

Nevada State Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

12/9/20

Attendees:

STAC Members:

Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR)	Zachary Ormsby, representing Dominique Etchegoyhen
Farm Service Agency (FSA)	Marilyn Jones
Nevada Associated of Conservation Districts (NVACD)	Agee Smith
Nevada Associated of Conservation Districts (NVACD)	Maggie Orr
Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP)	Birgit Widegren
Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW)	Shawn Espinosa
Nevada Land Trust (NLT)	Alicia Reban,
United States Forest Service (USFS)	Kendall Young
United States Forest Service (USFS)	Cheva Gabor
United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	Susan Abele
United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	Cheryl Mandich
United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	William Kutosky

The following members of the STAC Committee had no representative present:

Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Nevada Department of Agriculture, UNR Cooperative Extension Service

Members of the Public in attendance:

Melany Aten, DCNR; Gerry Miller, DCNR; Jake Tibbitts, Eureka Conservation District/State Conservation Commission; Lori Leonard, Nature Conservancy; Kim Rigdon, NDEP; Ethan Mower, Renee Aldrich, (NLT); Kelly Clark (RD); Ethan Mower, Sagebrush Ecosystem Council; Lesley Morris, UNR Cooperative Extension Service

Nevada State Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

12/9/20

April 22, 2020 meeting action items reviewed:

1. **NRCS will reach out to Idaho State Conservationist to see what their program is, and if it can apply in Nevada.**

Ray Dotson: We reached out to Range Riders and determined it was not the case where NRCS was not paying through our EQIP dollars or any other program for Range Riders.

2. **Could we designate a fund pool for emergency type situations?**

Ray: We have a funding cycle we are about to start. We announce programs with a sign-up date, and we go through eligibility and many other processes we are mandated to do. Once we finish that cycle and we award those applicants who've earned them, we are done funding for the year. So if a wildfire or some other disaster happens, we are not in the position to respond to it as though we have created a fund pool called Environmental Readiness which if we were to get funds from national headquarters we could address the financial assistance needed.

3. **Could Nevada complete ecological site descriptions in Elko county the same as how Utah does?**

Ray: I reached out to Cynthia Styles, Soil Survey Regional Director, who said they want to work towards completing this request but due to limited staffing they are currently strapped. When they get back up to their appropriate staff levels, I will bring it back up to her attention.

4. **NRCS will consider the recommendation for low ranking projects that never get funded by realigning fund pools accordingly.**

Ray: Last year when this was brought up, we realigned our fund pools and now each office receives allocations for their area so money can be used to address their local resource concerns.

5. **Will NRCS incorporate into the ranking to allocate higher points to senior water-right holders? Question inquired by Elko Local Work Group.**

Ray: Changes have been made to award higher ranking points to the senior water-right holders.

6. **NRCS made note of the STAC suggestion to make these practices a priority: 449- Irrigation Water Management, 550 Streambank and Shoreline protection and 351- Well Decommissioning as High Priority Practices.**

Ray: These practices are now eligible for a higher increase in funding.

7. **NRCS will follow up with the SETT to explore opportunities for utilizing credit system funds for non-federal match funds.**

Ray: We are unable to legally utilize our programs along with their programs.

Nevada State Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

12/9/20

8. **NRCS will reach out to form subcommittees for future specific conversation. Susan Abele posed the question about the ALE ranking and will be contacted for further discussion.**

Susan Abele: I don't remember being contacted by anyone.

Ray: We will get back with you. **(Action Item)**

STAC Member Presentation: Shared Stewardship

Cheva Gabor: The Shared Stewardship started as a Forest Service Initiative focused on sharing risk and accountability with states in reducing wildfire risk. There is a strategy on-line that describes it in detail. The focus is to work with states and engage them more as leaders and conveyors in reducing wildfire risk and deciding where to work with the Forest Service rather than the Forest Service deciding where projects will happen; wanting to engage and bring in state partners and stakeholders at the beginning rather than afterwards.

Because the catastrophic wildfire season happening in Nevada threatens everything we hold as shared values such as wildlife habitat, grazing allotments, mining facilities, recreation sites and residential communities, we signed an agreement in the fall of 2019 that has four commitments in getting work done on the ground. It prioritizes a couple of landscape projects to complete by the end of 2021. This commitment also includes to increase work on the ground by 50% annually by 2025. The second commitment involves data sharing. The third is to create an executive committee to implement the commitment. The fourth is to work with local groups or to form ones if they don't exist.

The executive committee met in January of 2020 to determine how to get these commitments completed. The state agencies working on behalf of the governor's office are:

Department of Conservation and Natural Resources

Nevada Department of Wildlife

Nevada Department of Agriculture.

In the summer of 2020, these agencies collaboratively identified data sets that prioritized 13 landscapes. So far two projects have been identified in the top two priority areas, Elko Spring Creek Lamoille and Spring Mountains Pahrump. We will create a shared stewardship program of work with the local agencies. This is a funding priority with the Forest Service.

Ray: The State Technical Advisory Committee is to go over local work group questions that have been submitted to us and also to look at local priorities that we are going to try to fund with our programs looking at the local needs at the field level.

STAC Presentation: Local Work Group Discussion – Concerns for STAC Consideration

Winnemucca LWG - Concern for STAC consideration #1: We would like to make NRCS aware of the need to have cost share on jack rail, let down, and pipe rail fence for springs or other sensitive areas.

Jim Gifford: Regarding the jack rail fence, we have a practice specification and drawings for what's called

Nevada State Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

12/9/20

a post and timber fence, practice code 382G. There is financial assistance available for these pole fence components in our costs list. We also have practice specification and drawings for the let-down fence, practice code 382H. The financial assistance is available under a multistrand or marker smooth wire. If the question is geared more towards a higher payment rate, that would require a separate discussion. We do not have specification or drawings on the pipe rail fence so it is not eligible for financial assistance.

Shawn Espinosa: We use the 2-rail, pipe rail fence and have the specifications. It's effective as a maintenance free fence and allows wildlife free movement. We've worked with BLM for several years on these and overall have been really impressed and use frequently.

Ray: There are some things we cost share on and some we need to pursue up to national headquarters to make sure it's technically acceptable and programmatically permissible. We will initiate this process to see if we can get this pipe rail fencing added.

Action item: NRCS will provide a follow-up on where we are at with pipe fencing at the next STAC meeting.

Winnemucca LWG - Concern for STAC consideration #2: Can NRCS help with grasshopper and cricket concerns?

