



# Ventura River Watershed Council

## Meeting Summary

Tuesday February 28, 2012

*Our mission is to facilitate and support efforts by individuals, agencies, and organizations to maintain and improve the health and sustainability of the Ventura River watershed.*

### 2. Brief announcements, updates & comments

Bob Thiel, California Coastal Conservancy, announced that copies of the Ventura River Parkway Vision brochure are available; for extra copies contact Diane Underhill, Kathy Bremer or Paul Jenkin. Also, in May, the Coastal Conservancy board will consider a staff recommendation to award the Ojai Valley Land Conservancy a \$300,000 grant for development of the Steelhead Preserve (formerly Hollingsworth Ranch) on the Ventura River into an environmental education center. Once completed, it will be the only watershed education center in the county other than the visitor's centers at the Channel Islands National Park and the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area in Thousand Oaks. Letters of support for this important project were requested.

Greg Gamble, Ojai Valley Land Conservancy, reported that the education and conservation center envisioned at the Hollingsworth Ranch would use existing buildings, and maybe a new building, and would expand the Conservancy's existing outdoor education program by adding an indoor component. The center would interpret the natural resources onsite, as well as the cultural resources. It would double as a conservation center and visitor center, could serve as a community meeting center, and there would be office space for researchers. The Department of Fish and Game and the Coastal Conservancy funded the original property acquisition.

Marty Melvin, Resource Conservation District, introduced Sonja Webb, an engineer, and Katie Haldeman, an environmental scientist and watershed planner, who have joined the RCD staff. They'll be working on the mobile lab, conservation planning, TMDL, and other projects.

Dale Zurawski, Ventura County Irrigated Agricultural Lands Projects, announced that she just finished 11 classes to bring the farming community up to speed on the first five years of water quality monitoring results, and is planning four on-farm tours for the spring to allow farmers to see examples of best management practices.

Lorraine Walter, Ventura River Watershed Coordinator, introduced her intern Cassie Quan. Cassie described her work researching the costs and permits involved in getting "entering the watershed" and river crossing signs erected in the watershed. She also circulated a preliminary map of horse and livestock operations that she created via drive-by surveys.

Sergio Vargas, Ventura County Watershed Protection District (WPD), reported on the update of FEMA's flood insurance maps. FEMA started in 2009 to update the Ventura River watershed's flood insurance maps. In Dec., WPD learned that FEMA was proposing new levee guidelines. When these guidelines are released in May, FEMA can proceed with the flood insurance maps. WPD should know by the end of the year when FEMA can release the draft maps, which will include the Ventura River, San Antonio Creek, and other major tributaries. WPD has been working with FEMA for the last two years on another effort to remap east Ojai floodplains and flood hazard areas. This is a very challenging because the alluvial fans in that area require a different and very complex approach. WPD hopes to complete this project in the next few months.

Louise Lampara, with Aera Energy, announced that she is hoping to make some contacts to discuss some mitigation opportunities.

## Watershed Council

### 3. New logo

The Council approved the new logo.

### 4. Charter proposal

Lorraine suggested that before we launch work on the watershed management plan, it may be an appropriate time to pause and think about where we've been and where we're going as a council, and to consider whether, going forward, it would be helpful to have some form of a governance structure. Lorraine reviewed the Council's milestones, from original formation until today. (See attached Powerpoint.) Lorraine explained several reasons why adoption of a charter might be beneficial to the Council, (see attached memo to the Council), and reviewed sections of the WCVC charter, including the section that outlines the Watershed Council's responsibilities as a WCVC subcommittee. Lynn inserted that the WCVC Steering Committee is reviewing their charter, and may be revising their decision-making structure also.

Lorraine explained that she drafted the proposed charter using examples from other watershed councils, pulling from many good examples in the Pacific Northwest. Her aim was to keep the language as simple as possible to begin with. The four key features of the charter were explained, (see attached Powerpoint), and the preliminary feedback received thus far was characterized. A proposed list of Leadership Committee members was presented.

