

Meeting August 11th, 2011

Stakeholders Present:

Mark Sovine	Grand Water and Sewer Service Agency
Laurel Hagen	Canyonlands Watershed Council
Donna Metzler	City of Moab
Mike Allred	UDWQ
Kirstin Peterson	Moab City
Ann Marie Aubry	Bureau of Land Management
John Weisheit	Canyonlands Watershed Council
Geoff Freethey	Grand Co. Trail Mix Committee

Others Present:

Tessa Groff Watershed Coordinator

Actions

1. Agenda and Minutes were reviewed and approved.
2. Partnership Agreement was reviewed and released for signatures. A date of October 1st, 2011 was set for approval.
3. The "By-Laws" document was voted on and approved. It will be sent out with the Partnership Agreement.
4. A final logo design for MAWP was chosen.
5. The group scheduled the next meeting for September 15th, 2011, at 8:00 AM at the GWSSA office.

Discussion Items

Item One: Approval of Agenda and Minutes. Mark Sovine asked for approval of the agenda and minutes from the previous meeting.

Conclusion/Action: There were no objections and they were both approved.

Item Two: Partnership Agreement. The extended review period for the Partnership Agreement concluded at this meeting. All comments and suggested changes that had been received to this point were presented and discussed. SITLA had drafted an "Additional Provisions" document outlining articles they wished to be added to the Partnership Agreement. The group decided that many of these topics were addressed in the by-laws and did not fit in the Partnership Agreement. It was suggested, that once the by-laws were approved by MAWP, Tessa Groff would send them out in conjunction with the Partnership Agreement in order to clarify how MAWP will deal with the subjects SITLA had presented. Mark Sovine offered to contact Bryan Torgerson in order to explain this decision. A tentative date of October 1st, 2011 was set for final signatures. Each member should present the by-laws and Partnership Agreement to their governing agency or parent organization before this date.

Conclusion/Action: Tessa Groff will make the suggested grammatical changes and check the document for uniformity before sending a fully executed document. The by-laws will accompany the Partnership Agreement and be distributed for signature.

Item Three: Review of the By-Laws. It was decided that by adding a few simple points to the by-laws MAWP could address some of the topics that SITLA had proposed in their legal review of the Partnership Agreement. The group addressed the need for a quorum, how new partners are nominated and the minimum number of meetings MAWP may have a year. There was a call for a vote on the document and Mark Sovine asked if there were any objections to its approval. There were none and the by-laws were approved. It was decided that Tessa should go over the document and make sure there is uniformity throughout it. Only non-substantive changes will be made.

Conclusion/Action: Please see document for changes. The by-laws were approved and will accompany the Partnership Agreement when distributed for signature. This is a living document and can be amended at any meeting so long as an agenda item is provided for this action.

Item Four: Report from Website Committee. Laurel had three logo design options to present. They included all elements that the partnership had suggested at the last meeting. Those present unanimously voted for the first design.

Conclusion/Action: Tessa will send the final official logo design to all partners and the web designer.

Item Five: Forming a Funding Committee and Project Discussion. John Weisheit informed the group of a grant that is available from the Bureau of Reclamation. MAWP partners discussed forming a funding committee to help identify grants like the one John presented. It was decided that the purpose of the funding committee should be to present all available funding opportunities to the group for possible projects rather than working to identify project specific funding. Donna Metzler suggested the group create a list to identify all projects, which pertain to water quality, that each agency has interest in or is already involved in. Tessa will send out a request for project ideas before the next meeting. Partners are encouraged to join the funding committee.

Conclusion/Action: At the September meeting MAWP will create a working list of all the projects that each entity would like to see implemented in the watershed. This will give us an idea what the major concerns are for this partnership. The creation of this list will take priority over other topics at the next meeting. The creation of a funding committee is advised.

Item Six: UDWQ Intensive Water Quality Monitoring Sites. Mike Allred stated that the Southeastern Colorado River Watershed is targeted for the Utah Division of Water Quality's intensive monitoring cycle for 2012. He presented a map that displayed all of the monitoring sites in the area. He can request additional sites, but all suggestions must be made by mid-September. It was suggested that all MAWP members look over these sites and identify if there are any additional sites that might aid MAWP in writing their watershed management plan.

Conclusion/Action: Tessa will collect a PDF version of the map from Mike Allred and send it out to the partnership. All partners should look it over and identify any additional sites they would like. Requests can be discussed at the next meeting.

Item Seven: Next Agenda. All items on the August agenda that were not discussed will be added to the following agenda. It was requested that the watershed plan outline be pushed to the October agenda. The next meeting was set for September 15th, 2011.

Conclusion/Action: The next meeting will be held at the GWSSA office on September 15th 2011, at 8:00 AM.