Jim Gifford: No and the quick reason is primarily a production agriculture issue. Production cost associated with normal production activities are prohibited for financial assistance with NRCS. I recommend contacting the Nevada Department of Agriculture.

Melany Aten: Is there any way to use the current IPM practice to treat the rangeland surrounding the field/pasture and incorporate it into an irrigated system, would this qualify? We want to prepare for this kind of year, for instance, in an area north of Winnemucca we ran out of the chemicals and compounds to treat grasshoppers effectively. Many contractors were hired by landowners to treat after the fact and the large scale treatments by the state was challenged so the state could not assist.

Ray: If there is a resource concern on ag land that we can treat and they apply for it and are awarded a contract we will do that. We have been given some applicability in this Farm Bill to treat resource concerns and we look at this in a very simple standpoint. Say if we go from irrigated fields to center pivots, we could anticipate some weeds so we would do pest management because of the logical evolution change with this system. Trying to predict a bad year when crickets are going to come is a little new but we can talk more thoroughly to see how we could assist.

White Pine and Tonopah CDs Concern for STAC consideration #3: Why are we not the South-Central Local Work Group anymore?

Ray: Before last year we had South Central lumped in with a lot of conservation districts and multiple field offices. We were not able to address their local resource concerns the way they needed to be

Nevada State Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

12/9/20

addressed and give those funds first dibs on those local resource concerns. We looked at the area of responsibility that a field office covers and we made that the funding pool. We have a local work group funding pool for Ely, we have one for Las Vegas, we have one for each of the field offices and those districts contained within and they get first dibs on those dollars awarded to them from the state budget. We want to make sure everyone gets a fair shot at funding.

Washoe-Storey CD Concern for STAC consideration #4: We would like to make NRCS aware of the need to have cost share on jack rail, let down, and pipe rail fence for springs or other sensitive areas.

Lakeisha Barber: This question was answered in consideration #1 so we will move on to #5.

Washoe-Storey CD Concern for STAC consideration #5: Are beaver dam analogs currently cost-shared by NRCS?

Jim Gifford: Yes, we can provide financial assistance; it's under conservation practice code # 643 Restoration and Varying Declining Natural Communities. The component is called Beaver Dam analogs post assistance log structures paid by the linear foot. This year it pays about \$29.00 per foot.

Susan Abele: Do you have a sign ups for this and if we evaluate how the payment is based is its linear foot vs by structure.

Lakeisha Barber: We haven't had anyone request this practice yet. Typically, this not used as a separate sign-up, it's a practice we do as part of our work. If this was a practice someone asked us to consider, it would be part of their conservation plan and eventual contract if they were selected for funding. We do not have enough data to answer how it pays by linear foot or structure at this time.

Susan Abele: We are just beginning with this service and have some projects done now but I would be willing to work with someone to evaluate a cost because we don't pay by that standard. It's a great tool and would like to see more people take advantage of this and want to know how the costs compares by structure.

Lakeisha Barber: Thank you Susan and we will have someone follow-up with you. **(action item)**

Elko/Eureka LWG Concern for STAC consideration #6: Going forward, how will NRCS funding be affected by NV State Water Law in areas where the basin has been designated?

Ray: NRCS is required to follow federal, state and local laws. If this is passed, we will attempt to understand what this implementation means, and we will manage our programs to be respectful of the change with our funding. It's hard to speak on specifics when anticipating something at a future point. If this opportunity does happen, we will still help as many producers as possible with the resources we have. We will work with our conservation districts and local partners to understand what the impacts are and how our programs and technical assistance can be available to them.

Nevada State Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

12/9/20

Elko/Eureka LWG Concern for STAC consideration #7: The group asked that NRCS be present and have more involvement in the Local Area Working Groups (LAWG-Sage Grouse groups).

Ray: I'd like to find out if someone from this area could speak on this question so we can better understand on how they see NRCS as present vs how they would like to see it. It sounds like it says NRCS hasn't been present.

Jake Tibbitts: Last year the South Center LAWG Sage Grouse group met and had sent out invitations and nobody from NRCS attended. There were very specific projects identified to the point of adaptive management process under the state sage grouse plan to bring various interests together and discuss how things could be leveraged with the right projects in the right places. Our LWG thinks NRCS participation would be great to discuss their sage grouse programs that producers could sign up for. NRCS's role is very important and we would request that someone from NRCS be present.

Ray: Thank you Jake, we will communicate the importance of this to our staff at the field level and have representation in the future at those meetings. **(action)**

Elko/Eureka LWG Concern for STAC consideration #8: In 2017, the LWG had suggested a question for the ranking that was worth 25 points; was the conservation plan, that supports the schedule of operation, developed in coordination with the local conservation district; the group would like to have this question added to cart.

Ray: We will add it. **(action)**

Lincoln County CD Concern for STAC consideration #9: Could there be the creation of a state-wide funding pool of \$500,000 for producers with five or less resource concerns identified and/or a project cost of \$20,000 maximum?

Ray: I'm going to talk about this and also the next agenda item which is a look back item of what we did from a program standpoint in the state. To give you a better picture go to slide #92 and it will show how we changed the funding around. Relating to the #9 question, we are not in a position to be able to do that. By policy the way our fund codes work we can have a fund pool by geographic area covering any resource concerns; we can have a fund pool for a geographic area covering specific concerns; and we can have fund pools for protected classes of people who have been historically disadvantaged from the federal government. These are all areas where we can set up fund pools to assist people. We do not have the ability to have a fund pool based on a dollar amount.

We cannot target money towards certain dollar amounts but with changing around how we fund in this state. See slide #92 and going from the south-central fund pool to showing Las Vegas having over \$692,000 worth of contracts last year and the year before they had \$0. Another office that really stepped up and did a great job was Fallon with \$1.5 million dollars. Elko has always been a standard in the state for the amount of conservation that they do but changing around those programs to push

Nevada State Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

12/9/20

those dollars down to address those couple of issues and ensure that we don't have people in the field offices applying for programs and not getting funded those changes are represented there and you see where those dollars are going and how they are addressing the local needs. This does not include the rest of the fund pool we have in this state.

We also have AMA that deals with seasonal high tunnels and things of that nature. We can't get to everybody, but we are now positioned where there is equity for everybody to have an opportunity at funding.

Maggie Orr: I appreciate you addressing the concerns and hope to see the smaller projects get done.

