



*Transboundary Grasslands Workshop,
Elkwater, AB January 19-20, 2016*



WORKSHOP SUMMARY NOTES

Contents

Welcome and Introductions	2
Lines in the Grass: Jurisdictional and Environmental Boundaries	2
Grasslands Case Studies Panel.....	2
Breakout Session #1 – Achieving or Struggling	4
Themes from Breakout #1	6
Holistic Approach to Large Landscape Conservation.....	7
Evening Speaker – Ian Dyson, Alberta	7
Issues & Interests: Identifying and Mapping Perspectives from each Jurisdiction.....	9
Breakout #2 – Themes: Issues (Gaps) / Opportunities	12
Breakout #3 – Overcoming Obstacles.....	14
Concluding Plenary: Putting it all Together	17
Next Steps & Closing Remarks	18



Welcome and Introductions

The workshop convened at 1:00 pm. Pat Gunderson welcomed the participants and reviewed the following workshop objectives:

- A. Increase familiarity with the broad scope of work and accomplishments of large landscape conservation transboundary collaboratives.
- B. Review the status of selected transboundary grassland initiatives with a focus on successes, challenges and outcomes.
- C. Discuss existing jurisdictionally-based environmental, land use and natural resource management priorities and challenges.
- D. Identify potential topics where new or enhanced transboundary collaboration may result in better outcomes.

Participants then introduced themselves and identified their title and jurisdiction. Please select the link for a list of participants http://www.albertapcf.org/rsu_docs/tb-grasslands-final-participant-lis-1.pdf

Lines in the Grass: Jurisdictional and Environmental Boundaries

Bill Dolan, Alberta Environment and Parks set the stage for the workshop by framing the context of environmental boundaries and the importance of viewing them holistically. He noted that successful environmental stewardship efforts overcome barriers and find ways to integrate objectives and management regimes across jurisdictional boundaries. The link to the presentation is provided below. http://www.albertapcf.org/rsu_docs/boundaries_prairie-conservation-workshop_elkwater_jan-19-20--2016-billdolan.pdf

Grasslands Case Studies Panel

Sue Michalsky, Ranchers Stewardship Alliance moderated a panel of speakers who each presented on transboundary initiatives occurring within their jurisdictions. Each panel highlighted aspects of their initiative(s) noting where things were working well, not working, and lessons they've learned along the way. The list of speakers and links to their presentation are contained below:

Karen Raven, Alberta Prairie Conservation Forum

http://www.albertapcf.org/rsu_docs/grassland-conservation-v2_ab_karenraven.pdf

Kayla Balderson and **Orin Balas**, Prairie Conservation Plan (SK)

http://www.albertapcf.org/rsu_docs/grassland-conservation_sk-pcapkaylabalderson.pdf

Peter Swain, Alberta Environment and Parks

http://www.albertapcf.org/rsu_docs/welcome-to-the-cypress-hills-grasslands-workshop-peterswain.pdf

Jeff Nelson, World Wildlife Fund (MT)

http://www.albertapcf.org/rsu_docs/grassland-conservation-cross-borderjeff-nelson.pdf

Kelly Williamson, Saskatchewan Stock Growers Association

http://www.albertapcf.org/rsu_docs/sarpal-fundingkellywilliamson.pdf

Paulette Fox, Alberta Environment and Parks and Leona Tracey, linnii Initiative Field Coordinator; spoke to the **linnii Initiative** as Melissa Weatherwax, Blackfeet Bison Program and Helen Augare-Carlson – Blackfeet Community College were unable to attend.

- They currently have three full time employees and are currently hiring students to help out with the linnii Initiative.
- Leona will be attending a meeting in Choteau about restoring grassland habitat. The conference is a Tribal student led initiative and one of the focuses is on bison habitat restoration.
- Currently working on repatriation of buffalo to First Nations with the Intertribal Buffalo Council.
- Held first annual celebration in Fort Peck will have their second annual celebration in Banff on September 23 and bison will be released in Banff on September 25.
- Leroy Little Bear is looking into winter bison range in Cypress Hills

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6LJfPMoGMAg&feature=youtu.be>

Joel Nicholson, Alberta Environment and Parks

http://www.albertapcf.org/rsu_docs/elkwater-presentation-jan-2016joelnicholson-.pdf

Tim Romanow, Milk River Watershed Council of Canada

http://www.albertapcf.org/rsu_docs/mrwcc-2015-transboundary-grasslands-workshoptim-romanow.pdf

Following the presentations, the speakers responded to questions from the floor.

