

## Greater Rio Grande Watershed Alliance\*

### Minutes of December 16, 2011

10:00 am, NMSU Room 202, Albuquerque NM Branch

<u>Agenda</u>	<u>Attendees:</u>
1) Call to Order	<u>Voting members:</u> Ciudad SWCD- Claunch-Pinto SWCD- Dierdre Tarr Coronado SWCD- Will Ouellete, James Pike, Ted Montoya Cuba SWCD- Brian Velarde East Rio Arriba SWCD- Edgewood SWCD- Lava SWCD- Santa Fe-Pojoaque SWCD- Socorro SWCD- Valencia SWCD- Charlie Sanchez  <u>Partners &amp; Cooperators:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GRGWA Technical Committee members: Susan Rich (NM State Forestry- Forest and Watershed Health Office), Jill Wick (NM Game &amp; Fish), Mike Matush (NM Environment Dept.), Terrell Treat (NM State Forestry- Forest and Watershed Health Office), Joe Zebrowski (New Mexico Forest and Watershed Restoration Institute).</li> <li>• SWCA- David Lightfoot</li> <li>• NM Game &amp; Fish- Cal Baca</li> <li>• Santo Domingo Pueblo- Bob Salter</li> <li>• NM Dept. of Agriculture- Katie Mechenbier</li> <li>• New Mexico Forest and Watershed Restoration Institute- Katie Withnall</li> </ul>
2) Introductions	
3) Approval of Agenda	
4) Approval of Minutes	
5) Correspondence	
6) Funding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- FY2010 Western Competitive Resource Allocation Proposal – States Only &amp; Water Trust Board</li> <li>- Schedule of Projects to be completed by Horizon Environmental Services</li> <li>- FY2012 Water Trust Board Proposal                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop Project Proposals</li> <li>- Report- Susan Rich NMSF (added)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
7) Monitoring Update	
8) Landowner Assistance Requests and Agreements	
9) New Mexico Game and Fish	
10) Partner and Public Comment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Facilitator adoption (added)</li> <li>- Review organization Structure (added)</li> </ul>	
11) Facilitator’s Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Pick next meeting</li> </ul>	
12) Adjourn	

**1) Call to Order:** Joe Zebrowski called the meeting to order at 10:06am. Joe thanked the group for allowing himself and NMFWR I to take on the role of facilitator for these meetings and general administration of the project meetings. He also discussed NMFWR I’s role in taking on more involvement in the monitoring side of GRGWA projects. Will Oullette observed that he was unaware of these developments. Dierdre Tarr explained that NMFWR I’s role was written into the Water Trust Board proposal of 2010. Will expressed concern that the group had not voted on the decision. Dierdre explained NMFWR I’s role had been previously discussed at meetings and that the Water Trust Board proposal had been widely circulated throughout the group. Will asked if NMFWR I’s role was included in the minutes received. Dierdre explained that it was in the copy of the proposal the group received. Will observed that the SWCD districts that represent GRGWA did not have a say in the matter since they did not vote on it. Dierdre explained that since NMFWR I was written into the proposal that GRGWA had to follow it. Will asked who made decisions for GRGWA, whether it was outside collaborators or the voting district members. Joe explained that NMFWR I’s role would be solely as a third party facilitator and that NMFWR I had no voting power. Charlie Sanchez stated that the chairman had not addressed this issue at the previous meeting. He felt that there was a lack of protocol and communication in regard to this issue. It was decided to pause the discussion and return to it at a later point in the agenda.

