

Moab Area Watershed Partnership

Meeting Minutes April 16, 2014
Grand Center, Moab

Stakeholders Present	Affiliation	Others
Mike Allred Dave Erley Dave Horsley Marc Stilson Mark Sovine Chris Baird Ann Marie Aubry Bryan Torgerson Kara Dohrenwend Rebecca Andrus Robert Davidson George Carter John Weisheit Slate Stewart Pat Holyoak Jerry McNeely	UDWQ Town of Castle Valley Utah Division of Water Rights Utah Division of Water Rights GWSSA Canyonlands Watershed Council BLM SITLA GCD Moab City USFS Moab Irrigation Co Canyonlands Watershed Council Utah Dept of Food and Ag Grand County San Juan County	Arne Hultquist, Watershed Coordinator

ACTIVITY	DISCUSSION	ACTION
Review Agenda and Introductions	Introductions were made and no changes were suggested for the agenda. There were no objections to the March minutes.	March minutes were approved.
MAWP Website	Arne reported to the group that he updated the web site with the addition of two pages. One page is called Projects, the other is called Letters. Arne has added three letters to the letters page and one project to the project page	Arne will continue updating the Website. Arne will notify the group when updates are made.
Mini-Grant Update	Chris has ordered the kiosk and it should hopefully be installed by our next meeting. Arne has ordered and received 5 dog waste stations, 5 standard signs, 2 special signs, and 2 cases of 3,200 refill bags. He is working with the BLM and the County to have them installed. He has already delivered 800 bags to Sara Melnicoff. Mark Sovine requested some refill bags for the stations GWSSA is putting in at Kens Lake	Chris Baird will have the kiosk signage installed. After the installation, Chris will send Arne an invoice and Arne will request the \$400 reimbursement from DWQ. After the dog waste stations are installed, Arne will request the \$800 reimbursement.
Section 2.3.1 Land Cover	Arne presented the revised of section 2.3.1 with changes to the last to paragraphs to the group. The partners approved the last two paragraphs and the entire Section.	Section 2.3.1 was approved without objections.
Newspaper Update and Water Resources Update	Arne contacted both papers and extended an invite to our meetings and offered an interview. Lisa Church of the Times replied she appreciated the offer and will get back to us.	

Moab Area Watershed Partnership

	Andrew of the Sun Times did not respond. The State Department of Water Resources has not responded to our request to update the Southeastern Utah Water Resource Plan.	
Project Ranking Criteria	Arne presented the project ranking sheet that he developed last spring. No one had objected or offered any suggestions for it. The group suggested we should use it because it brings credibility to our projects. Then we discovered the points only added up to 90 instead of 100. The group added a category for MAWP approval worth up to 10 points. After the ranking was concluded several members suggested we could improve the ranking sheet and will offer suggestion for next year's sheet.	A category for MAWP approval worth up to 10 points was added to the sheet. The group decided to use the sheet with the only change being a new category.
Project Ranking	Prior to ranking the six projects that have been developed, Mark asked the group to consider putting aside the projects and requesting a grant for the groundwater study and management plan. The group contemplated this suggestion and after some discussion it was concluded that a grant for a groundwater quantity study would probably not be funded by the Division of Water Quality (DWQ). Suggestions were made to possibly acquire that funding via a direct grant from DWQ or Division of Water Resources. The group then ranked the six NPS grant applications for projects in the MAWP area. Arne and most partners thought it went very well.	The rankings for the 6 projects are presented after the minutes. Arne will write a letter of support for these projects, get the Chair's review first, and then the partners review prior to sending the letter and projects to DWQ.
Land Exchange	Bryan and other members whom know the details associate with the BLM/SITLA land swap answered questions from the group. In general the partners believe the swap of lands in the MAWP area will be beneficial to agencies impacted and the watersheds as a whole.	
Groundwater Management Plan	We had a few minutes left, and although it was not on the agenda, Bryan brought to the MAWP's attention that the Watershed Coordinator, Arne, had been invited to participate in one joint city/county's meeting where the ground water management plan for Spanish Valley was discussed. Bryan's question was should the MAWP be providing guidance to Arne in this new role. Arne informed the group that neither he nor the MAWP had not been invited to participate in any future meetings. The members indicated they believe the MAWP should be involved with the ground water management plan. Arne's role representing the MAWP was not determined due to time constraints.	
Adjourn	The next meeting will be May 21 at the Grand Center	Adjournment

