



PO Box 3389 / 573 W. Crete Cr. #203
Grand Junction, CO 81502-3389

263-7401
263-8235 (Fax)

March 27, 2009

TO: 5-2-1 Drainage Authority Board Members

FROM: Eric Mende, Manager

RE: Summary of 3/26 Board Retreat

I would like to thank all of you for taking time out of your busy schedules to attend the retreat. The input and guidance I received was invaluable. With new Board members coming on board I felt it was important to re-confirm the goals and priorities the Board has for the organization, and to clarify your expectations of me as your Manager. I believe we were successful. After debriefing with our facilitator, Mr. Carr, I've summarized the general discussion topics and resulting guidance below. If you remember the discussions differently, please let me know at your earliest convenience.

- In general, the Board believes we are on the right path and making good progress toward achieving our top priorities, but the full scope of activities the 521 will perform, and the priorities assigned to those activities will require additional discussion.
- The Board members fully understand their status as an independent Board, but most feel they must act as representatives of their jurisdictions when acting on Authority issues. The Board feels the Authority is a partnership and should focus on the needs of the partners instead of the needs of the Authority as a separate entity.
- There appeared to be some confusion as to the general "unwritten" policy of limiting Authority involvement to only cross-jurisdictional and multi-jurisdiction activities. The Board expressed general consensus that the Authority could perform an activity benefiting only a single Contracting Party, and the Manager should bring these activity requests to the Board for consideration should they occur.
- The Board feels we are still in a transition period where the roles and responsibilities, and the interaction of the Board, the Manager, and the TAC are somewhat unclear. The Board generally expects the Manager to discuss technical and policy issues with the TAC before bringing them to the Board, but does not require the Manager to obtain "approval" of the TAC before bringing an issue or recommendation to the Board. Where differences exist, the Manager is expected to highlight those differences for Board consideration.
- The Board does not expect the TAC to be involved in day-to-day management or administrative decisions. The Manager and TAC need to come to agreement on defining what comprises management and administrative decisions. The Board is comfortable with the Manager exercising more decisionmaking discretion, but wants to be informed if issues arise.

- Because of the technical nature of the scope of work of the Authority, it takes more time than usual for Board members to come up to speed on technical issues facing the organization. Board members rely on their TAC members to help them understand the technical issues. The TAC is critical to achieving the coordinated approach of the Authority.
- The Board expressed no desire to pursue other MS4's (OMID, GVVUA) for inclusion in the Authority MS4 Permit application at this time. We should complete the current upload process first.
- Short term, the Board expressed general agreement that the current split in the allocation of time and money to Phase II compliance activities versus Basin Planning activities should continue.
- Long term, the Board expressed general agreement that the focus of the Authority should shift more to flood control (Basin Planning) rather than compliance.
- The Board is in general agreement that the Authority should be seen as a helpful resource and source of information rather than just a regulatory entity.
- The Board and TAC agree that the number one short term priority for the Authority is successful upload of a consolidated MS4 Permit.
- The Board and TAC agree that the number two short term priority of the Authority is meeting the performance commitments of the IGAs, with specific emphasis on the local permitting/ inspection process.
- There is a general consensus of the Board and TAC that the Authority should expand it's involvement with multi-jurisdictional stormwater issues beyond basin planning activities and take a more active role coordinating responses to specific drainage problems.
- The Board and TAC are in general consensus that hotline calls should receive priority attention by Authority personnel. There is some confusion on the level of response expected from the Authority (Illicit Discharge calls versus drainage calls) and the expectation of 24/7 hotline phone coverage.
- Board members expressed general agreement that the work performed by the Authority on behalf of the Contracting Parties has a high priority for funding within their respective organizations and will be relatively secure from significant budget cuts based on economic conditions.
- The Board members were comfortable with the level of financial commitment to the Authority and the formula for determining contributions, and did not see a need to re-visit funding issues in the short term.
- Facilitator Carr recommended a weekly communication between the Board Chairman and the Manager to discuss agenda items or other issues, with the Board Chairman responsible for deciding whether these issues should come to the full Board for discussion.

End of Summary