Following are points raised during the ensuing discussion:

- Will we be adding people to the Leadership Committee, in the business/landowner category, who have not been regular participants and aren't familiar with the issues.
- Some important participants, such as from the planning departments of local government, will hopefully get involved via subcommittees, but it is not appropriate to expect them to attend most of our regular meetings.
- The proposed number of members, by category, on the Leadership Committee are meant to be minimums, not maximums.
- Meiners Oaks Water District will be included on the Leadership Committee.
- The Regional Water Quality Control Board staff cannot vote, so will not be on the Leadership Committee.
- The composition of the Leadership Committee may grow and change, but for now the list is a good representation of our participants.
- A quorum will be a simple majority.
- Lynn noted that the Council hasn't voted that often in the past. Voting occurred on grant funds, on the objectives that went into the IRWM Plan, and on the performance measures in the IRWMP. But voting has not yet been on the level of detail a watershed management plan will require.
- As we go forward, the Council will no doubt need to establish subcommittees by topic, bringing in technical experts, etc.
- In order for our watershed management plan to be successful, it will be important to have buy-in from policy makers early on.
- It is important to get some county planning people engaged in this process so we don't spend lots of time working on policies that are not compatible with the General Plan.
- There are a couple levels of votes we may take. Some votes may be easily decided by consensus, others are more appropriate for a structured vote, such as from the Leadership Committee. If our very broad-based group wants to make a recommendation to a regulatory entity like a city or county, a structured vote would carry more weight.

- We may want to offer to record, for the record, the votes all members, even those not on the Leadership Committee.
- It is important not to disenfranchise nonvoting members. The Leadership Committee could just recommend positions to the larger group to consider.
- A good reason to have the decision-making structure is to vote on project funding.

After discussing the issue fairly extensively, Bert Rapp, of Ventura River County Water District, made a motion that the group adopt the proposed charter as a draft, and have the Executive Committee meet to develop any needed modifications to the language, which would be brought back to the Council. Leadership Committee members from each of the five categories will select one or two members to serve on the Executive Committee for this purpose.

## **5. Meeting schedule**

Lorraine made the suggestion that the Council meet a total of eight times per year to leave more time for members to attend WVCV meetings and subcommittee meetings, and for her to get work more done.

Dale Zurawski, of Ventura County Farm Bureau, objected to this idea, preferring the old schedule of the second Tuesday of every month. Dale emphasized that we have a lot of activity in the watershed, the trash and algae TMDLs, the parkway project, and others, and that it takes a long time to reach consensus. In addition two of the Council's meetings will now be in the evening, and those will be less business focused. Dale also emphasized the value of networking and establishing relationships at these meetings.

Lynn mentioned that she will be holding more WVCV special meetings as part of the IRWMP update. For example, the climate change workshop in March, then probably a meeting of the Council off-cycle to talk about climate change and the IRWMP.

Karen Waln, city of Ventura, suggested that maybe when we have an evening meeting, we could have a short daytime meeting in advance that month to tend to business matters. Lorraine commented that short meetings are as much work for her as long meetings, and she does not disagree with Dale's point of view, but it is simply a concern about time: if monthly meetings are preferred, then the group just needs to accept that the watershed management plan will take more time.

Greg Gamble, of Ojai Valley Land Conservancy (OVLC), supported the idea of eight meetings in order to give Lorraine more time to work on the plan. He said that was the first thing on the list in the job description. Dale said she thought we hired a watershed coordinator to coordinate this Council. She said a plan is something that sits there and doesn't get read; but when people get in a room and talk, that is how collaboration occurs. She expressed concern that Lorraine has become an instrument of OVLC. Marty said he thought running the group was the first item on the job description.

Greg recounted the process that occurred to hire the watershed coordinator, including inviting everybody on the Council to help write the job description. The group that worked on it determined that they needed the coordinator to write a watershed management plan, but you couldn't have a plan without coordinating the meetings and getting everybody's engagement. Greg said the Council approved the job description, that OVLC is not co-opting the coordinator; it is doing a service to the group by hosting it, which is a little bit of a burden to OVLC.

Dale said she doesn't mind the plan being number one, but thinks number two should be this Council.

Jeff reiterated that because we have so much going on in the watershed, there are going to be lots of other topical meetings. When we get to climate change and floodplain management and TMDLs, we're not going to be able to have those discussions in a half an hour, which is all the time we can allocate at this business meeting.

Russ suggested that we may have a case of the reorganization jitters, and that we should give this some time and see if it works.

Dale moved that the Council accept the proposed meeting schedule, but that at the Dec. 11 meeting, we have a discussion about how people felt about the meeting frequency. Mike Merewether pointed out that there were unbalanced intervals between some of the meetings; Lorraine will attempt to correct that.

## **Watershed Management Plan**

### **6. Our watershed management plan's purpose**

This item was tabled until the May meeting.

