

DCP October Task Force Meeting Notes

Notes from breakout groups on Agriculture Actions

Group 1

Group 2

Group 3

Action	Notes
A-1	This can be a sub-action of A-2 or A-3. Feasibility in the region. Has this been hard to get going? Is there technology there yet? Not ready to implement widespread right now. Does it use satellite, cell towers, or GSP for signal? Takes time to train cattle to respond to it.
A-2	Add livestock managers as a champion. Add into plans a way to protect water sources from cattle contamination.
A-3	Can be an overarching action with A-1 and A-2 within it. Add livestock manager(s) as champion. Motivator to implement better grazing practices can be fear of losing lease (USFS land leases). Barrier = no federal agency in the area currently has a range specialist. Barrier = no way to regulate grazing plans in leases (USFS). Water protections from cattle. Using movable/temporary electric fencing to keep cattle out of riparian areas.
A-4	Tie into A-5. Need input from ag. Community on how to improve. NRCs = not a lot of people know about the programs. Make champion? NRCS could be a way to help pay for changes. This is a more feasible action for immediate implementation. Consider cattle water sources. When water sources dry up during times of drought (i.e., a spring), ranchers must haul water. This hammers roads on public lands and is not efficient. Think of better ways for water delivery.
A-5	Need ag. Buy in/input on why flood irrigation is the way things are done here. Don't foresee a lot of buy-in to "efficient" watering practices. Need a "leader" landowner to champion any changes. Focus more on A-4 (easier to immediately implement) A lot of wet meadows and wetlands rely on groundwater and water return. How can a change in irrigation practices impact these? Take out until more is known on that the impacts would be. Are there places where this could be done without impacting those downstream?

A-6	Remove entirely. It is a good idea, but not feasible through “gentleman’s agreement”. Formalize = uncomfortable word. Will people start filing for water rights on return flows? Could put limitations on water in stream. Don’t want to start having people file for water → take out “formalize”. When would “gentleman’s agreements” be occurring?
A-7	What are the long-term repercussions of introducing new plants to the area? (Think of Russian olive). “explore” is too broad of a term. Need a narrowed down action word. Who would champion this? Same note for the term “explore”. Re-open mountain research station to investigate / do a pilot study? Change “explore” to “do a pilot study”. Research different blends of crops/species pilot study. Promote multiculture growing instead of monocultures. Change title from “alternative crop” → “_____?”
A-8	Don’t see what this has to do with drought. Leave this to a fire plan or emergency services. Change to “livestock moving in response to drought” and put into A-3.
A-9	Don’t understand what this is. Change name to “pasture banking” or “pasture preservation”? Easement program? Explain what this is more clearly. Can ranchers consider supplemental feeding?
A-10	Need to increase landowner knowledge of programs.
A-11	Feel more comfortable with this language than that in A-6.
A-12	People need more information on this, what is it doing and trying to accomplish?

General notes:

Where do we have willing partners to “explore” actions? Don’t see the benefit of studying something basin wide if it can’t be implemented basin wide. Need targeted area exploration.

Lack of available data, increase flow meters / gauges in the basin.

Is there any meaning to order of the action? I

Can a source water protection plan be written or incorporated into this?

Is movable electric fence to protect key riparian areas and wetlands an option to explore?

Bailey's notes from groups:

A-1,2,3 can be merged into one overarching action called "Grazing Management Toolbox". Within this grazing practices can be explored as sub-actions. Grazing plans, virtual fencing, other fencing options, water protections, public land grazing plan regulation, pasture banking options, etc.

Perhaps an option that could be explored is creating a partnership position that works with BLM, USFS, and NRCS. Rangeland Specialist that all agencies put funding towards as match with UGRWCD to work on creating grazing plans for areas that need one and private properties that want one. A UGRWCD employee but their position is under these agencies. Maybe 2 positions? 1 with BLM and USFS and a second one who only works with NRCS.

A comment was made that "that's the price of doing business" if it costs ranchers extra money to supplemental feed or decrease the size of their herd. I don't think this attitude is a good one to present to landowners. We need to acknowledge we need their input in the ag. workshop and want to hear everything they have to say. We aren't here to tell them what to do or what they have been doing is wrong; but we are here to help in ways they are willing to accept it.

I think a lot of general public people don't really understand grazing or grazing practices and why people do things they way they do. I think it could be a good idea to take time in that workshop to take note of actions the ag. community doesn't like, but *why* they don't like this. Understanding these reasons can help planning and it can be communicated during public comment periods. If the public understands why things are done, the way they are or aren't, it can only serve to improve their views of practices. Also telling landowners this. "We want to take note of why you don't like a suggestion or practice. We can then communicate these reasons to the public, so they have a greater understanding of practices, as well as helping us during this planning and drafting process". I think this will also show them we are on their side and don't want to change what they are doing or tell them what to do.

I think during the ag. workshop it would be a good opportunity to find a volunteers to be added to the be added to the task force. Maybe creating a small ag. committee within the task force? 3-4 people. This would show producers we really do care what they have to say and are taking their input seriously. Having someone during public stakeholder or comment periods to advocate for ag. actions will be helpful also. A direct line of communication with the task force, as well as the public. Maybe having a meeting with someone from NRCS and Jesse from TU before going to the ag. community with these actions would be good. They work with producers directly and understand what they deal with in their operations.

With my history with NRCS and working with ranchers and ag., if an ag. sub-committee is created I would be happy to oversee that and sit in on those meetings and brings notes back to the larger task force.

Please let me know any thoughts on my notes 😊 If you have already thought of something, please let me know. As I am just starting to learn about the basin and the DCP process, I am happy to hear any feedback on what I am thinking. I am here to learn, help, and provide insight or assistance wherever I can.