensation for industrial access (including seismic and oil and gas) on grazing reserves.
 - Loss of asset rental incomes.
 - Grazing reserves currently pay rental on government owned assets that are on the grazing reserves. This includes fences, houses, barns, dugouts and irrigation.
- The goal of the grazing reserve program is to assist in contributing to Albertans' high quality of life through economic, social and environmental values. Grazing reserves provide local grazing opportunity to ranchers to complement their operations.

Topic: Provide a list of all ACRP projects that were funded in 2018-19 from the combination of carbon tax and climate change emissions management fund? (Reference Transcript PA-88; Mr. Schmidt)

| Grant Recipient | Project Name | Amount \$ |
|------------------------|---|----------------------|
| City of Calgary | Stormwater Management - Sunnyside Pump Station Improvements | 1,453,458 |
| City of Calgary | Community Protection and Public Safety - Downtown Flood Barrier | 4,153,028 |
| City of Calgary | Stormwater Management - Upper Plateau Separation Project | 4,153,027 |
| City of Calgary | Community Protection and Public Safety - 9th Avenue Bridge - Flood Resilience | 5,240,487 |
| City of Grande Prairie | Stormwater Management - 108th Street and 92 Avenue Stormwater Management | 1,602,000 |
| Cold Lake First Nation | Community Protection and Public Safety - Cold Lake First Nations Flood Resiliency Roadworks | 1,587,488 |
| MD of Bighorn No. 8 | Community Protection and Public Safety - Exshaw Creek Debris Flood Risk Mitigation | 3,373,505 |
| Rocky View County | Stormwater Management - Cooperative Stormwater Management Initiative (CSMI) | 4,000,000 |
| Town of Canmore | Community Protection and Public Safety - Cougar Creek Long Term Flood Mitigation | 3,958,137 |
| Town of Canmore | Community Protection and Public Safety - Canmore Critical Infrastructure Protection | 247,500 |
| Town of Edson | Stormwater Management - Facility - Bench Creek Mitigation | 1,106,493 |
| Town of Sylvan Lake | Water/Wastewater Infrastructure - Wagner Raw Water Intake and Pump Station Stormwater Management. | 1,874,877 |
| Grand Total | | \$32,750,000 |

Note: The 2018-19 ACRP grants were captured in the 2017-18 fiscal year financial statements as the payments were accelerated and paid in 2017-18 to make sure funds flowed quickly to the municipalities and the projects funded could commence as expeditiously as possible.

Topic: Provide a detailed breakdown on grants provided in 2018-19 to airshed associations and watershed associations. (Reference Transcript PA88-89-; Mr. Schmidt)

Air Partner Grant Recipients in 2018-19

| | \$ |
|--|---------------------|
| ALBERTA CAPITAL AIRSHED SOCIETY | 216,500.00 |
| ALBERTA EMERALD FOUNDATION | 50,000.00 |
| ALBERTA LAKE MANAGEMENT SOCIETY | 59,000.00 |
| ALBERTA WATER COUNCIL ASSOCIATION | 750,000.00 |
| BLOOD TRIBE | 20,000.00 |
| CALGARY REGION AIRSHED ZONE SOCIETY | 159,350.00 |
| CLEAN AIR STRATEGIC ALLIANCE ASSOCIATION | 625,000.00 |
| FORT SASKATCHEWAN REGIONAL AIR | 59,198.00 |
| LAKELAND INDUSTRY AND COMMUNITY | 50,000.00 |
| LAND STEWARDSHIP CENTRE OF CANADA | 225,000.00 |
| PALLISER AIRSHED SOCIETY | 37,870.00 |
| PEACE RIVER AREA MONITORING PROGRAM | 49,000.00 |
| STONEY NAKODA FIRST NATION | 60,000.00 |
| WEST CENTRAL AIRSHED SOCIETY | 203,000.00 |
| WOOD BUFFALO ENVIRONMENTAL ASSOCIATION | 188,500.00 |
| Total | 2,752,418.00 |
| LESS: ALBERTA WATER COUNCIL * | (750,000.00) |
| Grand Total | 2,002,418.00 |

Water Partner Grant Recipients in 2018-19

| | \$ |
|---|------------|
| ALDER FLATS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL | 741.17 |
| ARBOUR LAKE MIDDLE SCHOOL | 100.00 |
| ATHABASCA WATERSHED COUNCIL | 330,000.00 |
| BANFF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL | 1,000.00 |
| BATTLE RIVER WATERSHED ALLIANCE SOCIETY | 450,000.00 |
| BOW RIVER BASIN COUNCIL SOCIETY | 430,000.00 |
| CANMORE COLLEGIATE | 930.00 |
| CAREER AND TECHNOLOGY CENTRE | 1,000.00 |
| EDMONTON CHRISTIAN NORTHEAST SCHOOL | 400.00 |
| FILIPINO LANGUAGE AND CULTURE SCHOOL IN | 1,000.00 |
| GRIFFITH WOODS SCHOOL | 1,000.00 |
| HILLHURST SCHOOL | 969.98 |
| J H PICARD SCHOOL | 942.90 |
| JOHN WARE SCHOOL | 500.00 |
| KILLARNEY SCHOOL | 510.00 |
| LAKELAND INDUSTRY AND COMMUNITY | 330,000.00 |
| LESSER SLAVE WATERSHED COUNCIL | 375,000.00 |
| MASTER'S ACADEMY | 1,000.00 |
| MIGHTY PEACE WATERSHED ALLIANCE SOCIETY | 400,000.00 |
| MILK RIVER WATERSHED COUNCIL CANADA | 370,000.00 |

