MEETING SUMMARY

Southern Sierra Regional Water Management Group
December 12, 2013

Table of Contents

1. Summary of Action Items

1. **Provost & Pritchard** to amend the Stakeholder section of the Governance Chapter to include the words, "refer to." This will provide readers with more information that is available on reference materials in the public outreach section.

2. **Project Team with help from Mr. Bob Robinson and Ms. Jaime Collins** to continue outreach efforts and inquire with individual Tribal Organizations (whether federally recognized or not) regarding how they would like to be incorporated into the project and referenced in the IRWMP.

3. **Provost & Pritchard** to amend the language in the Objectives portion of Goal #4 and Goal #6, to be more clear and non-duplicative.

4. **Provost & Pritchard** to provide more clarity and rationale on why the objectives are related to each specific goal and why there may be duplication among these objectives.

5. **Project Team** to research if and where DWR uses language concerning "environmental resource management", specifically as it relates to the objectives of the IRWMP.

6. **Provost & Pritchard** to form a subcommittee to address issues related to clarifying the language of the objectives and their relationships to the goals; refine or possibly develop new objectives that may be more easily understood.

7. **Project Team** to draft an email followed by a phone call to allow any other feedback on the Goals and Objectives chapter.
8. **Provost & Pritchard** to include narrative text explaining how the objectives will be used to track the progress and measure the effectiveness of the IRWMP.
9. **Provost & Pritchard** to insert a description replacing the word "none" in table 3.3 Goal# 6, 8, and 12 of the Goals and Objectives chapter.
10. **Provost & Pritchard** to maintain anonymity by keeping the names of those who complete the goals and objectives ranking survey separate from their responses.
11. **Provost & Pritchard** to include a statement in the survey instructions as well as the Goals and Objectives chapter explaining that the ranking process:
    o Gives focus and direction for the group
    o Is used to identify the highest priority issues
    o Helps to identify strategies, projects, and funding availability
    o Helps to capture a cross-section of the group's input
12. **Provost & Pritchard** to include a statement elucidating the concept that the goals are not ranked as all are considered to have equal value; the objectives will be ranked by priority.
13. **Provost & Pritchard** to amend the "Low" priority definition in the instructions to read, "Offers meaningful benefits and may be important, but is not urgent."
14. **Provost & Pritchard** to circulate an email providing instructions for feedback on the Region Description chapter.
15. **All Members**, once given instructions and a draft for review, are to provide feedback on the Region Description by February 15 regarding the sub-headings, existing research, and layout and usability of the maps.
16. **Project Team:** to clarify the outreach strategy to be more informative of both what the RWMG is doing and why general water management is important.

Of note, the Governance chapter, Goals and Objectives chapter and Region Description outline are draft in nature. It is expected that the group will have additional opportunities for review IRWMP chapters later in the development process. Agreement to draft material at this stage enables Provost & Prichard to further refine these sections and move forward in the development of additional IRWMP chapters.

2. Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Rich Wilson, Facilitator for the Center of Collaborative Policy, welcomed the Regional Watershed Management Group (RWMG) members and other participants to the meeting and reviewed the agenda and ground rules. He then described the meeting objectives to the group, including the following:
- Review and approving the Governance and Region Description chapters,
- Refine the Integrated Regional Watershed Management (IRWM) Goals and Objectives, and
- Discuss the website and public outreach strategies.

3. Project Updates

American Water Resource Association Conference (AWRAC):
There will be a conference held in June of 2014 in Reno, NV that will aim to provide greater awareness to the theory and practice of IRWM. Topics to be presented at the conference include but are no limited to: defining IRWM, integration of economics, tribal perspectives, and monitoring of IRWM programs. Many of the topics offered at this conference are closely related to the issues and discussions held in the SSIRWMP. Mr. Owen Kubit and Mr. Bobby Kamansky are considering presenting two possible documents at the AWRAC conference.

Sierra Water Work Group Tour:
John Shelton, working in collaboration with Liz Mansfield of the Sierra Water Work Group, presented a draft agenda of a proposed tour of the Southern Sierra Region. The agenda listed many of the most feasible locations and times in which the tour could be conducted within a two-day period. Possible topics for discussion during the tour may include: the Rim Fire, local tribal issues, meadow restoration, water quality, water supply, and the disadvantaged communities (DAC) within the boundaries of the project. The purpose of this tour would be to educate state and local legislators and/or a member of their staff, representatives from the Sierra Nevada Conservancy, and other participants about the work being conducted under the SSIRWMP initiative.

Future Workshop Topics:
Mr. Chris Moi discussed possible topics under consideration for future workshops. Topics may include, Climate Change, Fire, Water Quality, and various resource management strategies.

New Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Signatories:
The Project Team secured two new signatories to the MOU, including:
- USDA Forest Service Pacific Southwest Research Station (PSW)
- Sierra Foothill Conservancy

Project Budget:
Mr. Moi announced that the Sequoia Riverlands Trust (SRT), while experiencing some technical difficulties with its computer systems, is moving forward to submit the first project invoices to DWR.

