



Technical Committee Meeting

March 16, 2018 11:30-

SEAWA Office: Rm 41, 419- 3rd St. SE

Medicine Hat T1A 0G9

Teleconference: 1-855-392-2520

Access Code: 8126260#

Present: Marilou Montemayor, Patrick Jablkowski (recording), Karen Saffran, Larry Leipert, Garry Lentz, Ivan Shukster, Natasha Rogers,

Remote: Grant Wiseman (Stantec), George Kroupa (Stantec), Ray Walker

Regrets: Allison Campbell, John Michalopolous, Cathy Linowski, Stuart Murray, Colleen Walford, Janna Casson.

Minutes

CALL TO ORDER:

Karen, Chair 12:00 pm

AGENDA – ADDITIONS, DELETIONS & APPROVAL:

Gary Lentz moved to accept agenda (Doc1) with addition, seconded by Ivan Shukster.

Carried.

MINUTES:

Review and approval of previous meeting's minutes, November 27, 2017 (Doc2).

Larry Leipert moved to approve previous meeting's Minutes, seconded by Ivan Shukster.

Carried.

1. Review of Action Items

- a. Action Item 1: Janna and Colleen have agreed to become associates of SEAWA.
- b. Action Item 4: This is ongoing, the format of the minutes has to be adapted to be posted on the website.

NEW BUSINESS:

2. Stantec Aerial Assessment Review

- c. There are a number of editorial problems with the document. The committee will be providing comments to Patrick to be collected and provided to Stantec.

- i. Sign Off Sheet: Clarification on some of the legal language "any reliance on this document by any third party is strictly prohibited." This makes this document somewhat useless, we must be able to provide it to the public.
- ii. Executive summary: Appears to be some lines pulled from the body of the document.
- iii. Acknowledgements: Which names should be included here? Participants or those who provided feedback on the current report.
- iv. Karen: Does this document meet our needs? This is meant to guide not only SEAWA staff, but should be for the entire SEAWA watershed. This document provides a baseline of the riparian condition in the watershed. This is important for directing future restoration work, as well as being able to observe changes over time.
- v. A brochure or document should be created to summarize the results of this, as well as a way to promote the work.
- vi. How many hard copies will be provided?
- vii. Higher resolution photos should be included in the report, and arranged in a way that they can be put together. Perhaps at the scale of a section? Enough to see the dog park? Higher than what is provided in the current document.
- viii. Comments on the Method: The summary must be edited, (eg AEP is separate from the GoA). Project background: we are not doing stream restoration we are doing riparian restoration.
- ix. According to Alberta Environment.. needs a citation, in general there are a lot of missing citations.
- x. Literature Review: should include some comparison of their model to others that have been done, how are the methods

connected or associated to riparian function. Could the proposal be a place to start?

- xi. Correlation values are less than 0.5; no statement on the correlation or significance, and what values would be best for our purposes. Is the analysis accurate enough to base management decisions?
 - xii. Need some explanation of why the specific variables were chosen for the OBIA.
 - xiii. How were the weights chosen?
 - xiv. Lentic riparian areas were given equal weights, why?
 - xv. What is the hydraulic gradient of each of the Strahler levels?
 - xvi. Table 6-4 should be in a pie chart.
 - xvii. Conclusion:
- d. Stantec Presentation:
- i. Overview of what was covered in the 1st presentation.
 - ii. Then the second presentation, data analysis etc...
 - iii. Mid September, 2017 field work was complete;
 - iv. Making a representative sample is important, as the model is taught by these field collections.
 - v. Steep slopes, lack of vegetation woody vegetation, lack of sinuosity lead to poor habitat conditions.
 - 1. Marilou: Could some of the 'poor' areas be differentiated between anthropogenic or naturally caused. (Eg top of coulees). It could be misunderstood that there is a lot of anthropogenic effects in some areas that are naturally bare.
 - a. Grant: Cows and Fish assessment does classify these as having a lower riparian habitat condition

score. This can be clarified in the report.

- vi. Some water control structures were scanned in, irrigation canals and channels are being incorporated.
- vii. Weightings of the OBIA segmentation is a supervised classification.
- viii. Brightness is panchromatic channel, a pseudo true light value.
- ix. Cross correlation results:
 1. Marilou: Would be helpful to explain why the selection of the statistics for each lotic/lentic were made.
 2. Marilou: Is a correlation value of less than 0.5 acceptable?
 - a. Grant: There is no silver bullet for defining a riparian area. Need multiple data sets, and within the constraints of the project this is the result. This can be further clarified in the report.
 3. Marilou: Are there other studies that have done similar work? What have their correlations been. We need an explanation or justification for why we chose these correlations despite being relatively low.
 - a. Grant: There is no one else doing this approach to our knowledge, not a lot of precedence for comparison.
 4. Scores assigned to each OBIA statistic for each riparian health designation. How were these decided?
 - a. Grant: The breakdown of each is guided by the cows and fish methodology.