| | \$ |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|
| NOBLE CENTRAL SCHOOL | 993.80 |
| NORTH SASKATCHEWAN WATERSHED ALLIANCE | 450,000.00 |
| OLDMAN WATERSHED COUNCIL | 450,000.00 |
| RED DEER RIVER WATERSHED ALLIANCE | 400,000.00 |
| RUNDLE COLLEGE JR / SR HIGH SCHOOL | 997.12 |
| SOUTH EAST ALBERTA WATERSHED ALLIANCE | 315,000.00 |
| ST. GABRIEL SCHOOL | 985.45 |
| WESTWOOD COMMUNITY HIGH SCHOOL | 1,000.00 |
| Total | 4,314,070.42 |
| ADD: ALBERTA WATER COUNCIL* | 750,000.00 |
| Grand Total | 5,064,070.42 |

All air and water partners are listed; Airshed Associations and Watershed Associations are highlighted in green.

* The Alberta Water Council (AWC) grant in the amount of \$750,000 was moved from Air Partners to Water Partners to appropriately reflect the program supported.

Topic: Provide a detailed breakdown on funding given to oil sands monitoring programs.
 (Reference Transcript PA88-89-; Mr. Schmidt)

| Grant Recipient | Project Name | 2018-19 \$ |
|--|---|---------------|
| ALBERTA MACHINE INTELLIGENCE INSTITUTE | EVOLVING THE OSM INTEGRATED ENVIRONMENTAL DATA AND ANALYTICS FRAMEWORK | 500,000 |
| GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF CANADA | QUANTITATIVE SOURCE APPORTIONMENT OF POLYCYCLIC AROMATIC HYDROCARBONS IN THE ATHABASCA RIVER WATERSHED USING COMPOUND-SPECIFIC ISOTOPE RATIOS | 107,050 |
| INNOTECH ALBERTA INC. | OIL SANDS MONITORING SYNTHESIS DEER AND OTHER MAMMALS | 250,000 |
| INNOTECH ALBERTA INC. | OIL SANDS PROCESS AFFECTED WATERS (OSPW) SEEPAGE REVIEW | 50,000 |
| INNOTECH ALBERTA INC. | OIL SANDS PROCESS AFFECTED WATERS (OSPW) SEEPAGE REVIEW | 100,000 |
| METIS NATION OF ALBERTA ASSOCIATION FORT | WHERE ARE THE FRESHWATER CLAMS - EXPLORATION USING COMMUNITY BASED METHODOLOGIES | 210,130 |
| MIKISEW CREE FIRST NATION | COMMUNITY BASED MONITORING PROGRAM | 220,000 |
| UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA | SEDIMENT SUPPLY AND CONTAMINANT TRANSPORT IN THE LOWER ATHABASCA RIVER VALLEY | 125,000 |
| UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA | FOCAL PLANTS MONITORING IN THE OIL SANDS REGION | 155,000 |
| UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA | FOCAL PLANTS MONITORING IN THE OIL SANDS REGION | 54,000 |
| UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA | OIL SANDS MONITORING SYNTHESIS: BIODIVERSITY, MOOSE AND OTHER MAMMALS | 250,000 |
| UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA | OSM COMMUNITY BASED MONITORING FUND TRACKING CHANGE | 200,000 |
| UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA | INTEGRATED ANALYTICS AND REPORTING ON ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITION IN THE OIL SANDS REGION | 1,150,000 |
| UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY | RATIONALIZATION AND CONSOLIDATION OF METEOROLOGICAL MONITORING NETWORKS UNDER OSM | 250,000 |
| UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY | REPRESENTATIVE SUB-BASIN STUDIES - ELLS AND STEEPBANK RIVERS | 240,250 |
| UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY | OSM INTEGRATION WORKSHOPS AND MULTI-STAKEHOLDER SYMPOSIUM | 415,000 |
| UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN | BRIDGING KNOWLEDGE SYSTEMS: COMMUNITY-LED FISH HEALTH MONITORING PILOT STUDY | 175,000 |
| UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO | OIL SANDS WETLANDS ECOSYSTEM MONITORING NETWORK DESIGN | 285,729 |

| Grant Recipient | Project Name | 2018-19 Amount \$ |
|---------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO | OIL SANDS NEW WETLAND MONITORING: DEVELOPMENT OF BIOTIC INDICATORS COMPONENT | 110,055 |
| VILLANOVA UNIVERSITY | OIL SANDS WETLANDS ECOSYSTEM MONITORING NETWORK DESIGN | 348,854 |
| VILLANOVA UNIVERSITY | OIL SANDS WETLANDS ECOSYSTEM MONITORING NETWORK DESIGN | 34,042 |
| Grand Total | | 5,230,110 |

