

In attendance:

Sebastien Dutrisac

Adam Norris

Kerri O'Shaughnessy – teleconference

KayeDon Wilcox

Audrey Gall – arrived 10:30 am

Ashley Rawluk – teleconference

Ed Skrlík

Meeting called to order 10:08 am**1. Administration****1.1. Welcome and Introductions****1.2. Review of agenda and meeting goals**

- no changes to agenda
- meeting goals are to 1) begin developing a common understanding of the issues, 2) begin developing a common understanding of the work that has already been done, and 3) begin developing a common understanding of how we will move forward

2. Project Overview**2.1. Review of project goals**

The primary and overarching goal of the RFHWP is to restore fish habitat in the Heart River Watershed. With the understanding that habitat is critical to the success of fish, six subordinate goals have been defined to direct efforts to achieve the primary goal.

1. To follow-up on and restart restoration activities previously initiated with intent of restoring the Heart River.
2. To evaluate effectiveness of existing education materials and develop a current public education and awareness package using the work already completed on this watershed and restoration efforts.
3. Re-engage landowners in beneficial management practices intended to improve the natural resource of the Heart River based on videography and aerial assessment.
4. Undertake 6 new restoration activities on properties in this watershed
5. Development of a plan to ensure fish passage will be created through the weir at the Town of Nampa.
6. Improve and/or restore fish habitat in the Heart River.
 - Consensus about the project goals

2.2. Partner roles /expertise

Cows'n'Fish – riparian and educational/outreach expertise

Fisheries Branch – technical fish ecology expertise and AESRD tie-in (policy)

Heart River Watershed Advisory Council – land owner relations, Beneficial Management Practices implementation, monitoring

Mighty Peace Watershed Alliance – project lead, watershed planning and policy
Village of Nampa – land use, by-law and policy uptake, weir considerations
Northern Sunrise County – landowner relations, landuse and policy uptake

2.3. Other potential partners

- suggestions were Peace Country Beef and Forage, Alberta Conservation Association, South Peace Agriculture Research and Development Association
- discussions ensued around the relevance and fit of each organization to the project

ACTION ITEM – ADAM TO CHECK WITH THIS ORGANIZATIONS ABOUT THEIR INTEREST IN THE PROJECT

- see 3.5.2
- as the project progresses we might encounter specific needs and then the appropriate partner should be sought

3. Next Steps (Audrey Gall joined and provided context on the watershed and previous efforts including the Watershed Management Plan)

3.1. Review of previous efforts

3.1.1. Information and report from previous efforts

- Ed raised this issue of silt loading in the river
- The HRWAC was originally started as source water protection effort and since the NEW water treatment plant has come online there has not been the same urgency
- Successes of the watershed management plan include reducing the number of cows in the creek, no bacteria exceedances this year
- Challenges include engaging cropped land, long-term actions needed to create change
- Aquality's setback matrix model is being pursued by NSC

3.1.2. Who do we need to talk to?

- Jay White/Aquality have data and maybe we have to see if the partners could get access to this

3.1.3. Who do this review?

- To be decided

3.2. Education campaign

3.2.1. Who do we target?

- Can we get legal information

3.2.2. How do we communicate?

- Cows'n'fish has effectively use video testimonials to take landowners' stories to others

3.2.3. Who does the campaign development?

- Cows'n'fish (Kerri) has expertise here
- Ed has the understanding from a landowner perspective

3.3. Aerial assessment**3.3.1. Where is the data/who has it?**

- Flyovers are complete and Sebastien provided copies
- The most recent flyover report is to be released shortly

3.3.2. What do we want from this review

- Audrey thought that maybe the greatest benefit from aerial videography was the publicity/awareness aspect and she wasn't sure how much it translated into better management practices

3.3.3. Who does this assessment/review?

- Josh Haag with Aquality now has the certification to do this and might be a contact, otherwise we can review in house

3.4. Fish passage issues**3.4.1. What do we know?**

- Village of Nampa owns the weir
- It is not used much and they only draw some water to fill off-site reservoirs.
- The golf course draws from the Heart River, but they too might have off-site storage

3.4.2. What do we need to know?

- What uses does the weir still have? – Village of Nampa and golf course

3.4.3. How do we assess and develop an action plan?

- Talk to Village and golf course and determine their needs for a weir and then develop action plan

ACTION ITEM – ADAM TO CHECK WITH THE VILLAGE OF NAMPA AND THE GOLF COURSE ABOUT THEIR USE OF THE WEIR

3.5. Stakeholder engagement**3.5.1. How do we get landowners on board?**

- Is there appropriate grazing of riparian zones that would allow farmers get some production without seriously comprising the functionality of the riparian zone? There is a sustainable stocking rate that could potentially be applied to come up with guidance
- Growing Forward 2 has a watershed grant program – this might be useful for us
- Discussion about whether a carrot, stick or combination thereof is most effective, appropriate – no consensus reached

3.5.2. Which other stakeholders do we need to consider?

- Can we do BMPs for grain growers?
- Oil & Gas should be addressed – do they need to sit on the project team?

- HRWAC is a multi-stakeholder group and they will be meeting soon

ACTION ITEM – ADAM TO ATTEND HRWAC MEETING

3.5.3. Who will develop plan and engage stakeholders?

- Cows'n'fish can help develop engagement strategy, NSC is involved with landowners and can help with engagement of stakeholders

THANKS TO AUDREY FOR HER TIME AND INPUT. AUDREY IS INVITED TO JOIN THE PROJECT TEAM.

4. Timelines

4.1. Review of project timelines

- Reviewed gantt chart with project deadlines
- Team would like to proceed as plenary group (ie. no committees)

4.2. Next meeting

- Sometime in January, exact date to be decided

5. Adjournment - 12:07 pm