Local Work Group Discussion: FY21 Priority Resource Concerns

Yerington Local Work Group FY 21 Priority Resource Concerns:

1. Water quantity –Irrigation Water efficiency
2. Water quality –Sediment in surface water and flooding
3. Plants –Wildfire Hazard
4. Soil Erosion –Streambanks
5. Plants -Noxious Weeds

Winnemucca Local Work Group FY 21 Priority Resource Concerns

1. Degraded Plant Condition
2. Water Quality
3. Energy
4. Water Quantity

Ray: Can anyone tell me why are we not seeing more people taking interest in EQIP and the funding associated with pest management? How can we get people interested in these programs?

Melany Aten: Working with producers who decided not to enroll with NRCS and who went through a local funding instead, they found the IPM requirements with weed treatment scheduled was not effective for them along with the rigorous planning and the cost ratio was the issue.

Ray: If the need is being met through another partner, that is what's most important. If there are things we can do to avail those opportunities through NRCS I want to make that happen.

Ely Local Work Group FY21 Priority Resource Concern

Lakeisha Barber: The Tonopah and White Pine Conservation Districts have their concerns listed separately.

Minden Local Work Group FY21 Priority Resource

Nevada State Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

12/9/20

Lakeisha: The Washoe-Storey, Vya and Carson Valley Conservation Districts have their resource concerns listed separately.

Elko Local Work Group FY 21 Priority Resource Concerns

Lakeisha: The Elko LWG has their priority resource concerns listed.

Common Priority Resource Concerns Across LWGs

Lakeisha: This is a summarized list of the top priority resource concerns across all the local work groups:

- **Water Quantity**
 - Irrigation water inefficiency
 - Livestock water
- **Water Quality**
 - sediment
 - pathogens
- **Plants**
 - noxious weeds/pests
 - wildfire hazard
- **Soil Health**
- **Energy**

Lakeisha: This concludes my presentation on the local work group concerns brought before the STAC for consideration.

Ray: Is there any more dialogue or feedback from the STAC? Are there any questions or concerns or local work group priorities that somehow got missed?

Susan Abele: Is streambank erosion imbedded to water quality concern or are they separate?

Ray Dotson: Yes, it will always be by the identified resource concern and then we will anchor off that and look at potential practices to address it.

I want to take this time to acknowledge the field staff and state level staff with the work they did last year. Our field staff really stepped up and gave us a banner year with an increase of \$1.5 million dollars over what we've done in past years. I really want to say thank you to everybody and include the conservation districts and to our partners.

Working Lands for Wildlife (WLFW) Update

Jim Gifford: NRCS has drafted a new five-year strategy plan. WLFW is not a farm bill program like our

Nevada State Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

12/9/20

EQIP of CSP programs. It's really a strategy method like a business plan that prioritizes and targets NRCS funding. The purpose of the WLFW strategy is to develop a spatially explicit and state-based business plan that will guide us in how we will spend the funding. For example, we are trying to estimate how many acres for juniper control we can complete over the next 5 years and estimate how many program dollars to accomplish this work.

I'd like to thank our new state wildlife biologist, Tony Bush, who put together this presentation. Tony is the lead for WLFW in Nevada.

We begin on slide #20 with our introduction on what I'll be covering:

- States are creating new 5-year strategic plans for FY 21-25
- Two WLFW initiatives located in NV
- 4 Primary threats to address
- Partner input and collaboration
- NRCS NV estimated accomplishments/goals
- Next Steps

Slide #21 shows the change in focus from the 2010-2015 version to 2021 with species specific to larger biome/rangelands focus. On the old map, the area we covered under the initiative was a lot smaller than the new map where we're basically moving from covering about 33% of rangelands to about 90% of rangelands in the West. The Sage Grouse Initiative boundary is not going to change.

There are current efforts to re-envision the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (SWFL) initiative. This initiative will move to a much wider and inclusive boundary considering more of a desert riparian habitat focus, rather than a species-specific approach.

There are 4 major threats to be targeted in the new WLFW FY 2021-25 strategy:

1. Conifer Encroachment
2. Invasive Annual Grasses
3. Riparian and Wet Meadow Degradation
4. Conservation Easements / Land Use Conversion

For conifer encroachment, we've had massive increase in pinyon juniper across the state in the past 35 years. The maps on slide #24 are from the University of Montana and show a rangeland analysis platform. Much work is already being done and more can be accomplished with collaboration.

Invasive Annuals have similar issues as with the conifer encroachment; however, they are exponentially harder to treat, especially once heavily established.

Riparian and Wet Meadow Degradation is of extreme importance for hundreds of wildlife species that depend on these sites for at least a portion of their lifecycles. The two pie charts on slide #26 show the overall ownership of rangeland. Private landowners hold the key to addressing this resource concern.

Conservation Easements / Land Use Conversion is a goal to keep as much of our rangelands open, connected, and healthy as possible.

Nevada State Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

12/9/20

NRCS is moving towards a proactive spatial strategy, so rather than providing reactive/emergency care that is more expensive and has low success, we focus on being proactive and work on preventative care which is inexpensive and has high success. Our strategic targeting of funds and efforts will be focused on the intact core illustrated on slide #28.

We have had several meetings with partners and they have reviewed our draft WLFW strategy. Partner input and collaboration addresses these conservation issues across the landscape that cannot be accomplished by one agency, entity, or individual. Working together towards common goals across a landscape provides the possibility of treating much larger areas. We are beginning to identify the core transition areas needed and are collaborating with the interested parties. Partner input ranged from general to project specific. We found the 4 WLFW priority threats aligned well with the priorities of other agencies.

NRCS Nevada estimated goals for FY21 – FY25 WLFW are seen on slide #31.

The Woodland Expansion chart is conifer control and shows an estimate of just over 13,000 acres and needing almost \$3M in funding. The Annual Grass Invasion chart shows an estimate of 12,000 acres and probably \$3M dollars in funding. The Riparian and Wet Meadow Degradation shows an estimate of 2600 acres, or 171 miles, and about \$600K in funding. Conservation Easements we are estimating 2600 acres and approximately \$3M to fund.

Next Steps: These 4 conservation action goals will be rolled up into a regional strategy that will help inform the level of funding needed from the Farm Bill each fiscal year to accomplish proposed projects. We will publish Nevada's WLFW 5-Year Strategy and look for local collaboration between NRCS field offices, conservation districts, federal and state agencies, and most importantly willing private landowners and permittees to get conservation work accomplished on the ground and plan future projects.

Are there any questions?