Questions

For Leona: What sort of reception are you getting from Tribal councils?

- Have a supportive chairman in Browning, Harry Barns and Scott Kipp are very supportive and are key players in the buffalo restoration movement. Lobbying in DC for funding support for the initiative.
- Historical communications with tribal alliances have helped in the process. The linnii initiative has brought healing with the Tribes and First Nation Initiatives

For Joel: What percentage do you contribute to the increase in sage grouse during the translocation?

- Increased brood success
- Some due to existing birds and other habitat initiatives
- Good weather
- Last numerical increase was 2 decades ago

Do you feel that if something like this would have happened 2-3 years ago that the emergency protection order would still have been in place?

- If management was ahead of the decline, possibly.
- Some of the plans are being derailed by the emergency protection order.
- Want to continue with translocation work, cannot only focus on habitat protection.

Future of the prairie, can we share a perspective of what the grasslands will be like in 30 years? What are the threats?

- One of the big problems south of Cypress Hills is fire.
- Cultivation is still a significant risk, still seeing it at a reduced rate.
- There is positive work being completed with restoration and techniques for maintaining large intact habitat.
- One of the biggest threats is invasive species. Need to understand the role of stewardship and having eyes on the ground to detect invasive species.
- New opportunities with drones and technology. Drive home the importance of stewardship, need to do a better job of messaging.
- American Bison Society Conference, Human Dimensions, recognizing the relationships that are vital. Who do we need to get back on the land?

Breakout Session #1 – Achieving or Struggling – What and Why?

Participants then had the opportunity to share with each other the initiatives occurring in their respective jurisdictions. Participant discussion paralleled the approach taken by the panel speaker with each person sharing the following:

- What is working;
- What isn't working, and,
- "Must haves" and "Must avoid"



The discussions produced the following insights:

<i>MUST HAVES</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication - leaders, involve community, trust and multiple partners, urban consumer education on agriculture importance and role/play of industry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong communication between stakeholders, landowners, and policy makers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open effective communication with people organizations – inclusion / transparency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science-based research – support decision making

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning from our successes and mistakes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding (2)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement by everyone and have open communication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First Nations Involvement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy in place to support initiatives; Policy in place – support for protecting grasslands; Policy clarity – must give input /drive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Storytelling – conservation efforts around language preservation and culture revitalization
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitment and passion (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common narrative
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear outcomes and results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share common goal(s)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate consultations – public, stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balanced representation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement by everyone – inclusion, helping people to connect (urban support) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respect for land rights
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong relationships and communication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common metrics
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personal /institutional commitment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared vision/goals/objectives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action results on grounds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared capacity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connection with land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversity of stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration with varied perspectives, especially opposing views 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working on a local level with stakeholders, local partnerships

<i>MUST AVOID</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heavy-handed approach – “bully”, lawsuits, flexibility to avoid prescriptive solutions, not one size fits all, include First Nations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative impacts of declining economy driving decision-making (ex. changes to framing –diversifying)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duplication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid silos
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies that don’t reflect personal or economical needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single provider approach – competition for project funding
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exclusion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self interest
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Losing focus
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looking at issues in isolation (policy and pressure) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureaucratic B_____

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fragmentation/ single minded objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pitting stakeholders against each other
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoid land use plans that do not value both small and large landscapes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No succession plan! (including for bureaucrats – ties into shared leadership)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate timing for consultation – actually allow for feedback, limited voices heard 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limiting input from people – avoid fear / uncertainty
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excluding people / organizations with shared interests – avoid excluding stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having one solution for multiple jurisdictions / organizations – find ways to be adaptable
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Basing decision solely on science 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Getting initiatives started without funding
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specialization of focus – need to connect the pieces 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conflict because of definition
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies which are conflicting to our goals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoid land use plans that do not value both small and large landscapes

Themes from Breakout #1

Participants shared their findings with the large group and the collective identified the following “Must Have” themes:

