

Meeting November 10th, 2011

Stakeholders Present:

Mark Sovine	Grand Water and Sewer Service Agency
Laurel Hagen	Canyonlands Watershed Council
Mike Allred	UDWQ
Mary Hofhine	Grand County
Ann Marie Aubry	BLM
Dee Taylor	Cattle Grazing
Dave Erley	Town of Castle Valley
Mike Diem	USFS Manti-La Sal
Jerry McNeely	San Juan County
George Carter	Water Rights Owner
Mike Johnson	USU Extension

Others Present:

Tessa Groff Watershed Coordinator

Actions

1. Minutes were reviewed and approved.
2. By consensus a Civil Rights section was added to the Partnership Agreement.
3. The group formed a funding committee.
4. The group endorsed their support of a mini-grant proposal put together by Tessa Groff and Mike Johnson.
5. The group scheduled the next meeting for January 12th, 2011, at 8:00 AM at the GWSSA office.

Discussion Items

Item One: Project Lists. Tessa Groff asked if there were any additions to the projects list. There were none and it was decided that as projects are proposed/developed we will add them to the list.

Conclusion/Action: The projects list will be updated as necessary.

Item Two: Review USFS suggested changes to the Partnership Agreement. Mike Diem, the district ranger for the Manti-La Sal National Forest, attended the meeting in order to expand and discuss the wording required by the USFS in the partnership agreement. Due to his time limitations, this topic was moved up on the agenda. Tessa Groff asked for clarification on “comment 5” of the USFS copy of the partnership agreement, which asks for more information about the “Watershed Plan.” Mike explained that it needed to be made clear that the plan discussed by MAWP does not interfere with the USFS and/or other agencies already existing management plans and would not affect decisions that each agency chooses to make according to their management plans. He also mentioned that the USFS Grants & Agreements department was looking over this document and may offer suggestions on how to clarify this further. All present partners agreed that the plan MAWP will be drafting is a watershed plan and not a management plan. This is an advisory board. Tessa then asked Mike Diem if the USFS required the wording on the rest of the document to only list the USFS or if it could include all agencies/cities/counties/individuals involved. Mike Johnson stated that if the USFS was listed he would also need Utah State University Extension listed. Mike Diem said he believed it would be fine to list all partners, but the document still needs to go through the Grants &

Agreements department and they will have final say before approving it for signature. Lastly, the group was asked to consider adding a section **R. Civil Rights**. This section is required by USU Extension for participation.

Conclusion/Action: MAWP partners had no further questions or concerns with the additions required by the USFS, so it was decided that all partners will be listed equally in the additions to the document and a draft will be sent out with the minutes. It was decided by consensus that the civil rights section be added. The USFS Grants & Agreements department will receive an updated copy with all changes made thus far. Tessa Groff will stay in contact with Mike Diem in order to keep this agreement moving forward. The Partnership Agreement will be revisited at the January meeting.

Item Three: Approval of Minutes. The group was asked to review the minutes from the October meeting.

Conclusion/Action: Minutes were approved by consensus.

Item Four: Update from Website Committees. Tessa Groff presented mock-ups of MAWP's website homepage and a subpage that Neal Herbert had designed. All partners present seemed very happy with the design and did not offer suggestions or concerns with design elements. Dave Erley thought the mission statement at the center/top of the homepage should be a full mission statement and not a shortened version. The rest of the group agreed with this. The group then began to discuss the protocol for adding photos/website content/etc. to the website. After much discussion, it was decided that the webmaster would be responsible for picking photos to post at this point in time. If problems arise, or the group does not like the photos posted, they will be taken down and this issue will be hashed out further. Educational tools, information about MAWP and other content will be presented to the group before being added.

Conclusion/Action: Tessa will contact Neal Herbert and work with him to help develop the website for MAWP. She will also suggest content for the website as it gets closer to launching. The website committee will send Tessa "pretty" photos of the watershed that they are willing to share. Tessa will solicit for additional photos as she feels they are needed.

Item Five: Review committee nominations. Tessa Groff presented the names she had received via email as nominations for the technical and funding committees. Ann Marie Aubry, John Weisheit, Laurel Hagen and Mark Sovine all volunteered to join the funding committee. Tessa will work with this group to create a spreadsheet that lists funding sources and deadlines. There were a few other nominations for additional committees, but the group decided that the roles of these committees are not yet clearly defined and may need additional discussion before individuals volunteer their time. Dave Erley suggested having Geoff Freethey come and talk to the group about developing the plan. Mike Allred suggested it might be easier to identify what types of committees are needed as we move forward with the development of the plan. He believes the next step for the group is to review the watershed plan outline and develop technical committees through the process as needed.

Conclusion/Action: Tessa will send out a funding spreadsheet to those on the funding committee to begin fleshing out the document. She will also contact Geoff Freethey to see if he is interested in presenting the group with tactics to writing a watershed plan. MAWP will hold off on forming other committees until the group can agree on the types of committees that are needed and can define the role of those volunteering their time on those committees. The next meeting will focus on moving forward with the plan.

Item Six: Mini-Grant Proposal. Tessa Groff informed the group of the upcoming Utah Watershed Coordinating Council meeting and told them about the organizations solicitation of \$1,000.00 education and outreach mini-grants. She presented the idea of working with Mike Johnson to develop and advertise a series of educational programs about storm water/storm drains, pet waste, septic systems and lawn/garden care. Along with these programs, she would use a portion of the funds to develop of a brochure about MAWP that can be used to inform community members about this group. She then asked for support from MAWP for this proposal. There were no objections.

Mike Allred suggested that a letter be drafted by the chair stating MAWP's support of this proposal. Dave Erley also volunteered to write a letter on behalf of Castle Valley and their support of the proposal.

Conclusion/Action: Tessa will seek out the letters of support and submit the mini-grant proposal by the deadline of November 14th, 2011.

Item Eight: Next Agenda. The group decided not to hold a December meeting. The next meeting was set for January 12th, 2012. This meeting will focus on reviewing the watershed plan outline and defining what types of technical committees are needed to aid in the development of the plan. The Partnership Agreement will be revisited if the USFS has had sufficient time to review it. Mark Sovine asked that we review the policy of "elections" for a new Chair in 2012.

Conclusion/Action: Tessa will review election policies and send out an email before the end of 2011. The next meeting will be held at the GWSSA office on January 12th 2012, at 8:00 AM.