Topic: Provide information on the job analysis and industry impact analysis, etc. that was completed for the Methane Emission Reduction Regulation. (*Reference Transcript PA-89; Mr. Guthrie*)

- The response below is provided on behalf of Alberta Energy.
- The Alberta Government collaborated with the Alberta Energy Regulator, industry, environmental non-governmental organizations, academia and technology experts to develop options to inform the new regulatory regime that would recognize Alberta's unique operating conditions while reducing methane emissions by 45 per cent from 2014 levels by 2025.
- Alberta's approach addresses the primary sources of methane emissions by targeting the lowest cost-highest return interventions focusing on fugitive emissions from leaking or malfunctioning equipment, venting and emissions from pneumatic devices, glycol dehydrators and compressors. The requirements are also designed to improve measurement, monitoring and reporting activities.
- The new requirements set higher standards for new facilities in 2020, creating more flexibility for existing operations by allowing for innovation and the adoption of cost-effective measures by 2023.
- To ensure Alberta achieves the 2025 target, there is a built-in technical review period in 2023 that will allow for the introduction or removal of stringency, resulting in the protection of the environment and preserving Alberta jobs.
- Information on the analysis of costs to industry and job impacts that was used to support the regulatory development of the Methane Emission Reduction Regulation can be found at the link below.

<https://www.aer.ca/documents/DelphiAlbertaMethaneAbatementCostStudy.pdf>

Topic: Describe any overlap, grant duplication between the ACA grants and the department. (*Reference Transcript PA-90; Ms. Renaud*)

- Neither ACA nor the department are aware of any direct overlap or duplication between ACA grants and department grants.
 - Environment and Parks did provide a grant to the Alberta Fish and Game Association to support the general activity of the association, but that does not overlap or duplicate grant programs provided to that association through the ACA.

Topic: Provide information on if there would be any cost savings if ACA was brought in-house. (*Reference Transcript PA-90; Ms. Renaud*)

- While bringing the Alberta Conservation Association in-house would likely save on some administration costs, these cost savings would be offset by a loss of \$3 to \$6 million per year, which is currently generated by ACA in partnership funding that is not available to the Government of Alberta.
- As identified in the Delegated Authority Organization Review conducted by Solved, “ACA enjoys a number of partnerships across the province. It is able to take advantage of its arm’s length government entity status to leverage those partnerships for funding, donations (land assets, in kind resources, and dollars), information sharing, sponsorship, and project delivery.
- In particular, ACA has demonstrated an ability to collaborate with several big players in Alberta’s energy sector. In addition, the review states: “Through its partners across the province, ACA is able to leverage funds and multiply investment into bigger and a higher number of projects and programs.”
- Bringing ACA in-house would result in a net loss of revenue to conservation activities in Alberta.

Topic: Provide information on *Conservation* magazine; what the circulation cost is, what the cost is to produce, and whether or not it is revenue neutral, and ad-buy guidelines.

(Reference Transcript PA-90; Ms. Renaud)

- The Alberta Conservation Association produces two issues of Conservation Magazine per year (spring and fall). Each issue has a circulation of approximately 15,000. Yearly production costs (includes both issues) is \$60,000 and advertising sales generate revenue between \$10,000 and \$15,000 per year, depending on the issue. Conservation Magazine is not cost neutral; however, in recent years a more digital friendly layout has been offered to encourage our stakeholders to read the magazine online or on their mobile device. Eliminating the hard copy version would significantly reduce production costs; however, to date, there are still a large number of stakeholders who prefer a hard copy of the magazine.
- ACA has no specific ad-buy guidelines, as advertising buys vary depending upon the particular information ACA wishes to advertise, the readership ACA wishes to reach, the time of year the information must be released, and available budget.