- 2) Introductions:** Everyone introduced themselves around the table. As there were only 4 districts present there was no quorum and the group was unable to vote during the meeting or make official motions.
- 3) Agenda:** The group reviewed the agenda. It was agreed to add a few items to the agenda: a discussion of the facilitator adoption and a review of the organization structure under the Partner and Public Comment item, and a report by Susan Rich under the Project Proposal section of Funding. It was agreed to informally approve the agenda.
- 4) Minutes:** The minutes of November 10, 2011 were reviewed by the group. Will mentioned that the minutes of the September meeting had never been reviewed or approved. He asserted that his project budget had been cut in a previous meeting of which the minutes were not reviewed. Dierdre maintained that the budget had not been cut. Joe suggested that the conversation continue during the Funding section of the agenda.
- 5) Correspondence:** Dierdre handed out a letter she wrote to NM State Forestry regarding contractor selection. As soon as NM State Forestry approves the letter and contractor, the contractor (Horizon Environmental Services) will be in place to begin work January 9, 2012. Charlie suggested that in the future there should be at least one voting member from the districts to be on the technical committee. Dierdre explained that Jose, as the chairman, was on the technical committee however he did not help to choose the contractor.
- 6) Funding:**
- **FY2010 Water Trust Board:** Dierdre Tarr handed out the individual project budgets. Dierdre clarified the Coronado SWCD budget in regard to Will's concern. She confirmed that they did have an \$80,000 budget and it had not been cut.

Dierdre proposed to move overages from other projects (Valencia 20 acre, Santa Fe- Pojoaque, East Rio Arriba, and Coronado State Park) to cover the Valencia 82 acre project which was under budget by \$27,741. She explained most of the projects had extra money and even after using it to cover the remainder of the Valencia project that there would still be around \$19,000 remaining. She suggested that the extra \$19,000 be kept aside in case any of the current projects were to need it in order to be completed. Dierdre reminded the districts that all still had \$1250.00 to develop more projects. Dierdre said there were no other approved projects in the budget that could spend the overage money. Joe suggested that the group wait and vote on this budget change at the next meeting as there was no quorum. Will agreed. Dierdre agreed.

Dierdre reiterated that only current approved projects could use the extra money. Ted Montoya asked about projects occurring on Santa Ana and San Felipe tribal lands. Dierdre explained that they never developed full proposals, that they had only submitted letters of interest. Susan Rich suggested that if Santa Ana is still interested in developing a project that GRGWA should work with them to develop a proposal for other available funds.

Joe suggested that Dierdre send out the spreadsheet detailing the overages via email before the next meeting.

**Schedule of Projects:** Dierdre Tarr and Terrell Treat will meet with Horizon Environmental Services on December 28 at the East Rio Arriba project site. Horizon plans to begin work on Monday January 9. They will work north to south, first at East Rio Arriba, then move on to Santa Fe-Pojoaque, then to Coronado State

Park, and finally to Valencia. Dierdre will give SWCD's adequate notice before Horizon Environmental begins work on their sites.

Charlie asked if there was a contingency for possible delays in project work due to snow pack and runoff. Dierdre explained that they were aware of those issues and they would be working with the contractors with regards to that.