MAWP Watershed Project Ranking Sheet				
Project Name: Mill Creek Riparian Restoration Project 2014				
Sponsoring Organization: Bureau of Land Management-Moab Field Office				
Contact Person: Ann Marie Aubry			Total Score:90	
Water Quality Benefits	Total Possible: 35			Total Given
Does the project lie within a 303d listed waterbody?	Yes = 5		No = 0	5
Does the project lie within a priority (sub) waterbody?	Yes = 10		No = 0	10
Does the project reduce loading from pollutant(s) the waterbody is listed for?	More than one = 10	One = 5	No = 0	5
How significant is the reduction? (percentage of loading reduction needed to obtain attainment)	More than 10% = 10	5 – 10% = 5	<5% = 0	10
Habitat Benefits	Total Possible: 15			Total Given
How significant are the habitat benefits of the project?	Major = 10	Minor = 5	None = 0	10
Does the project include a habitat management plan?	Yes = 5		No = 0	0
Monitoring/Maintenance	Total Possible: 23			Total Given
Does the project include a monitoring component (defined in a SAP)	Yes = 10		No = 0	10
Does the project have milestones?	Yes = 3		No = 0	3
Does the project account for long term maintenance/sustainability?	Yes = 10		No = 0	10
Economic Issues	Total Possible : 5			Total Given
Will the project be possible without this funding?	Yes = 0		No = 5	5
Partnership Considerations	Total Possible : 8			Total Given
Does the project have numerous technical and/or financial partners?	More than 2 = 4	2 = 2	No = 0	4
Does the project support other management plans, actions, policies, or missions?	Yes = 4		No = 0	4
Public Involvement	Total Possible : 14			Total Given
Is it a high profile project and or does it have widespread public support?	Yes = 4		No = 0	4
Does the project have MAWP support?	100% = 10	100% > & >50% = 5	<50% = 0	10

MAWP Watershed Project Ranking Sheet				
Project Name: Castle Creek Bank Stabilization and TDS Reductions Project				
Sponsoring Organization: Town of Castle Valley				
Contact Person: Dave Erley			Total Score: 80	
Water Quality Benefits	Total Possible: 35			Total Given
Does the project lie within a 303d listed waterbody?	Yes = 5		No = 0	5
Does the project lie within a priority (sub) waterbody?	Yes = 10		No = 0	10
Does the project reduce loading from pollutant(s) the waterbody is listed for?	More than one = 10	One = 5	No = 0	5
How significant is the reduction? (percentage of loading reduction needed to obtain attainment)	More than 10% = 10	5 – 10% = 5	<5% = 0	10
Habitat Benefits	Total Possible: 15			Total Given
How significant are the habitat benefits of the project?	Major = 10	Minor = 5	None = 0	10
Does the project include a habitat management plan?	Yes = 5		No = 0	0
Monitoring/Maintenance	Total Possible: 23			Total Given
Does the project include a monitoring component (defined in a SAP)	Yes = 10		No = 0	10
Does the project have milestones?	Yes = 3		No = 0	3
Does the project account for long term maintenance/sustainability?	Yes = 10		No = 0	0
Economic Issues	Total Possible : 5			Total Given
Will the project be possible without this funding?	Yes = 0		No = 5	5
Partnership Considerations	Total Possible : 8			Total Given
Does the project have numerous technical and/or financial partners?	More than 2 = 4	2 = 2	No = 0	4
Does the project support other management plans, actions, policies, or missions?	Yes = 4		No = 0	4
Public Involvement	Total Possible : 4			Total Given
Is it a high profile project and or does it have widespread public support?	Yes = 4		No = 0	4
Does the project have MAWP support?	100% = 10	100% > & >50% = 5	<50% = 0	10