Topic: Provide information on how long Kingston Ross Pasnak has been the auditor and how are ACA auditors selected. (Reference Transcript PA-90; Ms. Renaud)

- Through several successful proposal processes, Kingston Ross Pasnak have been the auditors for ACA since 2004.
- Alberta Conservation Association tenders a proposal for audit services every three years. The proposals are reviewed based on the following criteria:
 - Cost, including an estimate of the reimbursable expenses anticipated to be required for this service, as well as professional fees.
 - Experience in non-profit charitable organization auditing.
 - Profile of the firm, including breadth of other audit assignments and clients; resource/support services available (for example, income tax consulting, GST); particular strengths relevant to this audit.
 - Information as to the location of the office that would be responsible for the audit, the names and resumes of the partner, manager and senior staff who will be assigned to the audit if the firm is successful.
 - An estimate of the hours that would be required for the annual audit, broken down between the various responsibilities that may be required, and showing the category of staff assigned to each of the responsibilities.
 - Three client references.
 - An affirmative statement that the firm is independent of ACA, and staff as defined by generally accepted auditing standards and professional ethics.
- ACA management reviews and ranks the proposals and provides a recommendation to the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors reviews management's recommendation and then provides a recommendation to the Member Groups of ACA at the Annual General Meeting (AGM). The vote of the Member Groups at the AGM determines the auditor on a year-to-year basis.
- Although ACA's normal practice is to tender audit services every three years, in 2019, ACA made an exception and extended our current contract with Kingston Ross Pasnak for a fourth year (with approval at the annual general meeting). In the summer of 2019, ACA became aware that its Chief Financial and Information Officer (CFIO) would be leaving ACA and moving to Prince Edward Island. As a result, ACA began the search to fill this senior position immediately. However, because a new CFIO was not in place for the fall, ACA and the Member Groups felt it was prudent to maintain the current auditors for one more year to ensure the new CFIO could have a role in evaluating the proposals for audit services for the next three years.

Topic: Provide information on the purpose of corporate partners in the conservation program and what accountability mechanisms exist to ensure the corporate partnership programs align with ACA's statutory responsibilities. (*Reference Transcript PA-90; Ms. Renaud*)

- The purpose of the Corporate Partners in Conservation Program is to engage Alberta's corporate and municipal communities in conservation activities and to recognize those organizations that make a longer-term commitment to partner with ACA through in-kind and/or cash donations.
- ACA believes that forging strong partnerships with Alberta's corporate and municipal communities not only allows ACA the opportunity to increase the profile of conservation issues within these organizations, but also allows ACA to leverage our funding.
- All Corporate Partners in Conservation agreements are reviewed by ACA's management team to ensure they fit with current programs. In addition, new Corporate Partners in Conservation are discussed with the Board of Directors on a quarterly basis. If any issues or concerns are raised, then they are dealt with on a case-by-case basis.

Topic: Provide a detailed breakdown of any grants that are provided to organizations that are engaged in citizen science (outside of airshed and watershed partnerships, and the oil sands monitoring programs). (Reference Transcript PA-90; Mr. Schmidt)

Citizen Science Grant Recipients in 2018-19

| | \$ |
|---|---------------------|
| ALBERTA INVASIVE SPECIES COUNCIL | 150,000.00 |
| ALBERTA RIPARIAN HABITAT MANAGEMENT | 310,000.00 |
| ASENIWUCHE WINEWAK NATION OF CANADA | 30,000.00 |
| CONSERVATION EDUCATION WISE FOUNDATION | 315,000.00 |
| DUCKS UNLIMITED CANADA | 400,000.00 |
| FOREST RESOURCE IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION | 7,300,000.00 |
| FRI RESEARCH | 120,000.00 |
| PRAIRIE CONSERVATION FORUM | 440,000.00 |
| THE ALBERTA TRAPPERS ASSOCIATION | 225,000.00 |
| THE CALGARY ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY | 171,993.00 |
| TOLKO INDUSTRIES LTD. | 50,000.00 |
| TRENT UNIVERSITY | 80,000.00 |
| UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA | 349,856.00 |
| UNIVERSITY OF LETHBRIDGE | 50,000.00 |
| UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA | 50,000.00 |
| UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN | 5,000.00 |
| WATERTON BIOSPHERE RESERVE ASSOCIATION | 125,000.00 |
| Grand Total | 9,896,843.00 |

Programs for Citizen Science grants include Whirling Disease, wildlife management and Wildlife Projects.

Topic: Provide information on any advancement on the South Saskatchewan Regional Plan with the accommodations of Eden Valley's request to make a change in terms of the boundaries (what plans have been made or what responses have been made). *(Reference Transcript PA-90; Mr. Feehan)*

- In the future, should any changes to the designation of the land take place, an amendment process would be initiated to reflect those changes within the South Saskatchewan Regional Plan.

