

**Jordan River Watershed Council
July 19, 2005 Meeting**

Attendance: Dan Woodbury; Sandy City
Kim Pickett; Sandy City
Garth Miner; Salt Lake Valley Health Department
Barry Tripp; Forestry, Fire and State Lands
Phil Markham; Murray City
John Whitehead; Division of Water Quality
Laura McIndoe; Town of Alta
John Mann; Division of Water Rights
Nathan Darnall; US Fish and Wildlife Service
Jeff Salt; Great Salt Lake Keeper
Steve Jensen; Salt Lake County Public Works Engineering
Kathryn Hernandez; Environmental Protection Agency
Terry Way; Salt Lake County Public Works Engineering
Charles R. Condrat; US Forest Service
Natalie Rees; Salt Lake County Public Works Engineering

Background Information—A powerpoint presentation was provided that went over some background information in regard to: 1) The Jordan River Watershed; 2) History of the Jordan River Watershed Council; 3) Current watershed issues; 4) Impaired waters in the Jordan River Watershed; 5) Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs); 6) Watershed Council goals and objectives, and 7) Anticipated timeline of TMDL. Please refer to the attached PDF of powerpoint presentation.

Discussion of Core Council concerns

1. Composition of the core council was discussed. Questions such as “How large should the council be?” and “Should representatives from the advisory groups sit on the core council?” were explored. Although a clear consensus was not reached, in general members of the core council were concerned with the size of this group—currently, the core council is comprised of 29 agencies/entities. Therefore, the composition of the core council will be limited to regulatory agencies for now. However, careful attention will be given to the advisory groups to assure that the core council hears their concerns and expertise.
2. The logistics of interaction between the core council and the advisory councils were also discussed. Position statements from the advisory groups, brief presentations of their concerns, and personal interaction are the primary ways in which communication will occur between the core council and the advisory groups. However, if other methods are deemed efficient, they will also be employed.
3. A discussion of desired meeting schedule occurred. Based on the discussion provided by members of the core council, meetings will be held on an issue basis; however, updates will be distributed to members of the council on a regular basis.

4. It was determined that in order for the council to operate in an effective and efficient manner, a mission statement is required. A draft mission statement is being sent out with these notes for review by the core council.
5. The need for the core council to be advised in regard to the workings of the advisory groups was discussed. Therefore, a summary of the core council meetings is being sent out with these notes. Updates and summarizes of future meetings will also be provided.
6. Voting logistics were briefly discussed. Currently, these logistics have not been determined. However, the working model is to determine the position of the council through a majority vote. These logistics will be further explored as the composition of the council becomes solidified.
7. The need to include concerns beyond water quality was discussed. Although the TMDLs are a primary concern of the council, it is anticipated that the council will be used to address habitat and other ecological concerns as well.

Closing Thoughts??

The Water Resources Planning and Restoration Program of Salt Lake County will be working to solidify the membership of both the core council and the advisory groups and will notify members of updates to these committees. Additionally, information in regard to source water protection, the Jordan River TMDL, the proposed treatment facility, and other concerns will be distributed as the information becomes available.