MAWP Watershed Project Ranking Sheet				
Project Name: Porcupine Fire Bare Ground Stabilization and TDS Reduction Project				
Sponsoring Organization: Town of Castle Valley				
Contact Person: Dave Erley			Total Score: 80	
Water Quality Benefits	Total Possible: 35			Total Given
Does the project lie within a 303d listed waterbody?	Yes = 5		No = 0	5
Does the project lie within a priority (sub) waterbody?	Yes = 10		No = 0	10
Does the project reduce loading from pollutant(s) the waterbody is listed for?	More than one = 10	One = 5	No = 0	5
How significant is the reduction? (percentage of loading reduction needed to obtain attainment)	More than 10% = 10	5 – 10% = 5	<5% = 0	5
Habitat Benefits	Total Possible: 15			Total Given
How significant are the habitat benefits of the project?	Major = 10	Minor = 5	None = 0	10
Does the project include a habitat management plan?	Yes = 5		No = 0	5
Monitoring/Maintenance	Total Possible: 23			Total Given
Does the project include a monitoring component (defined in a SAP)	Yes = 10		No = 0	10
Does the project have milestones?	Yes = 3		No = 0	3
Does the project account for long term maintenance/sustainability?	Yes = 10		No = 0	0
Economic Issues	Total Possible : 5			Total Given
Will the project be possible without this funding?	Yes = 0		No = 5	5
Partnership Considerations	Total Possible : 8			Total Given
Does the project have numerous technical and/or financial partners?	More than 2 = 4	2 = 2	No = 0	4
Does the project support other management plans, actions, policies, or missions?	Yes = 4		No = 0	4
Public Involvement	Total Possible : 4			Total Given
Is it a high profile project and or does it have widespread public support?	Yes = 4		No = 0	4
Does the project have MAWP support?	100% = 10	100% > & >50% = 5	<50% = 0	10

MAWP Watershed Project Ranking Sheet				
Project Name: Mill and Pack Creek Revegetation 2015				
Sponsoring Organization: Rim to Rim Restoration				
Contact Person: Kara Dohrenwend			Total Score:80	
Water Quality Benefits	Total Possible: 35			Total Given
Does the project lie within a 303d listed waterbody?	Yes = 5		No = 0	5
Does the project lie within a priority (sub) waterbody?	Yes = 10		No = 0	10
Does the project reduce loading from pollutant(s) the waterbody is listed for?	More than one = 10	One = 5	No = 0	5
How significant is the reduction? (percentage of loading reduction needed to obtain attainment)	More than 10% = 10	5 – 10% = 5	<5% = 0	10
Habitat Benefits	Total Possible: 15			Total Given
How significant are the habitat benefits of the project?	Major = 10	Minor = 5	None = 0	10
Does the project include a habitat management plan?	Yes = 5		No = 0	0
Monitoring/Maintenance	Total Possible: 23			Total Given
Does the project include a monitoring component (defined in a SAP)	Yes = 10		No = 0	10
Does the project have milestones?	Yes = 3		No = 0	3
Does the project account for long term maintenance/sustainability?	Yes = 10		No = 0	0
Economic Issues	Total Possible : 5			Total Given
Will the project be possible without this funding?	Yes = 0		No = 5	5
Partnership Considerations	Total Possible : 8			Total Given
Does the project have numerous technical and/or financial partners?	More than 2 = 4	2 =2	No = 0	4
Does the project support other management plans, actions, policies, or missions?	Yes = 4		No = 0	4
Public Involvement	Total Possible : 14			Total Given
Is it a high profile project and or does it have widespread public support?	Yes = 4		No = 0	4
Does the project have MAWP support?	100% = 10	100% > & >50% =5	<50% =0	10