Topic: Provide information on the Conklin Metis community's request to prevent the establishment of a waste management site close to their community (what plans have been made or what responses have been made). (*Reference Transcript PA-90; Mr. Feehan*)

- In terms of the proposed Class II landfill located approximately two kilometres southwest of Conklin, Alberta, Environment and Parks (AEP) has steadfastly adhered to the regulatory process for approvals as provided for under the *Public Lands Act* (PLA), the *Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act* (EPEA) and the *Water Act* (WA).
- From a land use perspective, with some mitigation required, the area was deemed acceptable for use by Secure Energy Services as a Class II landfill.
- Secure Energy met AEP requirements and the PLA disposition was issued by the department on September 21, 2018, conditional to Secure Energy providing the department with an acceptable wildlife survey schedule and mitigation plan for review. A fish habitat assessment on Birch Creek and its tributaries was also required as part of the conditional approval.
- It is the normal process for AEP to issue the PLA disposition, and then wait for the municipality to issue a development permit before issuing the WA and EPEA approvals. The WA and EPEA approvals have not yet been issued for Secure Energy's proposed Class II landfill.
- Secure Energy, as the proponent, was tasked with consulting with the community.
 - Under the current regulatory process, the proponent was required to advertise its intent to develop the site. Public notice was advertised by Secure Energy on August 23, 2016.
 - The department understands that Secure Energy planned and held multiple community engagement events, some that occurred with the support of the Conklin Resource Development Advisory Committee.
- AEP met with the Conklin community on the subject of the proposed Class II landfill and heard its concerns, and the department has maintained regular contact with the community as the application has progressed.
- Following the issuance of the disposition, the department provided the Conklin Resource Development Advisory Committee with information regarding the appeal process available through the Public Lands Appeal Board.
 - No person or group appealed the department's decision to issue a disposition under the PLA to Secure Energy.
- Public consultation through the municipal development permit approval process with the Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo (RMWB) provided another opportunity for residents to voice their thoughts and concerns.
- RMWB declined to approve a development permit for the Conklin Class II landfill and Secure Energy is appealing this decision.
- Statements of concern have been received by AEP regarding both the EPEA application and the WA application; however, both of these applications are on hold pending Secure Energy's appeal regarding RMWB's decision not to issue a development permit.

- The department looks forward to continuing to work together with both the advisory committee and the regional municipality as the Conklin Class II landfill proposal moves through the application process.

Topic: Provide information on the success of the Report-A-Poacher program, which regions of the province are most affected and which species are more at risk, and if funding for enforcement is adequate. (Reference Transcript PA-90; Ms. Renaud)

- The Alberta Conservation Association's role with respect to the Report A Poacher program is limited to two key elements:
 - promoting the program, through social media, print, and trade show advertising, and
 - providing funding for the cash rewards paid to informants that aid investigators in bringing charges forward.
- Alberta Justice and Solicitor General provided the following information:
 - The Report A Poacher program is a critical component to the effective delivery of the Fish and Wildlife Enforcement Branch programs. The program provides an opportunity for members of the public to provide information regarding suspected fisheries, wildlife or public land crimes. The program provides a 24-hour, seven days a week 1-800 reporting line and digital reporting. The public who provide information can remain confidential and are eligible for a reward.
 - The five-year average statistics for the Report A Poacher program are as follows:
 - Average annual calls for service – 13,683
 - Average annual fisheries, wildlife and public lands crime reported – 2,729
 - Average annual prosecutions resulting from calls – 805
 - Average annual rewards offered – 170
 - Average annual funds provided to reward recipients - \$70,000
 - The location of reported crime through the program varies throughout the province on a year-to-year basis. Every region of Alberta is represented fairly equally in the reported statistics.
 - There has been adequate funding available to ensure that the program continues to be an effective fisheries and wildlife crime-fighting tool.
 - The program does not specifically track species at risk. The most common species reported are black bear, white-tailed deer and walleye.

Topic: Provide information on the ministry's oversight role with the Alberta Energy Regulator. (Reference Transcript PA-90; Mr. Nixon)

- Under section 6(1.1) of the *Designation and Transfer of Responsibility Regulation*, the statutory powers, mandate and functions of the Alberta Energy Regulator (AER) are governed under both the Ministry of Energy and the Ministry of Environment and Parks.
- Under section 6(1.2) of the regulation, the AER's mandate to share information with the government is governed by the Ministry of Indigenous Relations, the Ministry of Energy and the Ministry of Environment and Parks.
- The AER is accountable to the Ministers.
- The Ministers are also responsible to:
 - Establish, through government process, policies applicable to resource development and AER.
 - Inform the AER of the government policies and direction which affect the work of the AER.
 - Sponsor, introduce and seek Legislative Assembly approval of new legislation and amendments to existing legislation which may affect the AER.
 - Sponsor, introduce and seek approval of regulations in respect of the AER, in accordance with its governing statutes.
 - Receive notice under section 22 of the Responsible Energy Development Act (REDA) in respect of the proposed rules.
 - Receive input from the AER, as appropriate, respecting the development, establishment, amendment, termination or repeal of any enactment, program, directive, guideline or policy that is related to the AER's statutory powers, mandate and functions
 - Give directions to the AER under section 67 of the REDA.
- The Ministers:
 - Annually review the AER's strategic plan and annual business plans to ensure strategic alignment with government policy.
 - Review the AER's financial reports submitted annually.
 - Monitor the AER's operations and performance to ensure the AER is fulfilling its objectives and statutory powers, mandate and functions in a manner that complies, and is consistent with, government policies.
 - Report to the Legislative Assembly regarding the operations and affairs of the AER, including submitting annual performance and financial reports on the AER to the Legislative Assembly.
 - Meet with the Chair to discuss issues relating to the effective execution of AER's non-adjudicative functions.
 - Coordinate regular interactions and contact on existing and emerging issues with the Chair and Chief Executive Officer (CEO) as applicable, through annual or semi-annual meetings.
- The Deputy Ministers of Energy, and Environment and Parks, support and act under the general direction of their respective Minister to advance the mandate of the ministries and government. The Deputy Ministers coordinate and work with the Chair and Chief