Agee Smith: Just an idea for what could be an important management tool for rangelands, and especially for the mesic meadows that are getting so degraded, goes back to cattle management and herding. Maybe there are ways to partner on these issues because most operators will say they cannot hire an extra person to manage their herds. We are currently working with companies in putting collars on the cattle for making virtual fences. It would be nice if NRCS could assist with funding some of these collars for cattle.

Jim Gifford: Thank you Agee, we will look further into these collars to see what potentials they have.

(action)

Conservation Practice Standards Update

Nevada State Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

12/9/20

Jose Rosado: I'm the state conservation engineer. Slide #35 provides an overview of our conservation practice standards that provide us the guidelines for planning, designing installing for operating and maintaining our conservation practices.

Typically, as our policy dictates, national reviews and updates them about every 5 years to make sure we stay up to date on standards and technology. However, in 2018, the Farm Bill required NRCS to review all 169 of our conservation practices in an effort for us to seek opportunities to increase the flexibility of our standards and incorporate new technology. So far 58 of the 169 practice standards have been through the first stage of the process where the National office has their specialists look at these standards for updates and then they will go through public review and comment. So far, 58 have made it through that process so there's a lot more to be done but this was the first batch and I wanted to talk a little bit about it. These updated standards include changes in technology and add criteria to address emerging concerns such as soil health, water conservation, drought tolerance and resiliency.

National Handbook of Conservation Practices (NHCP) is where our practice standards are kept and whenever a practice standard is updated, we will receive what's called a Notice. The latest notices we've received is 170 and 171 and in these two notices they have notified states of the 58 conservation practices updated. These notices let us know what the key changes are in the standards and it also provides a deadline of when to adopt them. Typically, we get about a year to take those national updates and incorporate them. However, because there are more updates than usual, we were given two years. We have until September 30, 2022 to update these new standards.

The next 3 slides, #37, #38 and #39 all have lists of all 58 updated standards. To give you an idea of what we're looking at, there are items like irrigation pipeline, land clearing, obstruction removal, terraces, and water facilities. So, they're updating these standards at the national level so they're updating for the whole nation but there's certain practices that might not apply to Nevada specifically. So, we review each update to determine which ones are the most important to Nevada and we will provide those updates to the state and local levels.

Nevada's Approach to Updates

Jim Gifford: This is an opportunity for us to make further changes to the practice standards. The process for updating Nevada's practice standards is done by the FOTG Committee. Our priorities are:

- Practices designated as high priority practices
 - Herbaceous Weed Treatment
 - Heavy Use Area Protection
 - Pest Management Conservation System
- Practices with the highest instances of implementation
 - Irrigation Water Management
 - Forage Harvest Management
 - Irrigation Pipeline
 - Watering Facility

Nevada State Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

12/9/20

- Pumping Plant
- Pasture and Hay Planting
- Livestock Pipeline

For the rarely utilized practices we will simply adopt the nationally updated standard. Is there interest in forming a STAC subcommittee to assist NRCS to review further modification of conservation practice standards.

Ray: Why this matters to you, and also to the different producers around the state, is if there are different things preventing further adoption, or addressing a resource concern, here's an opportunity to make sure those issues are addressed to the best extent possible.

Agee Smith: I would be interested in participating in this subcommittee.

Ray Dotson: Thank you Agee for interest; we need more people to commit. Ray will contact people one-on-one to ask for commitments. (*action*)

Watershed Rehabilitation Program Overview

Jose Rosado: NRCS started off building dams back in the 50s, 60s and 70s. There are 3 different programs under our watershed program:

1. Watershed Rehabilitation
2. Emergency Watershed Protection
3. Watershed and Flood Prevention Operation

The watershed rehabilitation program overview offers financial and technical assistance to rehabilitate dams constructed through NRCS Watershed Programs. This program extends the service life of dams to meet applicable safety and performance standards or decommission the dams so they no longer pose a threat to life and property. Those dams that were built back in the 50s, 60s and 70s are coming up on their design life. Most of them were built to protect agriculture land downstream so many are low hazard dams however some land has changed over to commercial or residential so these dams are protecting millions of dollars and hundreds or thousands of people downstream. It's very important for NRCS, and the sponsors, to keep these dams updated to current standards. Note: This watershed programs are only applicable to the dams built by NRCS with watershed funds.

Structures Potentially Eligible in Nevada

- Peavine Mountain Watershed, Sponsor: City of Reno
 - West Wash Dam
 - East Wash Diversion Dam
 - Upper Peavine Creek Dam
 - Lower Peavine Creek Dam
- Elko Watershed, Sponsor: City of Elko

Nevada State Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

12/9/20

- Eight Mile Creek Dam
- Fifth Street Wash Dam
- South Side Wash Dam

Slide #49 shows a map of USDA-NRCS dams in the Peavine Mountain Watershed dams. These dams are in the northwest part of Reno between McCarran and I-80. These dams are protecting a lot of property downstream.

Slides #50 and #51 provide pictures of what some of the dams look like. These aren't stereotypical type dams, so I wanted to provide you pictures of what they look like. Most of the NRCS dams built were soil dams or earth and embankment dams that were built for flood protection. Slide #52 shows a map of the 3 Elko watershed dams and slides #53 and #54 have pictures of these dams.

The people who become eligible are the people who already have dams and we do a preliminary investigation. On slide #55 the West Wash Dam rehabilitation project is currently a funded project. We have about \$3M funded for this project and that includes up to 2 years of planning, 12 months for design and 18 months for construction. This project kickoff meeting was a couple weeks ago so it was the very early stages and has a 5-6 year timeline.

We haven't done preliminary investigations on the Elko dams. We are trying to get a hold of the City of Elko and talk to them about the potential for us to at least investigate those dams so we can see if they need repair or update. If you look at the pictures, they could potentially have some impact downstream if they aren't up to date.

Are there any questions or comments on our Water Rehabilitation program?

Gerry Miller: I will send Paulette some information of who you can get a hold of in Elko and some great pictures of those dams filled to the brim in 2017. **(action)**

Jose Rosado: That would be great Gerry, thank you. We've sent letters to the City of Elko but have yet to hear back.

Emergency Watershed Program (EWP)

Jose Rosado: We don't have any EWP projects but that's a good thing because that normally involves some sort of natural disaster. The EWP Program safeguards lives and property from floods, drought, and the products of erosion on any watershed whenever fire, flood or any other natural occurrence is causing or has caused a sudden impairment of the watershed. On slide #56 I included a little table that shows the cost share and very important to sponsors. NRCS will pay 100% for technical assistance and then typically pay up to 75% of the construction. There are certain limited resource areas that they're called that are designated by National and you can get up to 90% cost to share for construction. Typically, with our programs we don't cover any easements or acquiring land rights permitting so those are a cost for the sponsor.