- Common goals (strategic)
- Measures of / for success (indicators/metrics)
- Commitment, passion
- Collaboration of resources to avoid duplication
- Shared capacity – balance (not too much, not too little; support resiliency)
- Conflict can be good – recognize its value to help build understanding
- Explore how we will cope with dissension – balance by partnerships
- Communication
- Listen, diverse voices, including engagement with the public
- Common narrative
- Bottom up
- Shared leadership
- Inclusive – respecting differences
- Policy support – goals not in conflict
- Celebrating successes
- Action, achieving results

Holistic Approaches to Large Landscape Conservation

Evening Speaker – Ian Dyson, Alberta Environment and Parks

Ian shared with the group examples of large transboundary conservation efforts. He noted the complexity of working across multiple jurisdictions and the strategies various collaboratives are using to help overcome these challenges. Key points from the presentation include the following:

- Value in taking a big picture ‘whole environment’ approach
 - Less likely particular conservation priorities will be cross-threaded with others
 - Less missed connections
- Working collectively enhances capacity to get work done
- Messy but figuring it out together enhances collective ownership/commitment
- It is possible to get applied results on large landscapes with relatively modest investments (people/money)
- There is never just one collaborative partnership underway on any large landscape - multiple initiatives can find a complementary fit
- Despite apparent jurisdictional/organizational complexity, it is actually often easier to focus on a clear conservation priority – the work is unfettered and energizing
- Passion, commitment, engagement are the key – success requires a core group of fully committed people

It is critical that conservation priorities are owned individually and collectively – that means the appropriate people in your organization need to be looped in and also that you need to sell the benefits in terms that resonate with your organization’s priorities. At an operational level there needs to be a clear program relevance connection. At a broader organizational level the case also needs to be made. For example projects are more likely to be currently supported by the Government of Alberta if they are demonstrating leadership on climate change, demonstrating we are serious about the environment by addressing environmental cumulative effects, and enhancing our reputation (and potentially mitigating market access liabilities).

It’s also important to recognize, particularly for agencies, that when you work in a transboundary multi-jurisdictional environment that you are not the centre of the universe. You can influence, but not control. You need to figure things out with others. Also agencies can drive conservation agendas, but they cannot do it without stakeholder and community inclusivity/ownership. Finally, it helps to think and act in terms of putting the system to achieve your defined conservation outcomes in place (pilot projects), rather than develop a big plan and try to implement it.

Grasslands provide unique challenges and opportunities to large landscape transboundary conservation. These are settled, dominantly ranching landscapes. Listening to landholders, engagement, respecting land use, culture and economy are critical. There are lots of do’s and don’ts. The experience repository is largely in the successful NGO and agency programs. Also Tribes and First Nations are not going anywhere – this is their home place too and we have not been serious enough about ensuring that they are also essential drivers of the transboundary

conservation journey. Finally, a good start to getting a handle on the transboundary grasslands holistically would be to undertake a combined stressor (climate change, anthropogenic footprint, invasive species) analysis and temporal modelling on grassland ecosystems/conservation values.

We have a number of potential pathways forward from this workshop. We could just go home (one more workshop that we hopefully got something out of). We could identify a project where we don't currently have anything transboundary underway – such as terrestrial invasive species. We could initiate enhanced networking. Or we could say we need to do something more...and make it happen.

[http://www.albertapcf.org/rsu_docs/Holistic Approaches Grassland TB Jan2016IanDyson.pdf](http://www.albertapcf.org/rsu_docs/Holistic_Approaches_Grassland_TB_Jan2016IanDyson.pdf)

END OF DAY 1

Issues & Interests: Identifying and Mapping Perspectives from each Jurisdiction

Participants began the second day of the workshop by identifying and mapping the policy, program and context related to their grassland conservation priorities. This information was then used to identify where there appears to be an appetite for transboundary collaboration. The results from each jurisdiction are listed below followed by a listing of priority areas for possible action.

