



Bridgerland Water Group (BWG) – Meeting Four Minutes -Monday, March 21, 2016

Attended by:

BWG Members	Advisory Members & Visitors	Project Staff
Michael Gibbons (Agriculture, Farming)	Mark Anderson (Outside legal counsel for Cache County)	Josh King (Facilitator, The Langdon Group)
Barbara Tidwell (Banking, Business)	Bob Fotheringham (Cache County Water Manager)	Andrea Gumm (Facilitator, The Langdon Group)
Jim Gass (Former Smithfield City Manager)	Lisa Welsh (Utah State University, Natural Resources)	Chris Slater (J-U-B Engineers)
Jennefer Parker (U.S. Forest Services, Park Ranger)	Shaun Dustin (Nibley City Mayor)	Elise Egbert (Duo Marketing Group)
Clark Israelsen (Agriculture and Natural Resources)	Max Pierce (Cornish City Council Member, Hyde Park City Engineer)	Marcie Lyons (Duo Marketing Group)
Kymber Housley (Legal, Logan City Attorney)	Craig Buttars (Cache County Executive)	
Jim Huppi (Utah State University, Landscape Architecture, Cache Highline Water Association)	Keith Shaw	
Dave Erickson (Cache County Council, Education, Farming)	Bryan Dixon	
Ruth Maughan (Former Wellsville City Mayor)		
Dave Rayfield (Bear River Land Conservancy, Environmental)		
Jon White (Cache County Council, Ranching)		

Meeting Purpose:

- Approve Minutes from 3/7/2016 meeting
- Discuss schedule
- Make final decision on name and website
- Refinements to Articles 2 and 3

Agenda:

Topic 1: Review Minutes and Address Administrative Items

- Josh King, facilitator, welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed the agenda. Josh presented the meeting minutes from 3/7/2016. No corrections were proposed and they were approved unanimously by the group.

- Barbara told the group about a letter left on her doorstep by Mr. Thompson. The letter stated concern about using the word “conservancy” in the name of the water district.
- Josh presented an updated project timeline, noting that the petition timeline was left in for reference, even though the group decided to go the route of a resolution. The timeline was created based on Election Day, and tasks were backed out from that date.
 - Dave R.: It says we should have a February and March piece. I assume those are PR pieces?
 - Josh: That was referencing talking points and items for the county. We have completed these tasks.

 - Jennefer: Who would be responsible for outreach and engagement?
 - Josh: The scope and extent of that will be determined by this group. You will decide if this needs to be a strong grassroots effort with the group taking ownership or if this is more of a PR and outreach effort through a firm, or combination of both.

 - Jim H.: You are showing on the timeline that adoption of resolution in May. Do we need to be getting in front of councils to get on the schedule?
 - Kymber: Every city runs different. Logan City doesn't need that type of lead time, but with budgets, some advanced notice is required.
 - Craig: Mayor Peterson asked that we present to the city council in a workshop on April 5, and then at the meeting on April 19, where Logan City Council could make a decision. His request was to come in April because of the budget. The earlier that we can get the resolution out to the municipalities the better.
 - Bob: Mayor Peterson wanted a separate resolution for Logan City and not combined with another community.
 - Dave R.: What do we need for the workshop?
 - Mark: They will want to see the resolution.
 - Kymber: What they are going to want to know is why we need a conservancy district, rather than the details of getting there. We need to provide an answer as to why the WCD should provide the services rather than the county.
 - Craig: They will want examples of what a WCD can do for Logan City.

 - Barbara: Is this something we need to take to the other municipalities, too?
 - Dave R.: Yes.

- Kymber: What we have decided is important. (Number of board, voting districts, etc.) The bigger question is benefit of the district.
- Ruth: The big question is if there will be an expense.
- Dave E.: And if there is a savings, county wide.

- Josh: What are the requirements to get them to pass the resolution?

- Mark: We have taken major steps to draft the resolution. We can have a customized version of the resolution prior to the next meeting.

- Jim G. A lot of the city council members won't do homework before the meeting. And they won't feel comfortable at the initial meeting to pass a resolution.
- Josh: We met with all the city councils last year. They have a copy of a draft resolution with areas left blank where decisions needed to be made (e.g., number of board members). It won't be the first time they have heard this information.
- Jon: We need answers ready to questions. They are going to want to provide input. They want to participate in making this resolution for them.

- Josh: When we use the term resolution, do we all know what that means?
- Mark: A resolution is a formal document that can be acted upon by the legislative body of the county or municipalities.

- Dave R.: Why would we not want to go in with what we have determined in these meetings? Even if the public wasn't involved, we wouldn't have time to change it.
- Jon: If you go in there and say, "This is the resolution. Here is what we think is best." They aren't going to adopt it until they give their input.