Executive Officer, as appropriate, respecting the development and implementation of policy instruments, priorities, business plans, resources, budget and other matters of mutual interest.

- The Chair of the AER is a member of the board and represents the AER. The Chair and Chief Executive Officer act as primary liaisons in dealing with the Ministers and ministries. The Chair leads the board to ensure effective operation of the AER's governance responsibilities, and the board is accountable to the Ministers for ensuring the AER fulfills its statutory powers, mandate and functions.

Topic: Provide the written analysis from the provincial flood damage assessment tool that enables the comparison of proposed mitigation measures to determine which measure or combination of measures provides the best benefit for the cost. (Reference Transcript PA-90; Mr. Stephan)

- To allow for a consistent approach to the evaluation of flood mitigation alternatives, the province of Alberta has adopted a standard methodology for flood damage assessment. The Provincial Flood Damage Assessment Tool (PFDAT) enables the standardized estimation of flood costs for varying levels of inundation within a community.
- This is accomplished by employing three sets of data: inundation damage curves, community-specific property data and community-specific flood elevation data. When combined, the data sets enable the development of an economic flood risk model for that community. To date, the Government of Alberta has funded PFDAT studies for the communities of Canmore, Whitecourt, Okotoks, Airdrie, Lacombe, Stettler, Coleman, Manning, Millet, Carbon, Irvine and Walsh. With newly completed flood mapping, additional studies are underway for the communities of Medicine Hat, Red Deer, the Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo (Fort McMurray), Canmore (update), Okotoks (update), High River, Black Diamond, Sundre and Peace River for open water flooding, and Peace River and Fort McMurray for ice jam flooding.
- Flood damage estimates are a required input for evaluating the cost effectiveness of projects designed to alleviate flood impacts. Use of the PFDAT permits comparative benefit-cost analyses of proposed flood mitigation measures to be performed within communities for which community models have been developed. The estimated cost of proposed projects can be compared to the cost of a particular flood within a community, as derived from the PFDAT, and the cost effectiveness between projects compared. For example, data from PFDAT studies can be used when reviewing and prioritizing Alberta Community Resilience Program grant applications.
- The PFDAT was initially developed for use in the cost-benefit analysis of alternative flood mitigation projects on the Elbow River to protect Calgary from a 1:100 flood event. For communities without PFDAT models to provide detailed cost-benefit estimates, proposed projects have been evaluated using a set of weighted criteria to evaluate the effectiveness, cost-benefit, environmental suitability and community support for proposed flood mitigation projects. In the absence of Government of Alberta produced studies, the PFDAT is open source and freely available to any community or organization that wishes to download a copy and create their own flood damage risk assessment. To assist communities and organizations, a tutorial training video is provided to anyone who requests a copy of PFDAT.

Topic: Provide information on the ministry's approach to leasing public assets, particularly in provincial parks, and leverage against not-for-profit or private sector activity or investment (a list or several examples). (*Reference Transcript PA-90; Mr. Gotfried*)

- The Government of Alberta (GoA) manages public assets in the provincial parks system on behalf of Albertans. This is done in a responsible and effective manner to ensure that taxpayer dollars are wisely invested in a parks system. Examples of public assets within provincial parks include visitor centres, boat launches, public trails and staging areas, equipment storage facilities, utilities, campgrounds, ski hills and golf courses.
- The ministry's approach to entering into agreements to manage public assets includes:
 - Maintaining an inventory of public assets.
 - Conducting cost-benefit analyses of current and potential delivery methods and tools in alignment with Auditor General guidelines.
 - In rare cases, determining what, if any, subsidization is required if a third party was to manage the asset:
 - Determining a reasonable and fair return to Crown
 - Ensuring all trade agreements parameters have been met
 - Placing opportunities out for tender
 - Evaluating responses from qualified candidates
 - Negotiating terms and conditions
 - Signing agreement
 - Routine management and reporting
- The ministry's mechanism for managing public assets through third parties within provincial parks includes revenue contracts – which include both facility operating agreements and concession operating agreements – and dispositions such as recreation leases.
- Revenue contracts:
 - A revenue contract is typically 5 to 10 years for a facility operating agreement and 3 to 5 years for concession operating agreements.
 - Based on cost-benefit analysis comparing AEP operations to third party operations, revenue contracts such as facility operating agreements (FoAs) may be publically tendered for third parties (including non-profit organizations) to operate public assets in the Alberta Parks system. Factors considered in the FoA tendering process include potential operational cost savings and required return to Crown revenue.
 - Campground FoAs are managed and promoted under the Alberta Parks brand for continuity of service delivery and management of customer expectations across the province. Delivery through the Alberta Parks branded platform offers both the support of franchise-like business operations and processes, and scale of exposure to potential customers (more than 650,000 account holders currently on Reserve.albertaparks.ca). Approximately 47 per cent of Alberta Parks' 400 campgrounds are currently operated through this type of agreement.