Who is eligible to apply for EWP Eligibility:

Nevada State Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

12/9/20

- Public and private landowners are eligible for assistance but must be represented by a project sponsor
- Sponsors include legal subdivisions of the state, such as a city, county, general improvement district, conservation district, or any Native American tribe or tribal organization as defined in section 4 of the Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act.

Type of Work Authorized:

EWP is designed for installation of recovery measures to safeguard life and property as a result of a natural disaster. These include, but are not limited to:

- debris-clogged waterways,
- unstable streambanks,
- severe erosion jeopardizing public infrastructure
- wind-borne debris removal, and
- damaged upland sites stripped of protective vegetation

Are there any questions on EWP?

Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations (slide #59)

Program Overview - The WFPO Program provides technical and financial assistance to entities of state and local governments and Tribes (project sponsors) for planning and installing watershed projects. This is the historical funding:

Fiscal Year	Program Funding
2000	\$99 M
2001	\$99 M
2002	\$106 M
2003	\$109 M
2004	\$86 M
2005	\$74 M
2006	\$75 M
2007	\$0 M
2008	\$29 M
2009	\$24 M
(ARRA) 2009	\$145 M
2010	\$30 M
2017	\$150 M
2018	\$150M
2019	\$200 M*
Total	\$1,376 M

Includes \$50M of Mandatory funding in the Farmbill

General Purposes

- Preventing damage from erosion, floodwater, and sediment
- Furthering the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water

Nevada State Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

12/9/20

- Furthering the conservation and proper utilization of land

Authorized Project Purposes

- Flood Prevention (Flood Damage Reduction)
- Watershed Protection
- Public Recreation
- Public Fish and Wildlife
- Agricultural Water Management
- Municipal and Industrial Water Supply
- Water Quality Management

These are important because they not only dictate the benefit but also the cost share. Slide #61 provides a table cost share by authorized project purposes. For most purposes NRCS will cost share 100% of the technical assistance which includes the planning and design. The construction depends of the project.

Criteria/Limitations

- Needs to have public sponsorship; not everyone can be a public sponsor.
- Max watershed or sub watershed cannot exceed 250,000 acres (for Flood Prevention purpose)
- Structures cannot provide more than 12,500 acre-feet of flood water detention capacity or more than 25,000 acre-feet of total capacity
- Must have 20% agricultural benefit

WFPO Program Process

- Eligible sponsor interest
- Preliminary Investigation Report
 - 6 months to 1 year
- Watershed Project Plan and Environmental Analysis (NEPA process)
 - 18 months to 2 years for Environmental Assessment
 - 2 years to 4 years for Environmental Impact Statement
- Design – *timelines depends on the different alternatives*
- Construction – *timelines depends the different alternative*

Current Nevada WFPO Projects

Slide #64 has a map showing we have 2 in Washoe County, 1 in Humboldt, 1 in Pershing and 1 in Lyon County.

Walker River Watershed Project, Sponsor: Walker River Irrigation District, Location: Yerington, NV

Description: Reduce and mitigate sediment deposition in key areas which has resulted in a myriad of problems including inconsistent delivery of irrigation water, an increase in flooding, increased operation and maintenance cost, poor water quality, declining riparian and upland habitats, and decreasing

Nevada State Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

12/9/20

vegetative diversity. Project funded for planning.

Planning	Design	Construction
\$338,247	\$837,500	\$14,237,500

Truckee River Watershed Project, Sponsor: Washoe County Water Conservation District and Steamboat Irrigation Canal Company, Location: Reno, NV

Description: Increase agricultural water management, stormwater management, public recreation, fish & wildlife, and water quality while providing flood protection and public safety to local communities and residents. Project funded for planning.

Planning	Design	Construction
\$935,000	\$1,921,126	\$18,415,726

Quinn River Watershed Project, Sponsor: Ft. McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe; Location: Ft. McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Indian Reservation

Description: Reduce flood damages and increase water supply availability for irrigation. Project funded for planning.

Planning	Design	Construction
\$825,000	\$825,000	\$3,550,000

Lower Humboldt River Watershed Project, Sponsor: Pershing County Water Conservation District
Location: Lovelock, NV

Description: The purpose and need for the proposed project is to reduce the risk of failure of the irrigation diversion reservoirs, create downstream capacity to handle floodwater in existing irrigation facilities, reduce the flooding severity during high run-off events, and reduce the large water losses within the canal (393 acre-feet annually). Project funded for planning.

Planning	Design	Construction
\$837,500	\$1,764,664	\$18,699,638

Nevada State Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

12/9/20

Peavine Creek –Truckee River Watershed Project, Sponsor: Washoe County Water Conservation District and Orr Ditch and Extensions Water Company, Location: Sparks, NV

Description: Project purpose and need is to increase agricultural water management, stormwater management, public recreation, fish & wildlife, and water quality within the Peavine Creek-Truckee River Watershed, while providing flood protection and public safety to local communities and residents.

PIR	Planning	Design	Construction
\$50,000	\$947,500	\$1,872,204	\$17,146,944

Project funded for a Preliminary Investigation Report.

Total Current and Future Potential Funding For All Projects

PIR	Planning	Design	Construction
\$50,000	\$3,883,247	\$7,220,494	\$72,049,808

Birgit Widegren: – NDEP worked with many stakeholders to develop a source water and watershed management plan for the Truckee River in Washoe County. I am definitely interested in finding out more about the 2 Truckee watershed projects to see if we might be able to coordinate further. If you're interested in looking at our planning process it can be found on-line at washoecountycleanwater.org.

Jose Rosado: Hopefully Birgit you have received a cooperating agency letter on the Truckee River watershed project sent out by NDEP. If not, I will try to find out the contact and get back to you.

Birgit Widegren: Yes, I believe we did receive the letter to Greg Lovato but we haven't responded yet.

Susan Abele: If projects are to be implemented on areas with private lands is there an AGI limitation for the private landowner and do the rules apply in this context? Also, a related question, is the federal managed lands included in the planning and hopefully potential construction?