ALBERTA (** indicates appetite for action/transboundary collaboration*)

- Continental fund for grassland bird conservation
- **Regional integration
- Network for Northern Great Plains, Prairie Conservation Action Plan(PCAP)
- Collaboration
- **On ground management –best management practices, MultiSAR, South of the Divide Conservation Action Program (SODCAP), Milk River Natural Area, Suffield, Milk River ridge
- Invasive species
- Biodiversity action plans – South Saskatchewan Regional Plan (SSRP)
- Biodiversity Management Framework
- Connectivity – Private / public lands
- **Milk River Watershed – downstream coffin bridge
- Property rights – impacts by new programs
- Coop – Alberta, Montana, Saskatchewan
- **Wildlife – Species at risk(SAR)
- **Private land conservation as buffer to public
- Improving grazing / supporting best management practices(BMP's)
- Workshop for sustainable land management
- Supports for landowners
- Planning transboundary – Milk / Cypress
- Heart of Palliser triangle – north of Missouri, south of Cypress
- Climate adaption
- Cultural / economic
- Economic incentives for conservation (e.g. pilot Saskatchewan)
- Watershed
- Invasive species
- Look at linking – Prairie Conservation Action Plans, non-government organization's, other



Alberta

SASKATCHEWAN (* indicates appetite for action/transboundary collaboration)

- Recovery PCAP Planning
- Recovery plans for SAR – Federal vs. Provincial
- More collective cross-jurisdictional approach
- Audubon Unites States
- Balancing economic issues**
- Restoration of disturbed
- Connecting critical habitat
- Education
- Respect for property rights – surface and subsurface
- Improved implementation of plans
- Have consistency within/between recovery plans
- Less reactive, more proactive
- Invasive species
- Sustainability initiatives (sustainable beef – McDonalds) – producer driven initiatives**
- Include municipal plan in synergy with SSRP – overall governance between jurisdictions
- Sage grouse conservation
- Programs with a stewardship focus (MultiSAR etc.)/ SODCAP**
- Support for market-based tools**
- Stewardship credit
- SODCAP
- SAR – Retention for habitat / research; critical habitat and native prairie quantification
 - o Need – social / regional support
 - o Have to work with groups/people legislative people
 - o Have to work with people on the ground – unique
 - o Implementation
- Build a team
- Create own tools – to meet SAR needs; habitat equipment work plans
- Policy is moving forward
- Long term – need to plan future
- Multijurisdictional – fine tune action, then how to anchor
- Communication plan schools – PCAP, PCF with MT
- Joint education programs between AB, SK, MT



MONTANA

Where is there appetite for action?

- Milk River Watershed
- Tribal bison
- Sustain grasslands
- Conserve native habitat
- Local landowner and community voices heard
- Conserve wildlife – focal species



- Working landscapes – ranching
- Public access
- Connecting isolated parcels of native prairie
- Connecting overall province grassland (action plan)
- Sale of Crown lands

Breakout #2 – Themes: Issues (Gaps) / Opportunities

Participants worked in small groups and explored the following questions:

1. Which transboundary are issues not currently being addressed?
2. From the issues not currently being addressed, which present the greatest opportunity for transboundary collaboration and why?

Reponses generated by the groups included the following opportunities:

OPPORTUNITIES	
Continuity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Common goals / objectives - Data sharing and knowledge sharing - Monitoring – land use, outcomes, threats 	Using common tools such as range health assessments for monitoring. Build database using common language and classifications - Forces agency collaboration.
Focal Species <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Especially migratory connectivity - Flagships as rallying point - How to balance holistic ecosystem goals? 	Lots of excellent transboundary initiatives – bringing together as a singular cohesive body.
Invasive Species / Invasive species management	Cumulative effects management
Defining urgency	Communication of BMPs, monitoring methods, guidelines that what worked
Conservation tools	Connect the dots <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - avoid duplicating effort - no silos! - coordinating funding - landscape focus - share our programming successes/failures
Whole ecosystem approach <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - humans are part of it; socially, economically - Multispecies / airsheds / landscapes 	Common spatial data and change analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - i.e. where is the native prairie? - what exactly is the annual change? - Modelling stressors - What is the rate of invasive creep?
Common umbrella for 3 jurisdictions (AB, SK, MT). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Common threads between plans that are already established - Work to goals of these that are common - Build geographic context from then 	Focus cooperation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Create common narrative approach with all input - Avoid duplication
Method to share information <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - E.g. Pooling collective knowledge to fill gaps or figure out how to get information to fill gaps. Who coordinates this? 	Supporting local landowner and on the ground people. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How do we approach all these ideas in an occupied land where people need to sustain living? - How do we engage them?