### **7. Integration with the IRWMP update**

Lorraine indicated that she intends to try to harmonize as much as possible with Lynn's deadlines for updating the IRWM plan by helping her develop the Ventura River watershed content she needs, which would also be used in our watershed management plan.

## **Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County, IRWMP (Lynn Rodriguez)**

### **8. Climate Change Workshop**

In the update to our IRWMP, we have to comply with the new state guidelines, which include addressing climate change adaptation and mitigation. As part of this effort, the WCVC is hosting a free workshop at the Ventura County Government Center on March 15, from 9:00 am– 1:00 pm. The Watersheds Coalitions of Upper Santa Clara River and Santa Barbara County were invited to participate. The Dept. of Water Resources representative for climate change, Lauma Jurkevics, will be the keynote speaker. She'll be showing a video about climate change and water from a statewide perspective. Karen asked if the state would be talking about how we have to address climate change in our grants. Lynn said this is just an overview workshop, focusing specifically on the IRWM process, and not other climate change requirements, such as in CEQA.

### **9. WCVC Steering Committee proposed change**

Greg explained a proposal that came out of the WCVC Steering Committee. The Steering Committee now comprises six representatives: two from each of the county's three major watersheds. At the Santa Clara Watershed Committee, the suggestion arose—in the process of voting to replace a member—that it would be helpful to have a countywide perspective vote, someone who had the entire county in mind. The group specifically had the Watershed Protection District in mind because they are such an important player in all the watersheds. So the idea of a six-plus-one Steering Committee composition was suggested. Greg also put on the table the idea of a three-plus-two alternative; one from each watershed and two countywide members. A countywide member could not bring a countywide project to the committee. The Watershed Protection District, the Farm Bureau, and the Resource Conservation District are the three entities with a countywide perspective that are active in our Council.

Dale said she is uncomfortable having only one member from each watershed. She suggested keeping the six, and adding two countywide members. Karen said she liked the idea of one, but not of two countywide members. Jeff suggested that the plus-one scenario allows for more external steering, whereas with the six-member composition, watersheds have to dialogue with the other watersheds to get a project advanced.

After the discussion a vote was taken, and most were opposed to changing from the current Steering Committee membership structure. Jeff suggested that the vote results indicate that we need to work together more with the other watersheds. Lynn said that we originally had a lot more meetings at the WCVC level. When the subcommittees became more active we began meeting less, mostly only when we have actionable items. Marty suggested that less interest in the countywide meetings may be because there is less of a financial incentive.

## **10. Proposition 50 & 84**

Prop 50: We just got an extension for one more year to allow more time to complete projects. The V6 project also got a boost of funding.

Prop 84: The county recently received a \$17.3 million dollar implementation grant, including \$500,000 for the Ojai Meadows Preserve restoration project. Lynn is still working with the state on the contract. There will be another round of Prop 84 implementation funding. It is an extremely expensive grant to apply for (~\$200,000). It is also costly to the project proponents because they pay a part of the application and administration costs. After a workshop in Dec. focused on how to make the process easier and more affordable, the state established a two-step grant process. The first step being a simpler application; if they like your project they invite you back for the full proposal. Winter is the soonest the next proposal solicitation package may be out.

## **11. IRWM Plan Update**

There have been some delays on the plan update because of the time involved with grant invoicing. Besides the invoices, Lynn has been focused on the governance section, climate change, and data management. A big part of the IRWM plans is to have a robust and accessible source of data. Lynn is working to develop a one-stop portal for accessing watershed data throughout the county. She is securing the services of a company that specializes in this. Data could either be uploaded and available on the site, or accessed by linking to other websites. The portal would include GIS data and images. Some regions are using data portals like these for organizing data by project. Lynn is using data from the V1 project as her prototype. She anticipates creating a data management committee to work on the project. Karen asked about how the data would be kept current, and asked to see a prototype before the project gets too far along in development.

## **12. Upcoming IRWM meetings**

The climate change workshop is the next important meeting.

## **13. Santa Clara River and Calleguas Creek Watershed Committees**

The Board of Supervisors will adopt a resolution on May 1 that recognizes May as Watershed Awareness Month. On May 2<sup>nd</sup> from 4:00 – 7:00 p.m., there will be a watershed awareness event at the Faulkner Farm in Santa Paula; there will be a series of people will speak on different issues in the watershed.

