

Members present: Sarah Campe (SNC), Koren Nydick, Dave Norman, Carole Combs, Chris Moi, Bobby Kamansky, Richard Garcia.

On the phone: Elissa Brown, Brittany Soto, Carolyn Hunsaker (joined at 2pm)



## MEETING NOTES

### Agenda overview

Majority of time will be focused on funding for the group.

The first meeting for 2015. A lot of uncertainties at the end of 2014. We were successful in getting our plan approved by DWR. The final version of the plan will be printed and mailed out to members/stakeholders within the next week or so.

The website will also be updated to reflect the final plan.

Project updates – Sarah Campe was called on to update the group on the Watershed Connections collaboration. There is an interest in collaboration among the upper watershed managers – the forests, park. Group would like to focus on forest restoration projects – identify the projects and map the project locations using the SNC GIS analyst. The group would like to help the park and forest fund these projects and perhaps enhance the projects through education, etc.

The SNC has launched a Watershed Improvement Program – SNC is looking at the Kings River basin presently.

Koren Nydick added that the Kings Basin is a good focus, but the park perspective is that a lot of the park is wildlife interface and therefore forest restoration, prescribed fire may be a challenge to implement in the King's watershed. Cedar Grove may be the only stand where the group could implement restoration activities. The park doesn't have any projects that are on the Kings watershed presently in the IRWMP project list, but that can be updated easily and quickly before Implementation Grant PSP is released.

Other avenues for funding could potentially be SNC if the Kings River Watershed is chosen as a focus, pilot area. One of the things identified on the Watershed Connections recent call is to identify and describe benefits to downstream users.

Lucas Patsik Ag Innovations Network – has a workgroup that is focused on the Kings River watershed – examining ways that downstream users may be encouraged to invest in upper watershed projects.

Generally, the SNC is interested in projects in the south sierra and wants to encourage projects there.

**Carolyn Hunsaker – forwarded a workshop to Bobby regarding (to be updated by Bobby after the break)**

Michelle Selman is the DWR climate change person and has been spearheading the efforts on bringing attention to the region and collaborations between the upper and downstream users/managers as it relates to IRWMP.

**NFF Grant update –**

Elissa – the SNC’s interest is to facilitate the SS IRWMP to become the forest collaborative group in our region and so the SNC encouraged the group to go after the NFF grant.

The Action Plan is a specific plan focused on the low-hanging fruit, focused on getting projects funded and done that are identified in the plan. Thus also ideally creating more encouragement for other groups to join the effort and get their projects funded.

Carole – Kings Basin is proceeding aggressively and therefore the competition will be fierce for Round 3 Implementation Grant funding.

The NFF also contacted Bobby and Chris and requested additional information on how the RWMG works with other collaboratives. Our group has a similar landscape focus and overlap with some of these existing groups – but there is no group actively working among all 3 forests.

Richard Garcia – asked about how BLM fits into our region – the largest piece is the Case Mountain ACEC.

The Three Rivers groundwater study should be completed and we are waiting on the final report from John Kirk to send it to us. We could use the report to do similar work in other watersheds. Dave Norman heard from John Kirk during the meeting and John said he is about half way done with the report. Dave suggested we give him an internal deadline to try and speed up the report’s completion.

The Sequoia has received two grants for two projects that the RWMG had on its project list – Osa Meadow (NFWF grant) and Long Meadow (NFWF grant).

Started discussing the Work Plan next. Main focus was on preparing for the development and submission of an Implementation Grant Application in August 2015. **Will finalize the work plan before the next CC meeting.**

Round 3 grant is \$4 million total for our region. Prop 1 will have IRWMP funding in it - \$34 million for our region – according to Carole Combs. Therefore if members put effort into getting projects ready for Round 3, it won’t be wasted effort.

Koren went on to discuss the CA LCC – as a possible funding source for getting an implementation application ready. Funding a workshop – hold a special session – on how we integrate workshops. We could have project proponents briefly present on their projects, we can discuss it, and rank them.

**Action item – Bobby and Chris need to work with Koren to create a 1 pager proposal for the LCC to evaluate regarding the Implementation Workshop.**

Elissa went on to explain the group the challenge of meeting the deadline for Round 3. Need a minimum of 90 days for doing a successful application. For the LCC workshop, we can look at project selection not just for DWR – 5 to 8 projects – but not just geared toward DWR fundable projects.

Science Delivery workshops – is the LCC funding that is potentially available to be used by the RWMG. The LCC funding is centered on the Climate Sense planning framework with the STEPs. They are focused on getting funding to groups that are trying to get through the STEP process. Our group can arguably be stuck at STEP five or so, whereby we have a Plan, but are trying to get to the implementation phase. A total request of \$10,000 seems like the upper limit.

Late April could be a target date range for having the workshop. We need to decide on a date today.  
**Decided on the date of May 21 for the workshop.**

After the break went on to discussing the remainder of the work plan. The CC meet.

The group needs to follow-up with Tulare County to formally request and receive funding. The County has verbally committed to funding our group with \$7000. **Carole suggested that we might get more money from the County if we presented to the Board of Supervisors.**

Bobby asked Dave Norman to address the group regarding P&Ps approach to helping the RWMG with any Implementation Grant application. 4 project grant applications typically cost \$100,000. Dave suggested that P&P can manage the process in the beginning to increase the potential for success. P&P could develop a project application memo for the group. P&P could go step by step through a winning application. P&P can help with our development of an application.

Average grant for Implementation Grant is \$1.27 million. Grant applications typically cost 10% of the grant request.

Richard Garcia suggested that an interregional type of project could be to develop tools to monitor groundwater – to obtain technical data, and good models. We also need to have tools to measure the benefits of the projects.

Bureau of Reclamation WaterSmart grant – new PSP in June most likely. More geared toward analyzing some water projects in our watershed.

Bobby asked Dave whether P&P would be willing to participate and maybe facilitate one of our workgroups such as the Project workgroup.

Bobby then went on to ask the group what the best way to be would to do outreach to current CC members and the project workgroup to figure out who can continue to be on the workgroup.

Koren asked how the Project workgroup interacted with the role of the workshop. Bobby answered that the group would take the results from the workshop and help ensure the results/action items occur.

Koren asked if the ranking could occur at the workshop. Bobby suggested that the workshop might not be the best forum for ranking so that folks don't feel excluded or attacked.

**SNC grant guidelines workshop is being held in Tulare County Board of Supervisor chambers – on the SNC website – under Prop 1 funding.**