5. Is there a situation where brightness could be high, and DEM STD would be low? ie contradictory values of
 - a. Grant: Yes; The final score is cumulative, as it is in the Cows and Fish methodology.
 6. RHM Scores assigned to each riparian health designation. The scoring system was relaxed slightly. This was important for our region as it is semi-arid. The Cows and Fish methodology is an average for all of Alberta, not strictly applicable in this region.
 7. Please present the percentages as a pie chart.
 - a. Agreed.
 8. Lentic results are missing
 - a. They are coming, few days time.
 9. SW Etzikome coulee, there is little woody vegetation, high influence from dam structures. This is an ephemeral stream essentially.
 10. Ross Creek: The air photos were not all taken at the same time. Probably earlier in the year.
- e. Questions posed to Stantec:
- i. Cathy: Could the format of the map be integrated with Alberta Land Inventory (ALI) and Grassland Vegetation Index (GVI)?
 1. This will be posed to Stantec in the comments on the report.
 - ii. Marilou: stream order section 6-9 tabulated length, can there be information about the elevation change for each class. Table 6-2.
 1. Answer: Sure.
 - iii. Marilou: Maps included in the report, is there an entire map for the watershed,

showing the Strahler stream order? So they can be viewed

1. Each class would be a different colour.
- iv. Marilou: Results for assessment, there are 36 tiles. What resolution should these tiles be? Scale?
1. Index map will show the entire watershed at a much larger scale.
 2. At this scale, they can't see the segments.
 3. Higher resolution pdf's could be possible.
 4. Another way of doing this is a transparency of higher resolutions, this can be approved by SEAWA.
 5. They will export higher resolution PDF maps, these will be a standalone package.
- v. Editorial changes
1. Submit a copy with comments, and they will go from there.
- vi. Literature review. Lot of jumping to conclusions that results of the analysis will lead to some riparian functions. These need citation.
1. Okay
- vii. When does Stantec need feedback?
1. From SEAWA's commitments, can we have more time? At least 2 more back and forth required.
 2. First Round of SEAWA comments will be sent to Stantec: March 22, 2018 12:00
 3. Returned to SEAWA March 28, 2018
 4. Second Round of SEAWA comments will be sent to Stantec: April 3rd would be our response, then they would send again to
 5. Returned to SEAWA April 6, 2018

6. Close of the project: this will include the entire the geodatabase. April 28th.

PARTNER RECRUITMENT:

Patrick presented the most recent potential partners that we have had conversations with. Andy Wagman, Sage Valley Ranching, Warner County and the SMRID. The amount that can be provided to each partner under which grant is being finalized.

GRANT OPPORTUNITIES:

The committee was made aware of the following grants that could be applied to in the future:

Ecotrust March 31, 2018: Cathy has requested a phone call with Maggie to put together a proposal for the Letter-of Intent for the research project grant application. She will follow up with a written update as soon as they have had a chance to talk.

Eco-Action Grant March 21, 2018: This grant is meant to address clean water (water quality and conservation), or climate change (mitigation and adaptation). The deadline for this grant is March 21, with another round of funding in November, 2018. It might be more feasible to prepare a project for this time. There haven't been many projects funded in Alberta (Riparian Restoration, Youth Stewardship Projects, low impact development)

Community Foundation of South East Alberta – September 30, 2018

This grant requires charitable status. We are in the process of applying for this. This grant is available to projects that address one of the five Vital Signs impact areas. In our case, Pursuing an Environmentally Sustainable Future.

GRANT/PROJECT IDEAS:

(Larry Leipert): Due to a high water table, groundwater enters sumps and weeping tile. This water enters the sanitary sewer system, and is treated unnecessarily. A project that diverts this water from the treatment system, to storage would be valuable.

(Karen Saffran): Tags that designate plants as having lower water requirements in partnership with Blondies nursery. Should have some leftover tags.

**BUILDING RESILIENCY
TO MULTI-YEAR DROUGHT**

PROJECT TEAM TERMS OF REFERENCE:

This project proposes to build on existing work and address resource gaps by examining other jurisdictions with proven drought management plans. The final products aim to facilitate the delivery of customizable information by WPACs to support municipalities and communities across the province before, during and after a multi-year drought. Small urban and rural municipalities are WPACs' key target audience for this work, given their capacity challenges, competing local priorities, and potential for impact.

Feedback on the Project Terms of Reference is due by March 16. We should still provide feedback on this.

ADJOURN:

Karen Saffran declared the meeting adjourned at 3:30.

Carried.