Jose: I don't believe the AGI applies because we're looking at a watershed scale and we are looking at the different things that can be done to address a concern. Some sponsors have very specific things in mind so we definitely always look at the big picture. It is up to the sponsor to work with the private landowners, or even other interested agencies, to see if there's a way for them to operate with them.

In answer to your 2nd question, if a watershed was on federal land, we would try to include those agencies or even the stakeholders. Typically, anybody that might have some expertise, or some permitting responsibility over the project, would be great. Stakeholders normally want to see the big picture but we haven't done that here. I would need to look more into how it works with federal land but I believe there are ways for us to collaborate.

Are there any other questions?

Nevada State Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

12/9/20

Ray: Thank you Jose. Hopefully everybody is learning and was introduced to a new part of the agency. There's a lot of dollars and a lot of resources and a lot of people who may not be in the ag community who will benefit from these new programs. I appreciate other agencies taking interest to participate. We have some new initiatives to talk about so I will turn it over to Jim and Kim.

Source Water Protection (SWP) Areas

Jim Gifford: We want to let the committee know the progress we've made on this Source Water Protection as far as the location and the funding. You might remember from the April STAC meeting where Karri Honaker discussed this program. We also have Kim Rigdon with the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Safe Drinking Water, on this call and you will be hearing from both of us.

Starting with slide #73, the 2018 Farm Bill included specific provisions to protect sources of drinking water by identifying practices that have a significant water quality or water quantity benefit and implementing those practices where source waters can be protected or improved. States, with input from community water systems and the State technical committee, will—

1. Identify local priority areas for the protection of source waters for drinking water.
2. Identify practices that address water quality and water quantity concerns, and that will target identified threats to community water systems; and
3. Within the identified priority areas, offer producers increased incentives and higher payment rates.

At the national level, NRCS is working in collaboration with:

- EPA Office of Groundwater and Drinking Water –Source Water Protection
- Association of State Drinking Water Administrators (ASDWA) –professional Association serving state drinking water programs.
- American Water Works Association (AWWA) –national association of public water supply utilities.

At the local level, NRCS working in collaboration with:

- Nevada Division of Environmental Protection -Water Quality Planning Bureau and the Safe Drinking Water Bureau
- Source Water Protection Taskforce –multi agency
- Carson Water Subconservancy District
- Carson Valley Conservation District
- Local Source Water Protection Stakeholder Groups

Kim Rigdon: What's interesting is, with NRCS the focus is both water quantity and water quality and our state program is mainly focused on water quality. So, this is an interesting new venture for us as a partnership and how we will bring all this together. As a result, I have put together a SWP task force that is a multi-agency group with leadership from the Nevada Department of Transportation storm water group, Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, Nevada Division of Water Resources, local

Nevada State Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

12/9/20

technical assistant providers and NRCS. We wanted to bring together this task force to coordinate and collaborate a bit more closely to better understand our Source Water protection goals and help achieve those goals. The Carson Water Subconservancy District is important because they are one of the primary watershed protection groups in the Douglas County area. The Carson Valley is going to be our focused area in this partnership. We would like to bring in the Carson Valley Conservation District and the local source water protection stakeholder group. The local source water stakeholder group is the public water systems, the Public Works Department and the Regional Planning Department that are all participating agencies in the local wellhead protection plan.

Slide #76 shows the 4 selected watersheds.

Jim Gifford: We worked closely with NDEP for the best places to do this initiative and in the next few slides you will see why these places were chosen. The Carson Valley has a combination of having a population that requires several public water drinking wells and it has a significant number of ag producers we can work with.

Kim Rigdon: The 4 watersheds that were selected are:

1. Brockliss Slough
2. Lower West Fork Carson River
3. Town of Gardnerville-East Fork Carson River
4. Town of Genoa-Carson River

Douglas County Wellhead Protection

On slide #77, you'll see a map of the Carson Valley with an overlay showing yellow and orange areas. Those areas are the communities' source water protection areas. What we wanted to demonstrate in these 4 watersheds is that in 2012 (the 3 years prior) we had worked with Douglas County and all the public water systems and developed their community wellhead protection plan. This plan includes 5 elements:

1. Description of source water protection goals
2. Delineation of wellhead protection areas
3. Identification of potential threats to source water
4. An action plan for implementation
5. A public education plan for community members

These programs are voluntary and completed by local grass roots stakeholder groups. We go into a community and give them the framework for what a plan is meant to accomplish, but we really tailor these plans to meet the characteristics of the community. The Douglas County stakeholder group identified 3 things important to them:

- Economic development
- Success of business
- Maintaining agriculture

Nevada State Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

12/9/20

With these 3 primary goals in mind, they have identified their Source Water Protection goals as being an enhancement to protecting their resources in balance with those 3 areas of operations. The figure shows where we can begin to look at project overlap. So, where NRCS is incentivizing these practices, we can look at how it will impact protecting drinking water supplies.

Carson River Watershed Adaptive Stewardship Plan

This plan was prepared by the Carson River Subconservancy District and it focuses on managing the Carson River Watershed. It looks at the overall watershed health, water quality, and meeting total daily maximum loads which ties directly in with agricultural water quality concerns in the area. The plan outlines the agriculture activities and the potential impacts of those activities to both surface water and groundwater. I believe The Carson River Watershed Adaptive Stewardship Plan and the community's wellhead protection plan, were the primary sources used by NRCS to determine what priority practices NRCS could use for their SWP funding.

Jim Gifford: This plan lays out some of those things that most of us know about potential water quality problems. If you look at the table on slide #78 it identifies the agricultural water quality concerns for the Carson River watershed.

- Phosphorus & Excess Nutrients
- Grazing & Loss of Riparian Vegetation
- Dairies
- Diversions & Irrigation
- Sedimentation & Soil Erosion
- Noxious Weeds & Pesticides

Slide #79 shows the practices we chose to receive higher level funding in these watersheds:

- Cover Crop
- Irrigation Ditch Lining
- Irrigation Water Management
- Irrigation Land Leveling
- Prescribed Grazing
- Structure for Water Control
- Nutrient Management
- Pest Management Conservation System
- Watering Facility

There is a mixture of irrigation practices that you would consider for water quality. Nutrient management which is one of the biggest practices needed in these watershed projects. Watering facilities would provide offsite water for cattle so they don't need to go to the river/slew for their water source.

Practice incentives

- These practices can receive increased payment rates up to 90% of the practice cost whereas most of our typical payment rates are calculated at a 75% rate.