- Concession agreements (i.e. for food services and equipment rental) within a government owned asset are typically branded and sold under their own name.
- The GoA is responsible for planning and investing in capital infrastructure in these sites.
- Recreation leases:
 - A recreation lease of a government owned asset is for a disposition of a duration longer than ten years. Typically, these arrangements are branded and made available as third party operations. There are only a few examples of this in the Alberta Parks system, which include the Kananaskis Golf Course and Nakiska Ski Resort.
 - Recreation leases are typically for the purpose of managing government owned complex commercial recreational activities like fly fishing lodges, ski hills and golf courses. They typically contain conditions like return to Crown requirements, lease footprint management and review provisions, and generally range from 10 to 15 years in length. In some cases where revenue is generated, funds are reinvested in facility maintenance, upgrades to the leased area and/or retained by the lessee. This would be spelled out in the conditions of the lease. Reasons for why a lessee would invest its own money in a public asset is that it could provide opportunity for the lessee's target audience to have enhanced experiences, or result in additional revenue for the lessee if users are willing to pay more due to the enhanced experience. Examples of investment include the Calgary Mountain Bike Association investing in a track course at Fish Creek Provincial Park, the Cardston Boating Club building and maintaining club house and boat facilities, and the Camp McCoy Association building and maintaining facilities for youth camping opportunities.
- Third party leases:
 - There are also a significant number of third party (non-profit or commercial) recreational leases for operations within Alberta Parks. Most are for non-government owned assets, such as youth camps, overnight accommodations, food services and recreational activities (e.g. archery club). In these cases the Government of Alberta neither owns the capital assets nor is responsible for any aspect of operations. Typical lessees include not-for-profit organizations, commercial businesses and municipalities.
 - Examples of these leases include the Pomeroy Kananaskis Mountain Lodge and Nordic Spa, McKenzie Meadows Golf Course in Fish Creek Provincial Park, Kinosoo Ridge Snow Resort in French Bay Provincial Recreation Area, the Gilwood Golf and Country Club in Slave Lake Provincial Park, and the Elkwater Lake Lodge and Resort in Cypress Hills Provincial Park.
 - A small number of non-profit organizations hold leases for publicly accessible sites with basic government owned day use assets such as trails, signage and vault toilets. These organizations are responsible for operation of the site. Examples include Wagner Natural Area Society, Riverlot 56 Natural Area Society and the J.J. Collet Natural Area Society.
- Non-profit agreements:

- Many non-profit partnership agreements exist to facilitate involvement and support to park services such as trail maintenance and public information. Some of these agreements also allow sharing public space for offices and equipment storage like the Friends of Fish Creek, Friends of Kananaskis, Greater Bragg Creek Trails Association and the Alberta World Cup Society.

Topic: With regard to the recommendations from the Auditor General related to grazing leases on Crown land, provide information on department actions on those recommendations, or information on why actions have not been taken. (Reference Transcript PA-90; Mr. Gotfried)

- The department accepted the Office of the Auditor General (OAG) recommendation in 2015 and has worked in collaboration with the Grazing Advisory Panel to draft environmental, social and economic objectives for grazing leases. Work is currently ongoing to develop performance indicators and measures related to these objectives to fulfill the OAG recommendation of yearly reporting.
- Preliminary work on potential performance indicators and measures related to rangeland health (i.e. biodiversity, erosion and water capture/release) was conducted in 2017 and 2018; however, further work is required to ensure there is sufficient data collection to support the measures.
- The department will continue to explore performance measure options to determine how best to report how the department is meeting environmental, social and economic objectives for grazing leases.

Topic: Provide information on the relationship between ACA and the ministry and Minister over the past four years, including information on the regularity of meetings with the Minister. (*Reference Transcript PA-90; Mr. Gotfried*)

- Over the last four years, the ACA and ministry staff have maintained ongoing interactions as part of routine business.
- A staff member represents the ministry on the ACA Board of Directors and has been participatory at regular board meetings.
- The ministry staff did conduct a review of the ACA through an independent third party as part of the review for agencies, boards and commissions. The outcome of this review has been shared with the ACA.
- Since then, the ministry has been focused on ensuring there is improved operating efficiencies between the organizations.