4. Interested Party/Public Comment Period

Mr. Kamansky reported that an associate submitted a grant application to the Army Corp of Engineers and was awarded $250,000 for a 3-year restoration project in Long Meadow.

5. Review of Region Description Outline

Mr. David Norman of Provost & Prichard provided a brief overview of the status of draft the Region Description chapter. He noted that the chapter needs to be tightened up and

will soon be forwarded to the group for review. Once this happens, the group will be provided instructions to provide feedback via email on the following process:

- <mark>ACTION ITEM:</mark> **Project Team** to circulate an email with instructions provided by Provost & Prichard to solicit feedback on the draft Region Description chapter.
- <mark>ACTION ITEM:</mark> **All Members**, once given instructions and a draft for review, are to provide feedback on the Region Description by February 15 regarding the sub-headings, existing research, and layout and usability of the maps.

Initial feedback on the draft Region Description chapter included the following:

- Some members suggested better use of tables to organize the Watershed data, including the various dams and hydroelectricity generated from these watersheds.
- Others suggested linking the geological description to hydrology and water quality within the project boundaries.

6. Discussion of the Refined Governance Chapter

Mr. Kubit reviewed past input on the draft Governance chapter and demonstrated changes that had been made as a result. He asked members to identify outstanding questions, concerns, and suggestions. Comments and clarifications included:

Use of the term "Stakeholder"

RWMG members discussed and agreed to use the term, "stakeholder" in place of "interested parties" in all sections of the IRWMP.

- Several members expressed support regarding this replacement; comments touched upon the benefits of consistency as well as elimination of a "pay to play membership" by providing an "open door" to any interested party or individual with a desire to participate.
- One member suggested the importance of providing more information on public outreach materials in the Stakeholder section. This member also encouraged the addition of a statement that includes a reference to the Public Outreach section, where more information is provided on the matter.
- <mark>ACTION ITEM:</mark> **Provost & Pritchard** to amend the Stakeholder section of the Governance Chapter to include the words "refer to." This will provide readers with more information that is available on reference materials in the Public Outreach section.

Use of "Stakeholder" to describe various Tribes

Several members noted the importance of conducting additional outreach to individual tribes to determine how they would like to be identified and incorporated into the RWMP.

- Mr. Kamansky noted that participants could be considered members without signing the MOU.
- Some noted that identification of each tribe may vary as a result of being federally recognized or not.

- **ACTION ITEM:** **Project Team with help from Mr. Bob Robinson and Ms. Jaime Collins** to continue outreach efforts and question individual Tribal Organizations (whether federally recognized or not) regarding how they would like to be incorporated into the project and referenced in the IRWMP.

Consensus on the Draft Governance Chapter

- Under the stipulation that the group was not giving "final approval" and would have future opportunities to review this chapter, other chapters, and the completed draft document, the group approved the draft Governance chapter in its preliminary form. As such, Provost & Prichard can move forward to develop other chapters.
- **AGREEMENT**: All members present approved the draft Governance chapter after Provost & Pritchard integrates members' feedback.

7. Discussion of IRWMP Goals and Objectives

Mr. Kubit showcased the draft Goals and Objectives chapter to the RWMG for the first time, providing background information as to how a pyramid structure (figure 3.1) outlines the hierarchal relationship between, "a regional vision, goals, objectives, strategies and projects." Open discussion focused specifically on the changes that should be made to the language of the goals and objectives. The group discussed a proposed ranking process later in the meeting.

The group provided the following comments and suggestions on the draft Goals and Objectives chapter:

Organization of Goals and Objectives
- Goal #4 and #6 should be combined due to similarity in language when referring to improvements to watershed management.
- Members noted inconsistencies and expressed concern with use of the term "watershed" and suggested that goal # 4 could also be done at the watershed scale as opposed to the landscape scale.
  - o Mr. Kamansky clarified that the group had distinguished between watershed management that dealt with issues specific to each watershed, but that the group does not have any specific watershed plan at this time.
- **ACTION ITEM:** **Provost & Pritchard with help from Ms. Carolyn Hunsaker** to amend language in the objectives portion of goal #4 and goal #6, to be more clear and non-duplicative.
- Some noted a lack of clarity for why some objectives are listed under one goal as opposed to a similar one, and members suggested that some goals are duplicative.
- One member suggested that the definition of "preserve" was unclear and should be thought of as a piece of land set aside rather than the land use practices to be performed once the land was acquired.

- **ACTION ITEM:** **Provost & Pritchard** to provide more clarity and rationale on why the objectives are related to each specific goal and why there may be duplication among these objectives.
- **ACTION ITEM:** **Project Team** to research if and where DWR uses language concerning "environmental resource management", specifically as it relates to the objectives of the IRWMP.
- **ACTION ITEM:** **Provost & Pritchard** to form a subcommittee to address issues related to clarifying the language of the objectives and their relationships to the goals; refine or possibly develop new objectives that may be more easily understood.
- **ACTION ITEM:** **Project Team** to draft an email followed by a phone call to allow any other feedback on the Goals and Objectives chapter.