Nevada State Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

12/9/20

- Higher payment rates are ONLY applicable within the selected watersheds
- Practices should address both water quality and water quantity, as appropriate
- NRCS Nevada dedicated 10% of FY2021 EQIP funds to Source Water Protection conservation practices

These are all voluntary programs for our producers whether working with NRCS or NDEP.

Are there any questions?

Birgit Widegren: The Bureau of Water Quality Planning in my agency has recently prioritized these watersheds and we're looking at water planning through the Clean Water Act and surface water improvements too. Similar to what I coordinated with the Washoe County Truckee River, we are looking at combining source water and watershed protection for surface waters in our planning efforts through the task force that Kim mentioned. We are certainly interested in the new SWP initiative and the National Water Quality Initiative.

Jim: We look forward to meeting and coordinating with you.

Ray: Next up is Angela Mushrush, District Conservationist in our Yerington Field Office with one of our partners from the local CD.

Water Smart Initiative for Plymouth Canal; Yerington Local Work Group

Angela Mushrush: The Smart Water Initiative is a collaborative effort between NRCS and the Bureau of Reclamation (BoR). We work together on the local entities and improving old infrastructure. The BoR had 8 grants in Nevada over a 10-year period, 2010 – 2020. Three of those grants were in the Yerington office so we looked at where we had location and some interest, and we put in a proposal for the entire Plymouth canal. The project BoR had was for the lower Plymouth pipeline which was to go from dirt lined ditch to Pike. NRCS received \$600K for the proposal and that targeted directly to the Plymouth Canal. On December 5th a National NRCS bulletin came out that dedicated \$13M in Environmental Quality Incentive Program (EQIP) funding for the Water Smart Initiative and we got a little piece of that money. On slide #86 it shows Smith Valley and the Plymouth canal which kind of intersects or goes through the center of this valley.

- It's about 10 miles long
- Runs through most of Smith Valley
- Feeds 5 primary ditches and multiple secondary ditches.
- Majority of the ditches are dirt-lined
- Agriculture uses include alfalfa, grass, grain and livestock
- The main uses are crop and pasture

On slide #87 there is a table that shows the priority resource concerns we looked at which were:

- Inefficient use of irrigation water
- Sediment in surface water

Nevada State Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

12/9/20

- plant productivity

All of these align with the Yerington local workgroup priorities. The practices that go along with these priorities are:

- Irrigation Pipeline
- Irrigation Sprinkler
- Structure for Water Control
- Irrigation System Micro-irrigation
- Pumping Plants
- Irrigation Water Management (high priority practice)

We have a fact sheet that describes the program along with all this information.

Does anyone have any questions or comments?

Steve Fulstone: Hi Angela, I'm the Vice President of the Plymouth Ditch Company and want to add what you've been doing with the Smart Initiative has been terrific for our canal. We've put about 4000 feet of pipe in last year and a couple more thousand feet in previous years. We are looking to put a couple more projects in for conserving water both quantity and quality.

Angela: Great, thank you Steve.

Ray: I think it's important to note so everybody is on the same page, the \$600K that went to Water Smart is extra money coming into the state. When it comes to Source Water, through the Farm Bill, there was a change that requires up to 10% of the state's budget to go towards those elective watersheds for funding. This equates to about \$800K for those watersheds and the difference is those dollars come from the state's allocation. Because it's coming from the state's allocation there is going to be less money to go to the local work groups than we had last year. This will cut their funding almost in half. We always follow the mandates we are given by National Headquarters (NHQ) however, there is also a rhyme and reason why we do things. Congress appropriates money, we get it along with rules from the Farm Bill and we implement it to address the local needs. Those dollars that are going to go to Source Water will be available for producers to access. If they don't access those dollars, the money will be removed from that fund pool and will be distributed around the other fund pools to address local needs. Just to make clear, we are required to put the funding in the priority practices mandated by NHQ.

If there are there no questions or comments we will move forward on the agenda?

Program Updates - Water Management Entities (WME)

Paulette Balliette: This is something new to NRCS in the 2018 Farm Bill allowing Water Management Entities to apply for funding for EQIP. Starting on slide #94 it provides a definition for eligibility:

Nevada State Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

12/9/20

- A Water Management Entity is a state irrigation district, ground water management district, acequia, or similar entity that has jurisdiction or responsibilities related to water delivery or management to eligible lands. Eligibility for EQIP includes:
 - Private or public companies that serve a public purpose such as a public utility; and whose
 - Purpose is to assist private agricultural producers with managing water distribution systems.
 - Cost –if the estimated contract cost for the minimum area required for the EQIP contract greatly exceeds the EQIP payment limitation for water conservation projects, then NRCS may inform the applicant that the projects are better suited for implementation under the RCPP “Watershed Projects.”
 - The FAPD division director may approve an AGI and payment limitation waiver for eligible projects with water management entities. Approved payment limitation waivers may not exceed an aggregate payment limit of \$900,000 to the water management entity or any individual member thereof, for all contracts entered into under the water conservation project authority during the 2018 Farm Bill period.

Note: The payment limitation associated with water management entities and members thereof is separate and not attributed to the \$450,000 general EQIP payment limitation.

Are there any questions on the Water Management Entities?

Ray: I made the decision to put \$1.8M into the Water Management Entities fund pool for Water Management Entities who may be interested. We’ve had a lot of interest in the past and if the money doesn’t become a contract, the money goes to the local fund pools. This is a great opportunity to make a greater impact on water quantities with the different entities and that’s why we’re are doing this.

Geographical Area Rate Caps (aka GARC Rates)

Paulette Balliette: For Water Management Entities we do have Geographical Area Rate Caps for Wetland Reserve Easements. On slide #97 the rates are divided by different areas. We’ve increased the funding by 2% every year to try to fall in line with the increase in prices. There is a high and low range and it also has a “Not to Exceed” category. There are different rate caps for Reserve Grazing Rights and Tribal areas. Slide #98 provides an aerial map of where these GARC easements are in the state.

Are there any questions or comments?

Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP)

The RCPP program first rolled out in 2014 and it was replacing a couple of repealed programs, the Area Water Enhancement Program (AWEP) and the Cooperative Conservation Partnership Initiative (CCPI). NRCS is trying to leverage our funding with various partners to get more conservation practices on a larger scale such as watersheds and regional natural resource concerns. It targets innovative solutions to conservation challenges and provides measurable improvements and outcomes.

Nevada State Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

12/9/20

The RCPP used to be funded through other programs such as EQIP, CSP or easements but now it's a stand-alone program. It still incorporates parts of those programs. It's now funded with \$300M annually and ranges from \$250K up to \$10M per project. These updates include an Alternative Funding Arrangement (AFA) provision: NRCS may award up to 15 AFA projects, which are more grant-like and rely more on partner capacity to implement conservation activities.

Another change is 3 funding pools were reduced to 2; the national pool was eliminated and partners must apply to either the Critical Conservation Area (CCA) or State/Multistate funding pool.

The RCPP critical conservation areas are shown on a national map on slide #102 and Nevada has 2 of them:

1. Western Waters up in the northwest part of the state
2. Colorado River Basin in the southeast part of the state

These are critical conservation areas and each have their own priorities that need to be targeted. Slide #103 lists the **Lead Partner entities** that must qualify as one of the following:

- An agricultural or silvicultural producer association or other group of producers.
- A state or unit of local government.
- An Indian Tribe.
- A farmer cooperative.
- A water district, irrigation district, acequia, rural water district or association, or other organization with specific water delivery authority to agricultural producers.
- A municipal water or wastewater treatment entity.
- An institution of higher education.
- An organization or entity with an established history of working cooperatively with producers on agricultural land, as determined by NRCS,
 - Local conservation priorities related to agricultural production, wildlife habitat development, or nonindustrial private forest land management; or
 - Critical watershed-scale soil erosion, water quality, sediment reduction, or other natural resource issues.
- An entity, such as an Indian Tribe, state government, local government, or a nongovernmental organization that has a farmland or grassland protection program that purchases agricultural land easements, as defined in 7 CFR Section 1468.3.
- A conservation district.

RCPP Project Funding is divided into two categories

1. Financial Assistance (FA) and
2. Technical Assistance (TA)

Each RCPP PPA (programmatic partnership agreement) will receive a commitment of funding as follows:

Nevada State Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

12/9/20

- At least 70 percent FA—These funds are held by NRCS and provided directly to producers/eligible entities to implement eligible RCPP activities.
- Up to 30 percent TA—These funds may be retained by NRCS or split between NRCS and partners to support implementation (e.g., conservation planning, practice design, easement survey, and appraisal and closing expenses) of the RCPP project.

National comes out with an announcement once a year for both classic RCPP and AFA. It usually comes out in the late spring or summer. We just closed one in 2021 so the next round of funding will be in 2022. The state review process is:

1. When proposals come in: we screen them for eligibility.
2. Next, we put together a review team involving staff in engineering, resources, or programs, depending on the project proposals and individually review the proposals.
3. The team then meets to discuss the individual reviews.
4. The team provides feedback to our State Conservationist (STC) and determinations are made for the final selection.
5. The review team then submits the consolidated feedback to the national RCPP team.

There is 1 feedback form per project. The lead state is responsible for getting feedback from partner states. This includes:

- Lead State Rank
- Strengths/Weaknesses per “core pillar”
- Scores for each pillar
- Lead State feedback on contributions
- Lead State feedback on partners
- Overall Strengths/Weaknesses from each partner state

Successful RCPP Projects Embody the Following Core Principles:

- **Impact**—RCPP applications must propose effective and compelling solutions that address one or more natural resource priorities to help solve natural resource challenges. Partners are responsible for evaluating a project’s impact and results.
- **Partner Contributions**—Partners are responsible for identifying any combination of cash and in-kind value-added contributions to leverage NRCS’s RCPP investments. It is NRCS’s goal that partner contributions at least equal the NRCS investment in an RCPP project. Substantive partner contributions are given priority consideration as part of the RCPP application evaluation criteria.
- **Innovation**—NRCS seeks projects that integrate multiple conservation approaches, implement innovative conservation approaches or technologies, build new partnerships, and effectively take advantage of program flexibilities to deliver conservation solutions.
- **Partnerships and Management**—Partners must have experience, expertise, and capacity to manage the partnership and project, provide outreach to producers, and quantify the environmental outcomes of an RCPP project. RCPP ranking criteria give preference to applicants that meaningfully engage historically underserved farmers and ranchers.

Nevada State Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

12/9/20

State Proposal Feedback Expectations

- Determine if partners, targeted land, and proposed conservation activities are eligible
- Does the proposal explain why RCPP is the best fit or only way to achieve the desired conservation outcomes?
- Is the project innovative?
- Does the lead partner demonstrate experience, capability, capacity to manage the project?

State Proposal Feedback Expectations

- Are the partner contributions value-added?
- Does the partner document firm commitments for the contributions?
- Is the timeline realistic, does it give the lead partner time to measure and report on environmental outcomes?
- Does the proposal demonstrate an understanding for how it will measure environmental outcomes?
- Can the partner deliver on the proposed partner technical assistance?

For more information on RCPP, visit the NRCS website at: <https://bit.ly/36lzwfz> or for funding announcements you can also go to www.grants.gov. Also, if you're on the Gov Delivery email you will receive notices. Let us know if you want to be added to receive Gov Delivery notices.

Are there any questions or comments for RCPP?

Ray: RCPP has made some good changes and I encourage partners to come together and pool their resources for funding opportunities. Please contact us to collaborate on your projects and gain a better understanding of these funds.

Action Items:

1. We will reach out to Susan regarding the ranking items; this is an action item from the last meeting.
2. Shawn will provide us the specs on rail piping and we will work with national to get those specs adopted and get funding for that type of fencing being applicable in the state. It matches up with what NDOW is doing and is also working with BLM and the USFS. This is a cross jurisdiction management practice that makes it easier on everyone, including our producers, and has been asked of by all the partners.
3. Susan will provide us some information and wants to participate in the Beaver Dam analog discussion.
4. Communicate the importance to our staff at the field level to have representation in the future at the Local Area Working Groups meetings.

Nevada State Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

12/9/20

5. Elko/Eureka LWG Concern for STAC consideration #8: In 2017, the LWG had suggested a question for the ranking that was worth 25 points; was the conservation plan, that supports the schedule of operation, developed in coordination with the local conservation district; the group would like to have this question added to cart.
6. Jim Gifford will look into cattle collars that assist ranchers in virtual fences.
7. We are going to contact individuals to see if they want to be on a subcommittee with Agee to review practice standard updates that considers geography or other issues that are important in Nevada that aren't recognized by the standards or incorporated.
8. Gerry will send Paulette some information of who you can get a hold of in Elko and some really good pictures of those dams filled to the brim in 2017.

Thank you everyone for attending and participating. We look forward to holding another STAC meeting in the summer of 2021.