OPPORTUNITIES	
Concise monitoring system	Range health monitoring
Multijurisdictional representation	Singular, focused, cohesive body focused on transboundary issues – mandate, meets frequently
Consistency of data classification – able to cross jurisdictions	holistic focus – currently fragmented on single issue / species
Common framework for recovery plans, action items and across jurisdictions	Coordinated stewardship efforts on private lands
Habitat connectivity across boundaries	Coordinated wildlife population management efforts
Communication / story telling	Linear disturbances
Consistent approach to range health monitoring across jurisdictions	Information sharing – data sharing
Information collecting – common approach	Idea sharing
Regional integration	Program integration
Transboundary planning – economic, species, landscape, economic/communication	Restoration – restoring connectivity
Networking – structure/ coordinator <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Landscape conservation” - Educating educators – common and current educational material 	KISS – Keep it smaller SODCAP – stewardship, producer MULTISAR - stewardship, producer MRWC/ MRWA (broad) PCAP / PCF (broad) NPCN – ENGO IITC / IINNII – First Nations NSSI – Agency, wildlife management agencies Transboundary plans, NCC,TNC, WWF, CBC Interprovincial parks LCC Global roundtables (sustainable beef initiative)

As a large group, gaps and opportunities were compiled into the following themes:

- A. Communications** – Mechanism to keep the conversation going, is there already a mechanism?
- B. Information Sharing**
- C. Invasive Species** – also consider pest management/ pollinators
- D. Common Tools and Data Classification** (what have we got and how is it changing?
Change analysis – native prairie retention, cumulative effects management)
- E. Holistic Ecosystems Landscape Approaches** – ecological, social, cultural; i.e. multispecies, soils
- F. Common Goals**

Breakout #3 – Overcoming Obstacles

New groups formed around each of the themes generated in Breakout Session #2. Each group discussed the issue and began to develop strategies to overcome the issues. Ideas from each group are captured below in the following tables.

Invasive Species

Obstacles	Strategies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ability to identify - Ease of dispersal - Need more monitoring and data sharing - Agreement on priorities and alignment on jurisdictional lists of invasive species - Lack of effective control on certain species - Lack of coordinated comprehensive effort 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sharing of successes and failures - Q.W. online – IMAP - Early detection and rapid response - More education - Invasive species check stations wash stations in construction - Inter-jurisdictional collaboration in monitoring and control efforts

Communication / Common Narrative

Obstacles	Strategies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nebulous goals, objectives and messages 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarify issues and identify solutions in a transboundary marketing plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of cultural connection to grasslands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Segment the markets and develop messaging based on potential for cultural connection
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Don't have the right nerds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hire specialists in communication to do the work
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hard to fit stewardship into curricula 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use parks as anchors to provide continuity and develop curriculum materials
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Data is not compelling on its own 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Find meaningful stories for each market segment

Information Sharing

Obstacles	Strategies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Venue or hub to host documents / contact lists <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o New – who manages? o Existing website? o Need dedicated leadership in advancing concept * what role do they play? o Need commitment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unite within existing cooperatives / groups (PCF /PCAP/ Montana)

Obstacles	Strategies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Understanding the areas of interest <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o NPD o SAR o Watersheds o Need to establish identity o Socioeconomics - Knowing what each other is doing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Leadership Group - need more meetings or cross boundary workshops (Ex. Matador Ranch) - Sharing success stories or what didn't work

Common Goals

Obstacles	Strategies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Silos 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mechanism prioritise to share / implement across boundary
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Weak or non-existent – no common goals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Start with achievable / small goals (e.g. aquatic invasive species)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Being unaware ; different perspectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use conflict / challenges to create dialogue / change
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ID key contacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Face to face networking / dialogue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of common goals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - *Identify common goals (e.g. an invasive control; keystone / flagship species / climate adaptation/ SAR/ Ecological footprint (Incentives)

Data – Classification / Analysis

Obstacles	Strategies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (Don't plan for unknowns /new trends) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mechanism to share / implement across boundary
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (Common monitoring not possible without common goals for using information) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (Common monitoring not possible without common goals for using information)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (Agreement on minimum standards for cross-boundary) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - *Minimum standard can be easier transboundary that one province/state/country; *Monitor/analyze/report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (silos) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Funding, Use information we have; MOU – Similar to Northern Plains Secretariat
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landscape / cultural conservation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Build on existing - Invent new - Start small