## **Other Updates**

### **14. May Watershed Awareness Month plans**

Lorraine reported on efforts to collectively promote various water-related events in May as part of Water Awareness Month. (May is both “water” and “watershed” awareness month; our group opted for “water.”) She encouraged members to consider scheduling tours or other educational events that month, and to send Lorraine the details to be included on the watershed-wide list. The committee working on the promotion will hold a lunch meeting on March 22 to continue coordination. Let Lorraine know if you’d like to attend.

Ron announced that Casitas Water District will hold an irrigation and smart controllers workshop on April 28.

### **15. Algae TMDL**

Ben Pitterle, of Santa Barbara Channelkeeper, announced that Al Leydecker just released a report summarizing the predawn monitoring that Channelkeeper has done for the last four plus years. Channelkeeper’s Stream Team volunteers have been going out before the sun comes up once a month during the algae season to take dissolved oxygen (DO) measurements to determine what chemical effects algae growth in the watershed might be having. Al’s report offers a pretty sophisticated analysis of the data. One of the report’s main conclusions is that these broader, seasonal fluctuations in the hydrograph—big rain event years and flow fluctuations over seasons and multiple years—weigh heavily on how algae affect the river. Ben said this watershed is very fortunate to have Al and the contribution he makes. Al has really studied this particular issue and from a more technical perspective.

And he draws his own conclusions. So he is a very impartial, knowledgeable expert on this issue. It would be a good idea to have him come and talk to this Council sometime soon.

Jeff said the report offered a pretty consistent look at DO in the river. There are a lot of factors in play when it comes to algae, and they are very complicated, and it points to the need for including sensitivity analyses as we move forward with watershed projects to tackle these complicated processes.

Jeff reported that he has been trying to talk to the Regional Board about the dates of the TMDL process, and it looks like the March, 2013 date for the EPA approval has no chance of moving. So the back end isn't moving, but the front end of the schedule keeps sliding. The Board has had some staffing issues. Still there is no date scheduled for the CEQA scoping session. Once it starts, it will be a very fast process.

#### **16. Biodigester Feasibility Study Kickoff**

Moira Barron, of Meiners Oaks Water District, is on the steering committee for the biodigester project. She received feedback that the feasibility study kickoff meeting on Feb. 21 was not well advertised, and that interested stakeholders did not hear about it. Martha Symes, of the Watershed Protection District, reported that the consultant, AECOM, is analyzing available information on the feedstocks, and will produce a draft report. She acknowledged that the kickoff meeting was a little rushed, and there could have been more communication. She also pointed out that the study will be looking not just at horse manure, but all feedstocks that could support a biodigester. Karen suggested that the Council's April 3 evening meeting could offer a venue to get more information out to the stakeholders.

#### **17. Local Groundwater Assistance Grant**

Lorraine reported that a group of people interested in pursuing the Local Groundwater Assistance grant has met once already and was scheduled to meet after this meeting. Two grant proposal ideas are in the works: one would develop a groundwater management plan for the Upper Ventura River groundwater basin, and one would study the relationship between groundwater pumping and surface flows.

#### **18. Ventura River Watershed Protection Plan Report**

Sergio thanked everybody for their comments on the draft Ventura River Watershed Protection Plan Report. He said a section on flood protection was added to the report, which should serve as a good base for working on the watershed management plan. The report is up on WPD's website.

#### **Next Watershed Council meeting:**

**April 3, 2012, 6 – 9:00 p.m., at the Oak View Community Center, 18 Valley Road, Oak View**

#### **Acronyms**

IRWMP.... Integrated Regional Watershed Management Program  
RWQCB... Regional Water Quality Control Board  
V1 ..... Ventura River Watershed Protection Project Grant (\$1,545,538)  
V6 ..... Senior Canyon Mutual Water Company Automation Upgrades Grant (\$488,462)  
VRWC..... Ventura River Watershed Council  
WPD..... Watershed Protection District  
WCVC..... Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County

## Ventura River Watershed Council Milestones

- 2002-04** Ventura Countywide Integrated Regional Water Management Group established to address Proposition 50.
- May, 2006** Ventura River Watershed Council formed.
- Nov, 2006** Ventura County Integrated Regional Water Management Plan completed.
- Jan, 2008** \$3,349,000 in Proposition 50 funding received (Ventura River Watershed Protection Project, San Antonio Creek Spreading Grounds, Senior Canyon Water Co. Equipment Upgrades).
- Mar, 2009** Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County adopts charter and selects Steering Committee.
- Jan, 2011** \$500,000 in Proposition 84 funding received (Ojai Meadows Restoration).
- Feb, 2011** \$100,000 received (Biogestor Feasibility Study).
- Sep, 2011** Watershed coordinator hired.
- Jan, 2012** Developed organizational identity (mission statement, logo, website).
- \*Now\***
- Mar, 2012** Begin development of a Watershed Management Plan; expand stakeholder participation.