- **FY2012 Water Trust Board:** Dierdre reminded the group that she handed out the grant proposal for \$600,000 at the previous meeting. She stated that it is very important to have projects lined up and ready to go by the time the grant agreement is signed. The \$1250.00 per district, which was mentioned earlier, can be used to develop these conservation projects. That money can be used for employee time, reimbursements, or contractors to develop a project. The plan must be included as a deliverable when the \$1250.00 is invoiced. The money has to be spent and plans must be completed by March 15. Mike Matush suggested that guidelines for spending this money be sent out for reference. Joe suggested that the Technical Committee make a schedule for receiving completed plans and making recommendations to the committee for which ones to fund. Dierdre reminded the group that GRGWA has a \$45,000 loan that has to be paid back from 2010 funding. Charlie asked Dierdre to send letters to each SWCD with amount due and deadline for payment of the loan. Dierdre agreed.
  - **Report- Susan Rich:** Susan addressed Ciudad SWCD's lack of attendance at GRGWA meetings and lack of GRGWA projects due to staffing issues. After the last meeting she met with Ciudad SWCD, Open Space Division, and the district forester to enable Ciudad to begin planning for the next round of funding. They agreed to work together and begin planning. Susan confirmed that Steve Glass, Board Supervisor of Ciudad would be involved in GRGWA, but was unable to come to this meeting.
- 7) Monitoring Update:** Joe stated that East Rio Arriba and Santa Fe-Pojoaque sites have been completed. He is in the process of figuring out the schedule for Coronado and Valencia sites. He will notify the districts before monitoring as coordinating access is needed. Monitoring will not continue until after first of year. NMFWRI and SWCA will develop a monitoring plan and monitoring handbook. Joe suggested a more in-depth presentation to examine monitoring should occur in the spring.
- 8) Landowner Assistance Requests and Agreements:** Dierdre stated that all paperwork was in order from all districts.
- 9) New Mexico Game & Fish Information:** Cal Baca introduced himself and his program at Fish & Game to the group. NMGF will be expanding funding opportunities on private property to improve wildlife and wildlife habitat. They would like to target the Middle Rio Grande, although the money is not exclusively for that area. Please contact Cal for more information.
- 10) Partner & Public Comment:**
- **Facilitator Adoption/Review Organization Structure:** Joe gave background information on himself and NMFWRI. He expressed that he felt there are weaknesses in communication in GRGWA and believes NMFWRI's role as a third party will help to remedy those issues. He also observed that decision making is driven by the constraints of the fiscal agents, and the group needs to fully understand those rules and regulations.

Will stated that he felt that because GRGWA is an organization made up of districts that GRGWA should be organized with a president, vice-president, etc. He expressed dislike at the new way of operating. Joe stated that Will's proposal would need to be made formal, and the organization would need to be chartered in a different way. He suggested that there are pros and cons to changing the type of organization. Will suggested that his ideas should be brought up when there is a quorum. He added that having minutes and financial reporting in advance would better prepare group members to make decisions on the organizational structure. He stated he would like this topic on the agenda for next meeting. Joe suggested that Will should prepare his proposal in advance and circulate it prior to the next meeting so that the group would have time to review and consider it.

Dierdre stated that the group is working under a memorandum of understanding not under a specific charter, bylaws or anything else. She stated that NMFWR1 was written into the Water Trust Board grant to help with facilitation, meeting minutes, and similar administrative tasks. She explained that using a third party as a facilitator allows the 12 districts to remain equal voting partners.

Charlie inquired as to who would sign any correspondence on behalf of GRGWA and whether the facilitator would have that authority. He suggested having an official chairman who opens the meetings and then turns them over to the facilitator. Dierdre stated there are no letters or correspondence to be signed, therefore the issue was moot. Will asked who the leader of GRGWA was. Dierdre stated that all 12 districts were in charge. Will asked who was in charge of the 12 districts. Dierdre stated this was discussed at a previous meeting over a year ago. It was reiterated that all districts were equal and had equal voting power. Charlie stated that he was not opposed to having a facilitator but was concerned that there was not a single member of the districts that was in charge of signatory authority or similar tasks. Dierdre restated that GRGWA has nothing to sign. Dierdre stated that if there were to be any correspondence in the future that all 12 districts would have to sign it.

Joe and Cal suggested that the organizational structure would need to be reviewed and voted upon after weighing the pros and cons. Charlie stated that his issue was that having a facilitator, chairperson or any other structural elements were not voted on by the group. He felt that those are decisions the voting members need to have a say in. Will agreed. Terrell stated that they would still have to follow the guidelines of the grant. Dierdre stated that when the districts signed the memorandum of understanding that they were agreeing to those terms.

It was agreed to revisit this topic at the next meeting. Joe suggested that all members re-familiarize themselves with the memorandum of understanding prior to the next meeting.

#### **11) Faciliator's Discussion**

- a) **Pick next meeting:** The group considered the next meeting date. The group set January 27<sup>th</sup>, 2012 at 10am at the same location for the next meeting date.

#### **12) Joe stated that the meeting could adjourn at 11:57 am without a motion. The group agreed and the meeting adjourned.**

\*(FKA) Upper Rio Grande Phreatophyte Control Project