Obstacles	Strategies
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Start with identified goals - Need geographic focus – e.g. Milk / Frenchman - Native Plains and Potholes / Large Conservation Cooperative

Multiple – Spatial Scales

Obstacles	Strategies
	<p>Be proactive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Multiple tools / programs (reseeding – restoration) - Holistic stewardship approaches (AB-MULTISAR, SK-SODCAP, MT Conservation Menu) - Manage for heterogeneity on landscape - Connecting existing areas and prioritizing corridors - Keystone species – can drive conservation. Using an inclusive approach to look at all impacts for decisions. Asking questions relating to impacts of choices of action - Address economic incentives to support land rights and ecological outcomes



Concluding Plenary: Putting it all Together

A final large group discussion took place and participants were asked to describe what success would look like if the ideas from this workshop were advanced. Their ideas were as follows:

Indicators of Success

Note: **Outcomes** relate to impact/ positive change resulting on the landscape. **Outputs** reflect specific actions or activities that would occur to support achievement of long-term outcomes

Outcomes

- Less species listed or some coming off the list*
- Slow down in rate of conversion*
- Public more appreciative of grasslands*
- *Fill some conservation gaps and add value to existing*

Outputs

- Establishment of leadership group
- Clearly articulate vision and goal
- Collective briefing that we can share with others
- Communication strategy materials
- Borderless program
- Engagement with stakeholders not here (industry, recreation)
- Extends the invitation to others / funding
- Mechanisms – learning we can take from actual things on the ground
- Ways to showcase and see advancements and share beyond
- It brings ranching, bio-cultural pieces together
- Piggy back – National Parks appreciation week, Milk River Watershed AGM, PCAP – Feb 2017 (International, Saskatchewan), Society of Range Management, America’s Grasslands (reach out)
- Convening is important
- LCC – Jeff to get funding / request for proposals
- Grasslands birds are of concern – could use to create cross-border interest.
- Use Parks as places for messages – from communication to storytelling

A call to action was made and those interested in forming a Leadership Team expressed their willingness to continue the momentum from this workshop. Interested individuals included the following:

- Peter Swain, Alberta Environment and Parks
- Ian Dyson, Alberta Environment and Parks
- Kayla Balderson-Burak, Saskatchewan PCAP
- Kerry LaForge, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada
- Jeff Nelson, World Wildlife Fund (MT)
- Marissa Sather, United States Fish and Wildlife Service
- Pat Gunderson, Montana Bureau of Land Management

- Tim Romanow, Milk River Watershed Council Canada
- Paulette Fox, Aboriginal Relations, Alberta
- Linda Cerney, Alberta Environment and Parks

Leadership Team Members:

- Ian Dyson, Alberta Environment and Parks
- Sue Michalsky, Ranchers Stewardship Alliance
- Tim Romanow, Milk River Watershed Council of Canada
- Ron McNeil, Alberta Prairie Conservation Forum
- Brian Martin, The Nature Conservancy
- Neal Wilson, Antelope Creek Ranch
- Pat Gunderson, Bureau of Land Management
- Pat Fargey, Alberta Environment and Parks
- Joel Nicholson, Alberta Environment and Parks
- Linda Cerney, Alberta Environment and Parks
- Lisa Talavia-Spencer, Alberta Culture and Tourism
- Sasha Harriott, Alberta Prairie Conservation Forum

Next Steps & Closing Remarks

Ian Dyson provided closing remarks for the workshop. He expressed appreciation for the contributions made by all participants and thanked members of the Planning Team for their support and hard work in putting together this workshop.

Ian indicated that a follow-up call with members of the Planning Team is scheduled for February 11, 2016 and that individuals who just expressed interest in participating on a Leadership Team would be invited to attend the call.

Ian also noted that all materials from the workshop including presentations, the invitation list and summary notes from the proceedings would be posted on the Prairie Conservation Forum Website for all participants to access.

The workshop concluded with each participant completing an evaluation and individual commitment card. The results from the evaluation and cards will be used by the Leadership Team, along with the results from the workshop, to inform future actions to support transboundary collaboration in the grasslands.



THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING.