

Humboldt River Basin Network Stakeholder Meeting

Cooperative Extension Office

Winnemucca, Nevada

9:00am-5:00pm

May 3, 2017

Meeting Notes

ATTENDEES

Participants

Jerry Annis, Lander Conservation District (CD) Supervisor

Jason Barnes, Trout Unlimited (TU)

Justin Barrett, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS)

Mike Baughman, Humboldt River Basin Water Authority

Doug Busselman, Farm Bureau

Carl Clinger, Rancher, CD Supervisor, Pershing County Natural Resource Commission

Duane Coombs, Intermountain West Joint Ventures (IWJV)

Steve Delsada, Nevada Division of Water Resources

Bob Gibson, U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

Hanes Holman, Newmont Mining (Elko Land and Livestock Co) and 2nd President NV Cattlemen's Association

Birgit Henson – Nevada Dept of Environmental Protection (NDEP)

Bobby Jones – Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW)/Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS)

John Paul Kiel, NDEP

Connie Lee, NDOW

Wes Levitt, Newmont Mining (Carlin)

Liz Munn, The Nature Conservancy (TNC)

Randy Paul, NDEP

Andy Preka, Humboldt Watershed Cooperative Weed Management Area (CWMA)

Tim Rubald, NV Dept of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR) & State Conservation Commission

Bettina Sherer – DCNR

Joe Sicking, Paradise CD and State Conservation Commission

Sherm Swanson, University of Nevada Reno Cooperative Extension

Jake Tibbits – Eureka County Natural Resource Manager, Eureka CD Supervisor, State Conservation Commission, Past President Nevada Association of Conservation Districts

Stephanie Wilson, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Dave Voht, Nevada Department of Agriculture (NDA)

Facilitators

Laura Van Riper BLM/Natural Riparian Service Team (NRST)

Mike Gerel, Sustainable Northwest

WELCOME AND BACKGROUND

- Connie Lee with NDOW welcomed the group, thanked everyone for coming, and offered a short summary of the genesis for today's meeting.
- For 10+ years, Connie and others have been having individual conversations about the potential for bringing a diverse group of people together to discuss and address the myriad of issues facing the

Humboldt River Basin (HRB). To date, there has never been a successful attempt to discuss and potentially resolve these issues in a forum with all of the stakeholders involved. There have been a few failed past attempts, but interest in the concept did not die.

- In January 2017, a core group of stakeholders representing BLM, the U.S. Forest Service, NDOW, Nevada Association of Conservation Districts, NDEP, State Conservation Commission and the University of NV Reno came together to test the appetite and organizational 'buy-in' for the initiation of a collaborative process to address issues within the HRB. With strong buy-in among this group, the 'Humboldt River Basin Network' (HRBN) was formed to serve as a 'voluntary, open group looking for community-based solutions where and if needed, in the Humboldt River Basin, to foster greater ecological, economic and social resilience.'
- In spring 2017 the Nevada State Conservation Commission agreed to host the HRBN.
- In the January meeting, the group brainstormed a series of next steps – with the first being to convene a second facilitated meeting and involve a wide array of stakeholders not present at the first meeting.
- The objective for today's meeting is to bring representatives from the various stakeholder groups within the HRB together, up-front, to engage in productive communication and collaboration and reach agreement on a workable roadmap for addressing the challenges this basin is facing.

INTRODUCTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS

- Laura Van Riper with BLM/NRST and Mike Gerel with Sustainable Northwest will be jointly facilitating this meeting.
- Laura asked everyone to introduce themselves, offer their relationship to the HRB, and share their expectations for the meeting.
- The relationships to the river and expectations communicated mirrored those heard at the January meeting.

AGENDA OVERVIEW

- Mike Gerel next walked the group through the proposed agenda for the day.
- The topics on today's agenda are as follows:
 1. Thoroughly review the January meeting discussion.
 2. Discuss the proposed action plan created in January.
 3. Describe the process for completing a situation assessment.
 4. Compile situation assessment participant list.
 5. Tie off loose ends and compile list of next steps.
 6. Close the meeting.
- Mike inquired if there were any suggested changes or additions to the agenda and none were received.
- He noted that group feedback will be captured for each subject, with a special focus on those that were in attendance at the January meeting.

WALK THROUGH JANUARY MEETING DISCUSSIONS

- Participants in the January meeting offered a summary of the discussions that day as follows:
 1. Status of the HRB—see Table 2 January meeting notes (Connie Lee, NDOW);
 2. Worst/best outcomes of working collaboratively to address the situation—see Table 3 and 4 notes (Jake Tibbits, Eureka County); and
 3. Barriers to achieving best outcomes—see Table 7 notes (Brigit Henson, NDEP).
- Next, group feedback was requested as follows:
 - Individuals not present at the January meeting responded to these questions in turn
 - How do you feel about what you heard from panel members?
 - What would you add based on your perspective?
 - Individuals present at the meeting were responded to these questions in turn:
 - How do you feel about the conversation so far?
 - What would you add?
- There was general consensus among participants on existing situation, outcomes, and barriers. Specific feedback is provided in Tables 1.

Table 1—Feedback from Group

Efforts must be bottom-up from stakeholders	Implications of climate change
Availability of water for all users is important	Basin decree created in a time of plenty—30 years late after drought (more intense, frequent) the decree is now “upside-down” as there is less water now
Groundwater basins are over-appropriated	Must coordinate management of groundwater and surface water
Water rights holders feel weight of new uses and regulations—how will they pay? Users are “paying to lose water” as assessments have gone up.	Looking to fund bigger and better infrastructure to improve system
Find “bite-size” pieces to address	Is the river fixable (readiness)—considering climate change, existing roads and diversions, etc.
Why would producers change their water use—what is the economic benefit?	Spraying weeds vs hydrology—need healthy system to control both—when water is low, weeds come.
Can quadruple stocking with certain actions—Dwayne examples over last 10 years.	Social benefits to working wet meadows—migratory waterfowl (has been lost over 50 years)
Communities come together to find common value—ag, conservation, sportsman	Acknowledge and address fears—find buy-in where we can
Beaver restoration is a viable strategy	Many haven’t been able to grow alfalfa since 2012, so livestock are eating weeds (high protein)
Money at County/CD level has been short	Fewer good years between drought over last 20
Agency people exceed landowners; we need to involve landowners in this process	Need greater coordination between landowners and agencies overall—situation assessment will bring them into process
Should consider pilots to address issues	Very expensive to fix diversions—options is to fix of buy hay (what is the best bang for the buck)
Some conservation groups are not trusted—	Great possibility here—sky is the limit (see Truckee

Table 1—Feedback from Group

barrier to participation so need to overcome this	example)
Focus on subbasins—smaller bites concept already noted	Hard to translate success in one place to another
Strategically start in the top of the watershed	Consider balance of moving dirt vs. letting system heal itself (let water do the work)
When will it be important enough for everyone to change management of the river—likely when domestic wells go dry	Need to share news of successes—small/large in size, cost, and impact—CD meetings would be the place to talk about success with landowners
Some stakeholders are not here—how to we get them here and in a positive way	Talk about Elko City and other success stories
Very important to build community engagement and capacity “where you are”	Producers are worried water will be transferred to other communities—rural-to-urban transfer concern
Point made that people need economic health to engage/care about river health	No current incentive for water conservation (“use it or lose it”)—so hard to enhance productivity and river health
How to we maximize the value of water for rights holders and state interests	Cloud seeding is being considered to create new water (tried in Ruby)—there is \$700K in budget to help Humboldt system
Key point is that land remains productive—can local economy support change we are seeking?	Agricultural is the cultural glue in local areas—regardless of regional/state economy
Well (resource) and pump (people)—must look at both	Impacts of actions go UP and DOWN stream—actions in one place impact another
Water timing is key—slow it down and soak it in	River is already changing even if we do nothing—rivers do heal themselves in time and in specific places we should spend money to fix (compare ‘do nothing’ to ‘spend and act’)
Production and healing the river is people business	Incentivize participation and build trust—translate participation into production/security/money for landowners—build bridges
Witness a community reviving itself around the river—communities are built around rivers—Humboldt is the heart of Nevada	Need to think carefully about how to talk about this that brings in/serves key interests
Economies of small rural communities are the life blood of the river—people connect to their place	Watersheds are the true infrastructure of rural communities—create natural recharge
Need to diversity rural economies	Highlight relevance of rural communities
No job, no schools = no rural and no support for urban and other visitors	Most rivers are on private ground
Saving sage grouse is pushing grazing to private grounds	Results bring money—not the other way around
Can producers afford needed steps?	CDs represent farmers, ranchers, landowners—important to decide when to bring actual landowners in

- A key take home was that economic and river health is dependent on each other—the arrow goes both ways. Work to educate landowners and the broader community to make this connection, buy-into needed change (triple-bottom line benefits, etc.), and take steps on-the-ground at the site and then regional level to achieve balanced health. An assessment will be necessary to prioritize best bang for the buck—money should go where there is readiness and then hope for snowball up and down the river. Case can be made that “we can no longer do nothing.”

REVIEW AND UPDATE PROPOSED ACTIONS

- Tim Rubald with DCNR described proposed near-term actions brainstormed at the January meeting and a status/timeline for completion:
 1. Form Humboldt River Basin Network as “kick-off” group (*Completed January 2017*).
 2. Find “motherhip” to house effort. State Conservation Commission has committed to host this coordinated effort. Among other things, this provides CDs and landowners with a direct ‘in’ into process (*Completed March 2017*).
 3. Convene second HRBN meeting that includes a wide array of stakeholders not present at the first meeting and seek group agreement on group purpose and refinement of next steps (*Completed May 2017*).
 4. Conduct basinwide situation assessment. Involves face-to-face discussions with interested/affected parties to better understand the various perspectives, needs, challenges, and opportunities in order to guide the HRBN in future planning efforts. The situation assessment is discussed further later in the meeting. Funding request for the assessment submitted to the Collaborative Action and Dispute Resolution program (*Completed May 2017*). If the application is not funded, other sources will be explored (*Schedule for November 2017—1st two weeks, complete report by January 2018*).
 5. Basinwide workshop. Convening a workshop or similar education event (*Potential timing 1Q 2018-begin planning late summer*). Could be general ‘State of the Basin’ or “This is the HRBN” event, update from State Engineer, and update on situation assessment. Goals will be to (1) raise awareness and understanding of existing situation within HRB, (2) learn about and link to existing efforts (i.e., Capture Study), and (3) could cross-pollinate with other events (State engineer’s formal workshops; Nevada Cattlemen’s—Nov 2017; CDs conference—November 2017; NWRA—February 2018; and Society of Range Management—January 2018). This workshop could be a feeder that brings people to a larger conference later in the year, and the report could inform its design and content.
 6. Basinwide conference. Consider a full blown conference that goes beyond the general into state of basin, problems, gaps in information, solutions, and mapping out of longer-term actions (*Potential timing November 2018*). Could model after Carson conference. Look to make it exciting, integrative, pioneering, and not boring. Base Flow Conference in the past was a turning point—discussed that mines weren’t the only issue but biggest problem was irrigation wells installed in 1960-70s.
- Laura next noted the following long-term actions also considered in January:
 1. Create a more formal stakeholder group to carry effort into 2018.
 2. Develop a watershed plan. Include appropriate studies to assess available data, identify gaps, and fill them (Humboldt River Basin Authority did a water quality/quantity assessment).
 3. Form Watershed Council, non-profit organization, or similar entity to take on effort long-term—consider fitting within existing groups/networks rather than forming a separate entity.

4. Seek funding for watershed plan.
 5. Implement watershed plan.
 6. Monitor, adapt, and adjust plan as needed.
- There was general consensus among the group that these near and long-term actions made sense. The main changes were to delay the situation assessment from spring 2017 to the fall, and to consider the two conference format discussed above.
 - The following new actions arose from the discussion:
 - Pursue demonstration/pilot projects to show what is possible. Must be deliberative about where to start—upper basin is in better shape, lower basin in worse condition. Be adaptive and learn from project to project. The impact of mine dewatering was noted.
 - Undertake ongoing education to engage landowners and other stakeholders. Be creative about how to reach new interests and people—new technology for producers, events for sportsman, active education for the public, etc.

SITUATION ASSESSMENT PROCESS

- Laura Van Riper led a discussion of conducting a situation assessment for the HRB.
- Laura and Mike Lunn (BLM contractor) were requested by the HRBN after the January meeting to conduct a situation assessment for the basin. Laura provided some background on the National Riparian Service Team (NRST), their use of situation assessments, and their experience conducting them in the West, including Nevada. She also explained that Liz Munn with TNC has been requested to serve as the local logistical coordinator, given her experience with the Northern Nevada assessment that occurred in January 2015.
- The purpose of a situation assessment is to meet face-to-face (or by phone if needed) with individual community members and stakeholders to better understand their perspectives regarding the local situation – including concerns, opportunities, and if/how the HRBN should move forward with subsequent activities. These assessments are a normal part of conflict resolution and collaborative process.
- Laura next described the following five step process for an assessment:
 - Step 1: Develop invitation list.** The intent is to meet with a broad and diverse cross-section of the people involved, with special attention given to those who may be most affected by any future decisions or activities. The group brainstormed (below) an initial list (approximately 50-75 people) to serve as a starting point for scheduling discussions. We will inevitably end up with more people at the end because additional meetings will get scheduled based on word of mouth. We will request in the invitation letter that it be forward to others who may be interested in meeting with us (i.e., purposive snowball sample). Goal is to get “saturation” when you here the same themes over and over.
 - Step 2: Develop invitation letter.** In order to give folks a ‘heads-up’ about the SA, HRBN will draft a letter to folks providing some context and the SA details. Laura will provide a sample invitation letter to the group. Past experience has shown that follow-up phone calls will also be needed, in addition to the letter, to secure participation.
 - Step 3: Schedule discussions.** Liz will handle the situation assessment logistical details, including securing meeting locations in various towns and scheduling discussions. To date willingness to participate has been very good. We typically schedule about an hour/person at a centralized location. On occasion, there are groups of people who want to talk to us together. That is fine; however, more time (typically an extra ½ hour for 1-3 people, and an extra hour for groups of 3 or

more). There will be 2 NRST members conducting the assessment. They can split up if needed, but prefer to do them together. At times, people will prefer to have us travel to an alternate location (restaurant, residence, etc.) to save travel time and meet with us on their 'turf.' We are happy to accommodate that, but travel time will need to be built into the schedule.

Step 4: Conduct discussions. At the onset of each conversation, Laura and Mike will explain that the discussions are confidential and explain that nothing would be attributed to any particular individual within the report. Notes are generally not taken. Our purpose is to learn about overarching themes, which generally become quite clear after enough people are visited with (i.e., saturation). During the discussions, Laura and Mike will use a model of 'listening with respect.' After initial introductions, they will listen to the perspective and insights of participants without judging the content. People will be encouraged to speak from their own knowledge and perspective about the situations/topics they feel are most important. Some general questions will be asked to prompt discussion and clarify points that are made. Questions will not be tied to a specific issue or outcome, starting general/broad has delivered better engagement. The goal is to capture whatever is important to the individual interviewee.

Step 5: Develop report. A report will be completed and distributed to all participants summarizing the information and insights (overarching themes) gathered during the situation assessment and providing recommendations regarding potential next steps. It is important to note that this report is not meant to serve as a comprehensive statement of fact, but rather to identify and document the range of perceptions that exist.

- The discussion turned to how to pursue the assessment for the Humboldt:
 - It was clarified that the HRBN can inform how to frame the assessment, approach to stakeholders, and other specifics.
 - Those that have been involved in situation assessments in the past felt they were "driving" not those conducting the assessment. A safe space for sharing was created.
 - A question before the group was how best to get people to participate in the assessment and the larger Humboldt issue? What is the trigger for participation? What do we do when there is a lack of a crisis to compel interest? How do we get those to show up and get engaged that usually don't get engaged—the harder crowd?
 - It was shared that in two years or so the State Engineer will be ready to curtail groundwater use based on junior to senior water rights because of existing over-appropriation. The group felt this was likely a trigger for landowner and community involvement.
 - Some of the actions that HRBN could pursue under a future watershed plan could result in a less strict curtailment.
 - A key question is who to invite—start with roughly 75 names. In other effort when they started with that many, 180 interviews resulted. Seek geographic stratification across the basin.
 - Assessment will not be about facts (true not true), but more qualitative capturing perspectives.
 - A question was asked as to whether to conduct situation assessment, workshop, or gather more data first. Consensus was that assessment should come first.
 - There was general consensus by the group that Laura and Mike should indeed move forward with the situation assessment during a two week period in November 2017.
 - As noted earlier, NRST submitted a \$35K funding request in May 2017 to BLM to cover Laura, Mike, and Liz's time to complete the assessment. News of award should come in early June.

SITUATION ASSESSMENT PARTICIPANT LIST

- Laura next led a conversation about Step 1 of the situation assessment—developing a participation list.
- Goals will be to achieve
 - 75-100 interviews
 - 5 counties
 - 9-10 discrete user groups, 1-2 people/group
 - Inclusion of statewide groups/NGOs
- It was noted that 75% of water rights are in Elko County so seeking participants there will be important.
- All participants were asked to provide names of organizations and/or individuals that should be interviewed in the five focal counties and others that should be included. The names are provided in Tables 2-7 below.

Table 2 —Humboldt County Participant List

Crawford Cattle	Cody Byrne, NDOW
Homeless	Tony Lesperance
Brad S., Humboldt County Cooperative Extension	Wmmca Farms
Humboldt County Commissioners	Frosty Tipton, T Quarter Circle
City of Winnemucca	Jess Braatz, Squaw Valley Ranch
Orovada Farmers	Tebo Piquet

Table 3 —Lander County Participant List

Town of Battle Mountain	Doug Mills, Lander County Commissioner
Jerry Chappin, PCWCD, manager of Pershing County pasture near Battle Mountain	Small ranches and farms—Antelope
Reese River irrigators and ranchers	Lisa Taylor, UNCE
Jerry Annis, County CD	NDOW Rock Creek Manager

Table 4 —Elko County Participant List

Rex Steninger, County Commissioner	Randy Brown, County Commissioner
DeMar Dahl, County Commissioner	City of Elko Parks, Public Works, and Planning
Elko County Natural Resources	Northeastern Nevada Stewardship Group
SANE	Ellison Ranch—Jon Dahl, Jimmy Ellison
Gibbs Ranch (Wyatt)	Mary’s River Ranch (Preston)
Winecup Ranch	Springcreek Association
John Ellison	Boyd Ranch (Andy)
Hegay Family	John Griggs
BLM/FS	Carol Evans
Kent McAdoo	South Fork Tribe
Nevada State Parks	Glazer Ranch
Larry Hyslop	Holland Ranch
Shammy Rodriguiz	Mori Family (Sam and Pete)
Jesse Braatz	Chuck Wolf

Table 5—Eureka County Participant List

Jake T.	Eureka CD
Pine Valley Irrigation (Pine Creek)—Slagowski, Stitzel, Tomera, Bailey	TS & Horshoe Ranch
Hay Ranch	JD Ranch
Dean Ranch	Newmont—Hanes, Jeff, Wes
Barrick—Al Plank, Gail Ross, Bob Ingersoll	Goicoechea Dynasty
Pete, State Legislator	JJ, County Commissioner
Eureka County NRAC	The Dann Family (Crescent Valley Tribal interest)

Table 6—Pershing County Participant List

Steve Foster, Cooperative Extension Agent	Benny Hodges, PCWCD
Bob Depaoli	Walter Brinkerhoff
Richard Dennlon	Robert McDougal, Nevada Nile
Dan Knisky	Mike Stremmer
Bob Redd, C Punch Ranch	Tim DeLong
Tom Moura	Mike Gotschalk
Lovelock Meadows Water District	Dan Hill
Debra, Pershing Gold	

Table 7—Additional Participant List

County Commissioners	Laurel Saito, TNC
BLM RAC	Trout Unlimited
Flyfishers	OHV Association
Nevada Bigh	RMEF
Mule Deer Association	Ducks Unlimited
Tribes	All UNCE educators in basin
UPRR	HWCWMA
NDOW—fisheries, conservation education, law enforcement, diversity, game	NCA
Northern Nevada Stewardship Group	Nevada Weed Management Association
Nevada Association of CD's	Individual CD members
Friends of Nevada Wilderneww	Jim Harvey, USFS—fish
John McCann, USFS—Hydrology	Andy Starsostka, USFWS
Chad Mellison, USFWS	

LOOSE ENDS

- Laura led a short discussion to clear up any loose ends remaining from today's meeting. Two issues arose.
 - HRBN—Clear consensus that we need “worker bees” to continue the group. The following participants volunteered to be part of the network's core group: Birgit, Tim, Sherm, Liz, Carl, Joe, Jake, Andy, Connie, Bettina, Bobby, Maggie, Mike, and Justin/Chad. All other participants will keep informed.

- PFC Assessment—There was an inquiry about pursuing Proper Functioning Condition (PFC) Assessment near-term. There was concern from several in the group about getting technical assessments out front of people—has “crash and burn” potential for the effort. Lay people need to know what PFC is about before it is pursued on-the-ground. Landowner assurances will be needed and education about how an assessment is done, who holds information, how it is shared or not, and how it can/can’t impact landowner operations. Could form a Technical Advisory Committee to figure out how to move forward to address scientific needs. HRBN should absorb PFC, NDOW’s 40 binders of information on the HRB from the late 1980s (only in hardcopy right now), and other information to get handle on basin. Further thought was that PFC assessment is not necessarily needed before Capture Study. Public workshop on capture model could be useful long before it’s done to raise interest. Consensus that PFC should be conducted at a later date as part of development of watershed plan. Sherm has a white paper on PFC and how you could do it in the Humboldt that he will share with the group.

CLOSING IMPRESSIONS

- Laura used a 3x5 card process to collect from each participant impressions on today’s meeting and appropriate next steps. The impressions generally as provided are grouped by subject matter below. A discrete list of next steps is provided in the next section.
 - *Outreach & Awareness Building*
 - Go slow to go fast—seek first to understand then be understood. Understand landowners want to be heard—“my biological expertise is the last thing they want to know about until they ask for it.” Build trust with folks in our respective circles of influence to participate in situation assessment and follow-up workshop/conference.
 - List all resource values (irrigation, fish, etc). Engage all resource advocates possible and link them with relevant issues. Develop engaging rallying cry for outreach purposes and meeting planning. Tie stakeholder groups in or at least inform them of capture study workshops. Outreach to urban areas as well, and get their support early.
 - Identify landowners that would be interested in being involved with this group. Bring up at CD meetings. Work with CDs to develop knowledge and use them to get producers to the table, along with other groups. Send a news bulletin to the appropriate CDs that identifies the HRBN and outlines its plan going forward. Start education with landowners and water rights holders. Help Department of Water Resources spread message about workshops to help inform private landowners.
 - Increased outreach and education; more PFC classes. Put together fact sheets on HRBN, PFC, Capture Study, other.
 - Consider involvement in upcoming Society for Range Management Conference in Reno.
 - *Situation Assessment*
 - Plan, organize and carry-out situation assessment. Set up assessment and generate report. Network review of situation assessment results (Dec/Jan). Based on this, schedule workshops to present situation assessment results.
 - Obtain funding for situation assessment.
 - Review and write situation assessment letter. Draft assessment invite. Write intro to invite letter for situation assessment outreach.
 - Finalize list of all stakeholders. Build stakeholder list with key contacts from compiled sheets. Enlarge list of assessment contacts, emphasize non-producers. Work towards identifying and contacting local folks to conduct situational assessment. Coordinate with State Engineer’s office for outreach.

- *HRBN Conference*
 - Use situation assessment results to plan and schedule a conference.
 - Start planning for a pre-conference conference, which is carefully designed as a hoot-n-holler good time!
 - Work towards designing larger Humboldt specific conference. Start planning for a HRBN conference. Do we plan it out or can we hire conference planner? HRBN structure robust enough?
 - Identify workshop planning committee. Pick location and date, develop agenda 1st draft. Plan conference: topics/message, speakers, sponsors, location, time, advertisement, workshop agenda. Set up groups to plan winter 2018 conference: location/date/funding, agenda & topics, speakers, invitations.
- *Information Sharing*
 - Data/information clearinghouse established. Identify/establish what resources currently exist; resources that will help inform and educate people about the natural resources in the HRB. Compile list of reports, papers, etc. related to Basin – information clearinghouse (too soon?).
- *PFC Assessments*
 - Figure out the role of PFC assessments.
- *Develop HRBN*
 - Need dedicated people. Make people accountable if you want to see things accomplished. Identify what my role is within this group.
 - Maintain communication! Month or bi-monthly coordination call amongst core group.
 - Compile results from this meeting and distribute. Timeline/schedule of major events with steps and roles assigned (through ‘formal’ conference). Get marching orders from everyone else’s cards. Do what Laura asks me to do.
 - Reach out to Walker Basin Conservancy for information on benefits of bringing capacity to an issue. Look at other organizations that have proceeded us – Truckee, Carson Cons., Walker Basin.
 - Education session for the group members of the HRBN on various topics. Group building of the network with field training.

NEXT STEPS

Meeting participants suggested that HRBN pursue the following actions:

1. HRBN participants to review situation assessment participant lists provided in Tables 2-7 of these notes and provide additions, edits, and more details (context, contact information, etc.). *Timeline: By July 1st.*
2. NRST to write situation assessment invite letter. *Timeline: By August 1st.*
3. Core group to further define what group is, building capacity and functionality, and developing core message. What is the trigger for landowners and the public to care? Start with fact sheet. *Timeline: Summer 2017.*
4. CDs and others with local connection to use bottom-up education to build broader trust/buy-in/knowledge in the effort to help assessment and otherwise. Conduct educational sessions, field trips, and case studies. *Timeline: Ongoing.*

5. Core group to consider how to integrate with other efforts ongoing on this landscape (e.g., curtailment, sage grouse, etc.). *Timeline: Ongoing.*
6. Core group form a committee to develop 2018 workshop purpose, agenda, etc. *Timeline: Summer 2017.*
7. HRBN to figure out how to fund situation assessment, network capacity, education events, and workshops. *Timeline: Ongoing.*
8. NRST to conduct situation assessment. *Timeline: November 2017.*
9. Schedule next HRBN meeting to review situation assessment results and finalize workshop. *Timeline: January 2018.*
10. Hold first workshop. *Timeline: 1Q 2018.*