MAWP Watershed Project Ranking Sheet				
Project Name: La Sal's Springs/Wetlands Protection and Water Development				
Sponsoring Organization: USFS Manti-La Sal National Forest Moab Ranger District				
Contact Person: Tina Marian			Total Score:90	
Water Quality Benefits	Total Possible: 35			Total Given
Does the project lie within a 303d listed waterbody?	Yes = 5		No = 0	5
Does the project lie within a priority (sub) waterbody?	Yes = 10		No = 0	10
Does the project reduce loading from pollutant(s) the waterbody is listed for?	More than one = 10	One = 5	No = 0	5
How significant is the reduction? (percentage of loading reduction needed to obtain attainment)	More than 10% = 10	5 – 10% = 5	<5% = 0	5
Habitat Benefits	Total Possible: 15			Total Given
How significant are the habitat benefits of the project?	Major = 10	Minor = 5	None = 0	10
Does the project include a habitat management plan?	Yes = 5		No = 0	5
Monitoring/Maintenance	Total Possible: 23			Total Given
Does the project include a monitoring component (defined in a SAP)	Yes = 10		No = 0	10
Does the project have milestones?	Yes = 3		No = 0	3
Does the project account for long term maintenance/sustainability?	Yes = 10		No = 0	10
Economic Issues	Total Possible : 5			Total Given
Will the project be possible without this funding?	Yes = 0		No = 5	5
Partnership Considerations	Total Possible : 8			Total Given
Does the project have numerous technical and/or financial partners?	More than 2 = 4	2 = 2	No = 0	4
Does the project support other management plans, actions, policies, or missions?	Yes = 4		No = 0	4
Public Involvement	Total Possible : 14			Total Given
Is it a high profile project and or does it have widespread public support?	Yes = 4		No = 0	4
Does the project have MAWP support?	100% = 10	100% > & >50% =5	<50% =0	10

MAWP Watershed Project Ranking Sheet				
Project Name: Pack Creek at Wagner St Stream Bank Restoration				
Sponsoring Organization: City of Moab				
Contact Person: Rebecca Andrus			Total Score: 85	
Water Quality Benefits	Total Possible: 35			Total Given
Does the project lie within a 303d listed waterbody?	Yes = 5		No = 0	5
Does the project lie within a priority (sub) waterbody?	Yes = 10		No = 0	10
Does the project reduce loading from pollutant(s) the waterbody is listed for?	More than one = 10	One = 5	No = 0	5
How significant is the reduction? (percentage of loading reduction needed to obtain attainment)	More than 10% = 10	5 – 10% = 5	<5% = 0	5
Habitat Benefits	Total Possible: 15			Total Given
How significant are the habitat benefits of the project?	Major = 10	Minor = 5	None = 0	10
Does the project include a habitat management plan?	Yes = 5		No = 0	0
Monitoring/Maintenance	Total Possible: 23			Total Given
Does the project include a monitoring component (defined in a SAP)	Yes = 10		No = 0	10
Does the project have milestones?	Yes = 3		No = 0	3
Does the project account for long term maintenance/sustainability?	Yes = 10		No = 0	10
Economic Issues	Total Possible : 5			Total Given
Will the project be possible without this funding?	Yes = 0		No = 5	5
Partnership Considerations	Total Possible : 8			Total Given
Does the project have numerous technical and/or financial partners?	More than 2 = 4	2 = 2	No = 0	4
Does the project support other management plans, actions, policies, or missions?	Yes = 4		No = 0	4
Public Involvement	Total Possible : 14			Total Given
Is it a high profile project and or does it have widespread public support?	Yes = 4		No = 0	4
Does the project have MAWP support?	100% = 10	100% > & >50% = 5	<50% = 0	10