

MEETING SUMMARY

Southern Sierra Regional Water Management Group

June 12, 2014

Table of Contents

1. Summary of Action Items	1
2. Welcome and Introductions	2
3. Project Updates.....	2
Southern Sierra Project List.....	2
Drought Funding Opportunities	2
Additional October RWMG Meeting.....	2
4. Interested Party/ Public Comment Period	3
5. Discuss and Determine Utility of Objectives Ranking Results	3
6. Revisit and Approve Impacts and Benefits Chapter	3
7. Website Update	4
8. Introduce and Discuss Resource Management Strategies and Data Management Chapters	4
9. Introduce and Discuss Relation to Local Land Use and Water Planning Chapter	6
10. Attendees	6

1. Summary of Action Items

1. **Members and Interested Stakeholders** utilize the project description to submit any projects to be included in the IRWMP, highlighting any partnership opportunities.
2. **Provost and Pritchard** review the projects submissions and determine what opportunities the region may be able to create for regional funding.
3. **Project Team** send out an email update on the addition of the October meeting with the logistical information and materials included.
4. **Provost and Pritchard** provide a complete version of the IRWMP document to Regional Water Management Group (RWMG) members for review prior to the October meeting.
5. **Members and Interested Stakeholders** provide feedback on the website and corresponding Facebook pages by COB July 3, 2014.
6. **Ms. Woodard and Project Team** include the new website link on the Sequoia Riverlands Trust (SRT) website.
7. **Provost and Pritchard** provide Ms. Niki Woodard the list of studies and land use documents to be included on the website.
8. **Provost and Pritchard** revise the legend (in the Resource Management Strategies chapter) to appear on each page, not just the bottom of the table.
9. **Members and Interested Stakeholders** provide input for revision by COB June 27, 2014.
10. **Members and Interested Stakeholders** provide input on table 13-7 and section 13.5 by COB June 27, 2014.

Of note, the goals and objectives ranking process, Impacts and Benefits chapter, Resource Management Strategies, Data Management, and Local Land Use, and Water Planning chapters

are draft in nature. The RWMG will have additional opportunities to 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 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:

- Discuss and determine the utility of objectives ranking results;
- Revisit and approve the draft Impacts and Benefits chapter;
- Discuss and approve the draft Resource Management Strategies and Data Management chapters;
- Introduce and discuss the draft Relation to Local Land Use and Water Planning chapter; and
- Provide an overview of future outreach efforts.

3. Project Updates

Southern Sierra Project List

Mr. Owen Kubit reviewed the previous project solicitation and noted that submissions had been included in the project list for the IRWMP document and future grant applications. Additional project submissions should be sent to Mr. Kubit no later than July 3 2014.

Drought Funding Opportunities

Mr. Owen Kubit notified the group of the recent release of the DWR drought grant solicitation; and provided an overview of the Coordinating Committee's (CC) recommendation for the SSIRWM to wait until 2015 to apply for additional funding opportunities related to drought or project implementation generally. A primary obstacle is that the IRWMP must be adopted to receive funds. In addition, SRT is not yet willing to serve as a fiscal agent for new grant opportunities. Given these challenges, the CC agreed on the need to focus on completing the IRWMP rather than pushing an expedited timeline in order to acquire funds through the drought solicitation. All this said, Mr. Kamansky still emphasized the importance of preparing now for the 2015 grant solicitation.

- **ACTION ITEM: Members and Interested Stakeholders** utilize the project description to submit any projects for inclusion in the IRWMP, highlighting any partnership opportunities.
- **ACTION ITEM: Provost and Pritchard** review project submissions and determine any near term opportunities for funding in the Southern Sierra region.

Additional October RWMG Meeting

The Project Team recommended the addition of an October RWMG meeting to complete preparation and adoption process of the Southern Sierra IRWMP. An additional meeting will provide an opportunity to discuss the document as a whole and give members and interested stakeholders a chance to suggest final revisions. Ms. Julie Allen agreed to the benefits of having an additional meeting in October. She recommended updating the RWMG via distribution of an

updated workplan that includes the date, time and location of the October meeting. Members also requested that the entire IRWMP be made available for review prior to the meeting.

- **ACTION ITEM:** **Project Team** send out an updated workplan that includes the date, time and location of the October RWMG meeting.
- **ACTION ITEM:** **Provost and Pritchard** provide a complete version of the IRWMP document to the members for review prior to the October meeting.

4. Interested Party/ Public Comment Period

There were no public comments at this time.

5. Discuss and Determine Utility of Objectives Ranking Results

Mr. Kubit reviewed the objectives ranking results and noted that the sample size was relatively small, and thus the process requires greater participation. He recommended inviting non-MOU signatories to encourage their continued participation and increase the sample size. He noted that responses from MOU signatories and non-signatories could be separated if desired by the group. The facilitator sought initial reaction to the objectives ranking results from the RWMG.

- Ms. Allen noted that the presentation was good, but recommended creating more consistency in the formatting of the scale, with respect to the capabilities of SurveyMonkey.

The facilitator also sought member feedback on the suggestion of non-signatory participation in the ranking process.