Topic: Provide information on the conservation work not-for-profits take on behalf of or in collaboration with the ACA, and characterize the relationships with the groups.

(Reference Transcript PA-90; Mr. Gotfried)

- The Alberta Conservation Association works with a wide range of not-for-profit organizations on a regular basis. ACA believes that developing strong working relationships is key to its success. Whether as a direct project participant, a supplier of in-kind services, or as a funding source, ACA works with approximately 120 not-for-profits, municipalities and irrigation districts located across the province.
- As an example of ACA collaborations, ACA often partners with Nature Conservancy of Canada, Ducks Unlimited Canada, Alberta Fish and Game Association, and Pheasants Forever to undertake habitat purchase and/or enhancement of conservation lands.
- The Alberta Hunter Education Instructors' Association is a major partner on a number of youth hunter and angler initiatives, as is 4-H Alberta with the pheasant raise and release program. The Alberta Trappers Association has been a partner on several citizen science projects related to furbearer harvest, some of which have garnered international interest, and Nature Alberta has partnered on the development educational materials for landowners.
- The following is a full list of not-for-profit organizations, municipalities and irrigation districts that ACA has worked with in 2018-19. This list does not include those not-for-profit organizations that have been supported through the ACA grant program:
 - Alberta Trappers Association, Ducks Unlimited Canada, Nature Conservancy of Canada, Alberta Hunter Education Instructors' Association, Alberta Fish and Game Association, Pheasants Forever, Nature Alberta, Phillip J. Currie Dinosaur Museum, 4-H Alberta, County of Newell Early Childhood Development Coalition, Brooks Fire Department, Coronation Elks, Coronation Family & Community Support Services, Edmonton Old Timers Fishing Club, Edmonton Trout Fishing Club, Fort Saskatchewan Lions Club, Hinton Fish and Game, Hinton Growing Great Kids Coalition, Lacombe Fish and Game Association, Lamont Fish and Game Association, Lesser Slave Lake Forest Education Society, Lesser Slave Lake Watershed Council, Lesser Slave Regional Fire Services, Northern Lights Fly Fishers, Provost & District Fish and Game Association, River Valley Alliance, Safari Club International – Red Deer Chapter, Slave Lake Rod & Gun Club, Slave Lake Volunteer Firefighters, Stony Plain Fish & Game Association, Wabamun Gun Club, Taber Fish and Game Association, Delta Waterfowl, Hunting for Tomorrow, Calgary Fish and Game Association, Innisfree & District Fish and Game Association, Lethbridge Fish and Game Association, Wheatland Conservation & Wildlife Association, Fort Saskatchewan Naturalist Society, Paintearth Economic Partners Society, Milk River Watershed Council Canada, Prairie Conservation Forum, Alberta Beef Producers, Canadian Cattlemen's Association, Cows and Fish, Cardston Fish and Game Association, Fort Macleod Fish and Game Association, Medicine Hat Fish and Game Association, Peace Wapiti Fish and Game Association, Picture Butte Fish and Game Association, Safari Club International – Northern Alberta Chapter, Magrath Rod and Gun

Club, New Dayton Rod and Gun Club, Southern Alberta Bowhunters Association, Alberta Culinary Tourism Alliance, North Saskatchewan Watershed Alliance, Radway Lions, Trout Unlimited – Oldman River Chapter, Alberta Streamwatch Conservation Coalition, Alberta Trail Riding Association, Myrnam River Ridge Snowmobile Club, Strathcona County, Westlock Whitetails Junior Forest Warden, Trout Unlimited Canada – Central Chapter, Trout Unlimited Canada – Yellowhead Chapter, Red Deer River Naturalists, Wild Elk Foundation, Mighty Peace Watershed Alliance, Oldman Watershed Council, St. Mary River Irrigation District, Taber Irrigation District, Raymond Irrigation District, Bow River Irrigation District, Eastern Irrigation District, M.D. of Taber, Town of Taber, City of Lacombe, County of Grande Prairie, County of Newell, County of Paintearth, Parkland County, Town of Beaumont, Town of Cochrane, Town of Coronation, Town of Gibbons, Town of Hinton, Town of Provost, Town of Stettler, Village of Wabamun, County of Warner, Athabasca County, Big Lakes County, Camrose County, Clear Hills County, Lac La Biche County, Lacombe County, Mackenzie County, County of Minburn, County of Northern Lights, County of St. Paul, County of Two Hills, County of Vermillion River, Flagstaff County, MD of Bonnyville, MD of Fairview, M.D. of Greenview, M.D. of Peace, MD of Provost, MD of Smoky River, MD of Spirit River, Northern Sunrise County, Smoky Lake County, Settler County, County of Saddle Hills, City of Fort Saskatchewan, Mountain View County, Thorhild County, Village of Spring Lake, Clearwater County, and Rocky View County.

- Overall, ACA's relationship with these groups is very good, with many of the relationships being multi-year and multi-faceted.