Methods for Measurement

Some members questioned how the objectives will be used to track of progress and measuring the effectiveness of the IRWMP. The Project Team noted that quarterly and annual reports will be produced that evaluate whether or not the IRWMP objectives are being met.

- **ACTION ITEM:** **Provost & Pritchard** to include narrative text explaining how the objectives will be used to track the progress and measure the effectiveness of the IRWMP.

Table 3.3

Several members expressed concern about use of the term "none" in the description of some objectives.

- **ACTION ITEM:** **Provost & Pritchard** to insert a description replacing the word "none" in table 3.3 goal# 6, 8, and 12 of the Goals and Objectives chapter.

Table 3.5

- Mr. Kubit provided context into previous goals and how they were prioritized in the past and described how this information would be useful during the upcoming prioritization process.
- Members expressed support for the inclusion of this past process of prioritization and noted that the RWMG still has the option to remove it or place it in an appendix in the future.

8. Introduce IRWMP Goals and Objectives Ranking Process

Mr. Kubit provided a handout to the group and subsequently described the proposed process for ranking objectives. His described how SurveyMonkey would be used to collect the ranking data. Members will have the ability to rank objectives anonymously based on their professional opinions and constituent interests. He noted that although the group may approve of the ranking process, the act of ranking the objectives would not be carried out until the group approved the draft goals and objectives. The group provided feedback on the proposed process, including the following:

Use of SurveyMonkey

- Some suggested that Provost & Pritchard ensure the anonymity of the members by separating their names from their responses.
- <mark>ACTION ITEM:</mark> **Provost & Pritchard** to maintain anonymity by keeping the names of those who complete the goals and objectives ranking survey separate from their responses.
- Members also noted that it would be helpful to provide a list of benefits for why this ranking process should be carried out.
- <mark>ACTION ITEM:</mark> **Provost & Pritchard** to include a statement in the survey instructions as well as the chapter explaining that the ranking process:
  - Gives focus and direction for the group to act strategically
  - Is used to identify the highest priority issues
  - Helps to identify strategies, projects, and funding availability
  - Helps to capture a cross-section of the group's input

The Purpose of Ranking Objectives and Not Goals

Some members requested clarification on why the objectives were being ranked and not the goals. In response, some suggested that the goals be, "thought of as a package" to help explain that they are considered equal and necessary, whereas the objectives were considered necessary to meet each goal but required prioritization.

- <mark>ACTION ITEM:</mark> **Provost & Pritchard** to include a statement elucidating the concept that the goals are not ranked as all are considered to have equal value; the objectives will be ranked by priority.

High, Medium, and Low Prioritization

Members discuss the application of high, medium and low as a means to rank the objectives. Members questioned the specificity of the "low" priority classification and requested clarification in many of the terms that were included in the definition. Members agreed to simplify the definition to provide more consistency between the varying classifications.

- <mark>ACTION ITEM:</mark> **Provost & Pritchard** to amend the "Low" priority definition in the instructions to read, "Offers meaningful benefits and may be important, but is not urgent."

9. Discuss Status of Outreach Material and Strategy

Website/Outreach

- The group has contracted someone to update the website with a budget of $9000 to do so. Members suggested allowing volunteers to update the content of the site and specific events to ease the responsibility of the group. Thus, it would be beneficial to make the site as user friendly as possible so that volunteers would not be required to program code.
- Mr. Moi noted that he would be exploring different content options and would request feedback from the group in the future.

- o Several members expressed the importance of adding a "Water Events" calendar to the website.
- o Some suggested that members of the RWMG be added to the website for recognition

Outreach Plan:
Mr. Kamansky noted that a high level of public and stakeholder outreach is required for any IRWMP and should target specific audiences. He suggested that briefings and short letters could be utilized to recruit future signatories. Placing an emphasis on public outreach increases the ability of the RWMG to get stakeholder support and, involvement and ultimately buy in to the IRWMP. Members made the following comments about outreach

- **ACTION ITEM: Project Team:** to ensure the outreach strategy includes a description of both what the RWMG is doing and why general water management is important.
- Some suggested that outreach include education into the purpose of the SSIRWM initiative and the benefits of becoming a signatory.
- Some suggested to increase networking in the education arena in order to secure greater involvement from professional educators.

10. Attendees

1. Kathy Wood
2. Bob Robinson
3. Koren Nydick
4. Dave Norman
5. Emily Adams (Assistant Facilitator)
6. Jaime Collins
7. Michelle Dooley
8. Carolyn Hunsaker (Telephone)
9. Bobby Kamansky
10. Owen Kubit
11. Chris Moi
12. Bea Olsen (Telephone)
13. John Shelton
14. Jarrod Takemoto (Telephone)
15. Rich Wilson (Facilitator)