- Mr. Dave Norman noted that the majority of the responses were from federal land agencies; smaller communities and other stakeholder interests were not well represented.
- Mr. Shelton supported opening up participation and saw no reason to separate the results.
- Ms. Allen noted that while some members have been involved all along, others have not had such in depth participation and may not be aware of current issues. She supported separating the responses.
- Mr. Baty recommended adding a comment box at the end of the survey to accommodate narrative comments. He too, was supportive of separating the data.
- Ms. Kerri Vera expressed concern that separating responses skews the analysis and reminded the group that increasing opportunities for participation may generate additional membership in the IRWMP.
- Members generally agreed that giving smaller communities a voice may encourage additional participation.
- The Project Team reminded RWMG members that the objectives ranking results can be presented in a variety of ways, and then the group will determine the best aggregation and utility of the information.

AGREEMENT: Members reached consensus in supporting a wider set of objectives ranking respondents.

6. Revisit and Approve Impacts and Benefits Chapter

Mr. Norman reviewed the Impacts and Benefits chapter memo and discussed comments received during or shortly after the previous meeting. He displayed the subsequent revisions with a primary focus on table 8.1. The facilitator opened discussion on additional key sections of the draft chapter.

Discussion followed:

- Sediment Management:
 - Mr. Shelton noted that while logging still happens north of the applicable area, recreation causes the majority of the sediment impacts. Additionally, he noted hydroelectric facilities as another important source of sediment.
 - Ms. Allen recommended adding a provision for other vegetation management, and incorporating this information in more detail in section 5.7.6 in Resource Management Strategies chapter.

AGREEMENT: Members reached consensus and gave preliminary approval on the draft Impacts and Benefits Chapter with the caveat that members have until COB June 27, 2014 to submit any revisions on section 5.8.

7. Website Update

Mr. Kubit introduced Ms. Niki Woodard, the website consultant. She provided an overview of the website to the members, specifically highlighting completed sections. She reviewed sections that still need revisions, which include:

- Projects:
 - Mr. Kamansky supplied a list of the past, present and future projects to provide content for this page.
- RWMG Resources:
 - Ms. Woodard requested feedback on key RWMG documents, studies in the Southern Sierra, educational materials, and links to other resources.
- Meeting List:
 - Ms. Woodard has created a Google calendar, based on the RWMG workplan, which can be updated with events as desired or necessary. Members have the ability to add RWMG events to their personal calendars via syncing.
- Membership Application:
 - May need to be removed/renamed because no application is currently available.

Ms. Woodard emphasized that the website is designed in a user-friendly format, but also requested feedback on its usability. She also created a project Facebook page.

- **ACTION ITEM: Members and Interested Stakeholders** provide feedback on the website and corresponding Facebook pages by COB June 27, 2014.
- **ACTION ITEM: Ms. Woodard and Project Team** include the new website link on the old SRT website.
- **ACTION ITEM: Provost and Pritchard** provide Ms. Woodard the list of studies and land use documents to be included on the website.

8. Introduce and Discuss Resource Management Strategies Chapter

Mr. Norman discussed the IRWMP Standards that guide development of resource management strategies, including: describe the strategy, discuss applicability, review constraints to implementation, and link climate change impacts to the strategy's efficacy. He reviewed previous revisions made by members. He described the dot system, with black indicating the item is applicable to the region, open indicating it is applicable but not directly so, and blank demonstrating the item is not addressed.

- **ACTION ITEM: Provost and Pritchard** revise the legend to appear on each page, not just the bottom of the table.

He clarified that total irrigated agricultural land in the IRWMP is actually 15,500 acres. He further noted that the number did not include the entire watershed, yet did include pastureland.

- Mr. Shelton highlighted a potential opportunity to include stock ponds as well, but the group noted little regulation, presenting a challenge to obtaining reliable numbers.

Mr. Norman summarized the rest of the chapter and pointed out notes throughout soliciting input from subject-matter experts. He requested particular attention be given to new sections, specifically section 5.8, People and Water.

- **ACTION ITEM: Members and Interested Stakeholders** provide input for revision by COB June 27, 2014.

The facilitator asked for input from members, discussion followed:

- Mr. Shelton asked whether or not the chapter included discussion regarding the connection between healthy forests related to fire protection and water.
 - Mr. Norman noted that this issue is discussed, but could be further developed in the Climate Change chapter.

Mr. Baty asked whether the marijuana section included invasive species eradication. The project team noted that it might be discussed in the Forest Management section.

- The facilitator asked Mr. Norman to provide context to the issues associated with illegal marijuana cultivation in forest ecosystems. The primary impacts include:
 - Heavy application of fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides and other toxic chemicals;
 - Removal of understory vegetation; and
 - Damming of small streams.

AGREEMENT: Members reached consensus and gave preliminary approval on the draft Resource Management Strategies chapter with the caveat that members will have until COB June 27, 2014 to submit any revisions on section 5.8.

9. Introduce and Discuss Data Management Chapter

Mr. Kubit asked the group's viewpoint on the most important data needs in the region, and subsequently incorporated the feedback. He noted that no single entity collects and organizes available data in the region. In general the CC concluded that greater efforts are needed to collect, store and distribute water resources data in the region.

Discussion followed:

- Data Sources:
 - Mr. Shelton recommended local high schools or colleges as a potential data