## Reasons to Consider More Structure

- Help ensure a plan we can commit to.**
- More to manage.**
- Deadlines/Need for efficiency.**
- Provide staff direction.**

## Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County Charter

### A. Watershed Committee Responsibilities

The Watershed Committees consist of a broad range of stakeholders within each watershed. They meet regularly as necessary to fulfill the following responsibilities.

1. Develop and update goals, priorities and performance measures for the watershed.
2. Develop a watershed plan and prioritize integrated programs and projects.
3. Set watershed project priorities via criteria or other chosen methods for integration.
4. Coordinate integrated projects among watershed project proponents.
5. Review grant opportunities and associated program guidelines for possible recommendation to the Steering Committee.
6. Provide a forum for outreach and stakeholder participation.
7. Select two representatives to serve on the WCVC Steering Committee.
8. Develop integrated, inter-watershed projects.

## Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County Charter

### B. Steering Committee Responsibilities

The Steering Committee consists of two representatives from each watershed and the Program Director... The Steering Committee shall have the following responsibilities.

1. Obtain feedback and information from the Watershed Committees.
2. Serve as an information conduit between Program Director and the Watershed Committees.
3. Provide financial oversight for the IRWM Program.
4. Review the IRWM Plan updates and revisions and provide feedback to WCVC general membership for ratification.
5. Set and weigh criteria for grant project ranking.
6. Review grant opportunities as recommended by the Watershed Committees.
7. Review Watershed Committees' input for specific grant applications.
8. Develop recommendations for WCVC general membership ratification for the "suite" of IRWM projects to be included in a WCVC grant application.

## Key Features of Proposed Charter

1. Establishes a Leadership Committee (18+ members), and assigns one vote per member.
2. Establishes an Executive Committee (6 members) to address administrative issues.
3. Outlines decision-making procedures.
4. Establishes a governance instrument that can be expanded and amended as the group evolves.

## Preliminary Feedback

1. General agreement that we may need something more structured for decision making, but also feelings of "it's been working fine the way it is."
2. A very strong sentiment of not wanting anyone who is not on the Leadership Committee to feel excluded.
3. Questions about the best way to "categorize" our members (government, nonprofit, etc.).

### Proposed 2012 Meeting Schedule

Feb 28, Tuesday E.P. Foster Library Topping Room, Ventura 9:00 – 11:30 am  
**Apr 3, Wednesday Oak View Community Center, Kunkle Room, 6:00 – 9:00 pm**  
May 9, Wednesday Ventura County Govt. Center, 10:00 am – 12:00 pm  
Jun 13, Wednesday Ventura County Govt. Center, 10:00 am – 12:00 pm  
Aug 8, Wednesday Ventura County Govt. Center, 10:00 am – 12:00 pm  
**Oct 3, Wednesday Oak View Community Center, Kunkle Room, 6:00 – 9:00 pm**  
Nov 27, Tuesday E.P. Foster Library Topping Room, Ventura, 9:00 – 11:30 am  
Dec 11, Tuesday Ventura County Govt. Center, 10:00 am – 12:00 pm

### IRWM Plan Update Schedule

Apr 2012 Revise Region Description  
Jun 2012 Develop Governance Section  
Jun 2012 Revise Objectives  
Dec 2012 Revise Project Review Process & Review Projects  
Dec 2012 Update Data Management Process





Ventura River Watershed Council  
c/o Ojai Valley Land Conservancy  
PO Box 1092, Ojai, CA 93024  
[www.venturawatershed.org](http://www.venturawatershed.org)  
[info@venturawatershed.org](mailto:info@venturawatershed.org)  
805/649-6852 x4

February 21, 2012

TO: Ventura River Watershed Council  
FROM: Lorraine Walter, Ventura River Watershed Coordinator  
SUBJECT: Recommendation to consider adopting a basic organizational charter, at the outset of the watershed management plan development process, to help guide decision-making and staff, and to help ensure an efficient and effective outcome.