- Kymber: Once this goes on the ballot, does it have to pass by majority by each city? My conclusion is that once it is on the ballot, it just has to pass by the district.
- Mark: That is correct. That is what the statute says. A municipality can withdraw from the process through the protest period.
- Barbara: Once they pass the resolution, can they make changes to it in the future?
- Mark: If the votes approve the creation of the district, the county/city can't go back and change anything. At that point, the voters have decided what they want. The only control the county will have after the creation of the district is the irrigated agriculture representative will be appointed by the county council. If a community doesn't participate now, a boundary adjustment could be made, in the future, to annex the community back in.

- Josh: The requirements for draft resolutions:
 1. Area and boundary
 2. Name

3. Services to be provided
 4. Method of paying costs of providing services
 5. Tax rate
 6. Number of board members and initial board make-up
- Craig: How is the district funded the first two years?
 - Mark: The County would provide funding the first two years.
 - Dave R.: City Council members and the public will ask about costs.
 - Mark: We can't truthfully answer that. In my opinion, you don't know what projects they will take on. There are too many unknowns to say for sure, long term, what the costs will be. In the short term, it won't change. The county will continue to tax at the rate their taxing, then, the WCD will pick up that slack and the county will decrease funding.
 - Shaun: This is an easy question to answer. In the short term, the district is tax neutral because the funding comes from the county. In the long term, it depends on what we as a district want to do. If we decide we want to show up at meetings in Salt Lake and tell people not to use water, then it costs nothing. If we build a dam, it will cost a lot. In four years, the citizens of the county will be making that determination.
 - Bob: Can the resolution state that it will be tax neutral for four years?
 - Mark: I don't see a problem with that.
- Assignments for scheduling city council meetings (5 minute presentation, 10 minute Q&A)
 - Jim G.: Smithfield, North Logan
 - Jon: Paradise, Hyrum and Mendon
 - Dave E. Richmond, Clarkston, Newton, Amalga
 - Kymber: Logan
 - Mike: Lewiston, Trenton
 - Max: Cornish (April 21 at 7 p.m.)
 - Ruth: Wellsville
 - Dave R.: Hyde Park
 - Shaun: Nibley, Providence, Millville, River Heights
 - Barbara – wants to go along
 - Dave R. asked Bob to report on the Water Users Conference.
 - Bob: This conference is a place where water users in the state get together and talk about water issues. The first general session was given by the NRCS on the current water outlook/supply in Utah. The Bear River Basin is a little below normal by snow pack, but that could still change if we get a couple rain events or if we don't get anything. The second general session was about Prepare 60 – a group that the governor is quasi working with. This group includes Washington County WCD,

Jordan Valley WCD, Weber Basin WCD, and Central Utah WCD. They tackle issues surrounding how the state gets the water it needs in the future. Utah sits ok because they plan well. This is the group that proposed SB80. They talked about a state water plan and how they will fund that.

- Mark: The legislature approved a 1/16 percent sales tax increment that will come over to the water side from the transportation side over time after five years. 15-20 years ago, this 1/16 was on the water side and it was given to transportation.

Topic 2: Branding and Public Relations

- Josh: At the last meeting, we discussed the name. DUO group brought some names and logo revisions. Are there any legal issues using the word “conservancy” in the district name?
 - Mark: We are not required to keep conservancy in the name.
- Discussion took place regarding the inclusion of the word conservancy. Some feared that it limited the group in their undertaking (some might perceive that conservancy is all the group does), and with failed efforts to do this in the past, the word “conservancy” might bring that up for people. Others felt that it was important to keep the word conservancy because it is something the group will be doing, and it is important for people and for the future of water resources. After discussion, the name Cache Water District was motioned, seconded and passed unanimously by the group
- Duo Group: Passed out proposal/price on website. The website would be responsive (mobile device-friendly). Updates and frequency price can be adjusted. Duo group could also train someone to do the updates.
 - Bob: The county will plan on being trained to post updates to reduce the per month update fee.
- Motion to approve the basic website passed unanimously by the group.

Topic 3: Article 2

- Mike: Didn't we talk about making a mention of hostile takeover of irrigation companies?
 - Mark: I don't think a hostile takeover is a practical possibility, but if it would make people feel better, I don't have a problem adding that language, although it does draw attention to the issue.
 - Jim H.: I can see some of these small irrigation companies asking us to take them over.
 - Mark: That wouldn't be a hostile takeover.

- After group discussion, Mark agreed to add a paragraph regarding irrigation companies and a restriction on hostile takeovers of them.

Topic 4: Article 3

- Mark: At the staff level, we are reasonably comfortable with the draft bylaws if the group is reasonably comfortable with it.
 - Clark: Change the title.
 - Mark: Noted.
- Other word changes and discussion about the Bear River Development took place. Andrea made edits to the purpose statement in real time and Mark will refine and bring another draft to the next meeting.