The watershed Council has been in existence since May of 2006. The Wetlands Recovery Task Force of Ventura County, a program of the California Coastal Conservancy, had the original idea to form the council. At the same time, the Watershed's Coalition of Ventura County (WCVC) was working on developing an Integrated Regional Water Management Plan and needed a stakeholders group from each of the watersheds for that process. And so it happened that WCVC's program manager was able to serve as the Watershed Council's coordinator during its first five years.

Although the WCVC has a charter, the Watershed Council has operated since its inception as an unstructured group. In its role as a WCVC subcommittee, the Council helped make decisions about the Ventura River watershed component of the Integrated Regional Watershed Management Plan, and has prioritized projects for funding through Propositions 50 and 84. In addition, the group decided to hire a watershed coordinator, and agreed that position would be housed with the Ojai Valley Land Conservancy. These decisions were made using the consensus of the members in attendance, except that only one representative from any given agency could vote.

Other than these decisions, the group's primary purpose has been to serve as a networking forum for agencies, water districts, and organizations that have mandates or concerns related to the watershed. Coming to agreement on controversial issues has not generally been required.

Attendance at the Council meetings has been relatively consistent, both from public agencies with water-related mandates, such as local government and water districts; and from nonprofits and businesses, such as environmental organizations and growers. Attendance is usually around 20 people.

Looking forward, the Council, with the help of the watershed coordinator, intends to adopt a watershed management plan that lays out, in a fairly fine level of detail, the priorities for the watershed. This undertaking marks a potentially significant transition for the Council that warrants consideration of adopting of a more formal organizational structure.

**A plan we can commit to.** Although watershed management plans have no regulatory authority of their own, the very purpose of such plans is cross-jurisdictional cooperative planning, and the participation of the various entities involved implies a commitment to the goals and objectives of the plan. If participants really "mean it," then adoption of a watershed management plan is not an insignificant commitment; and the process of developing the plan, and its ultimate content, really matter.

A formal commitment to the process of developing a fine-scale watershed management plan by way of a charter should help to ensure the desired commitment to the final plan and its specific goals and objectives.

**More to manage.** A standard part of the process for development of watershed management plans is reaching out to “stakeholders” of all kinds, from all sectors, in order to ensure that the goals and objectives of the resulting plan are truly representative of community that the plan is intended to serve. So the Council will be inviting more members of the community to the table. If we do our job well then, attendance at our Council meetings will increase, or at least the number of different people involved in the process will increase, such as through participation in subcommittees or task-oriented teams that may be formed. Increased participation is not just an issue of numbers; some of the issues the Council must deal with could be found threatening to certain groups of people. Examples include steelhead, homeless, Matilija Dam, oil fields, water rights, horses and cattle, public access, groundwater management, pesticides, water budget, property rights, and levees. A clear structure and process to help us fairly address differences of opinion while continuing to move forward could prove helpful.

**Deadlines.** As of now, the Council has funding for a watershed coordinator through September of 2014. The more efficient we can be with our plan development process, the more quickly we can get a plan adopted, and the more likely we can use the watershed coordinator’s time for actual coordination and implementation, as well as fund raising.

**Staff direction.** Currently, the watershed coordinator has no official small group of Council members to seek direction from between meetings. The Council email list now stands at 164 members, and includes elected officials and many others who shouldn’t be bothered with minor business-related correspondence.

For the above reasons, I think we are at a point in time that we should consider a more formal governance structure. Maybe the group would prefer to keep things unstructured and informal, which would be fine; but I have heard the sentiment that some kind of structure is needed, so I’d like to at least have the discussion.

I have drafted a basic charter as a starting point for your consideration. Language was pulled from various watershed council charters throughout the country; the state of Oregon in particular has many established watershed councils, and adoption of a charter seems to be part of standard operating procedures there.

The draft charter designates a core group of about 18 members as the Council’s Leadership Committee. Membership of the Leadership Committee would be established to fairly represent the different categories of watershed stakeholders. Leadership Committee members would be voting members. I’ve proposed six categories of Leadership Committee members, with one member from each of these categories also serving on an Executive Committee to address more administrative issues.

Nothing significant need change about our meetings, except that we would now have a decision-making process to fall back on should the need arise.

I have allocated a significant block of time on next week’s agenda to discuss this idea.

Attachment:  
Draft Charter, Ventura River Watershed Council