COLORADO RIVER WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Protecting Western Colorado Water Since 1937

MEMORANDUM
October 6, 2004

TO: CRWCD BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: CHRIS TREESE

RE: POLICY REVIEW/DEVELOPMENT

At the July meeting, the Board directed staff to review the Board's existing policies to distinguish between those that are truly policy statements and those that are business practices, administrative policies or procedures, or legislative positions. You further instructed staff to make an initial recommendation regarding which, if any, policies could be consolidated or eliminated. From this recommendation, staff anticipates that you will provide additional direction, consistent with your July directions, regarding development of a consistent format for all policies and which policies you wish to schedule for review in 2005. Once these are established, staff expects to review and redraft those policies identified for action next year and present those at the January Board meeting.

Existing Policies:

As discussed, the District has a variety of policies in a variety of forms, as well as a variety of business directives that are currently listed as "policy." A list of all the current policies is attached under the heading "Legal Polices." This is from the District's intranet web site. Also attached are complete copies of the "Comprehensive Policies," "Recovery Program Policy," "Transmountain Diversion Policy," and your "Water Quality Policy." These are the only "policies" that truly qualify as District policy statements. Other "policies" listed on the summary list are administrative procedures or specific direction to staff regarding certain business practices (e.g., Equipment Use, Financial Governance, Grant Program, Investments, and Minutes Policies). Although not included in the Board's October notebook, I will have copies of all the policies listed on the "Legal Policies" table of contents at the Board meeting.

I recommend the Board confirm that the business practices and administrative procedure "policies" are not the District policy statements to be reviewed triennially.

Suite #200 * 201 Centennial Street / PO Box 1120 Glenwood Springs, Colorado 81602
(970) 945-8522 * (970) 945-8799

"Comprehensive Policies"

There are 31 separate "policies" listed under the Board's "Comprehensive Policies." Few of these are true Policy statements. None conform to our more recent format for Policy statements (e.g, "Recovery Program Policy," "Transmountain Diversion Policy," and "Water Quality Policy").

Recommendations:

- Policy #1 can and should be eliminated. How can we do anything but follow our organic act? I suggest we don't need this as a policy.
- I suggest Policies # 7, 9, 13, 6, 10, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, the first half of 19, 20, 21, and 23 (listed in order of presentation on the attached list), are administrative/business operating procedures and specific direction to staff regarding district operations and priorities. As such they do not qualify as Policy and should be eliminated from your Policy considerations. The Board may wish to consider if and where they wish to maintain these directions to staff.
- Similarly, policies # 11, 31, 8, 27, 28, 3, 4, 5, and 14 are specific legislative positions, most of which are still pertinent, but not Policy. The Board should also consider memorializing these position statements as on-going direction to staff.
- Policies # 8, 2, 22, 24, 25, 26, 29, and perhaps the second half of 19 are statements deserving more thought, development, and elaboration to better determine if they should be considered as Policy statements.[1]

I recommend the Board confirm or modify the recommendations above and direct staff to more fully develop the issues addressed in the policies listed in the final bullet.

Staff will also review and modify the "Recovery Program Policy," "Transmountain Diversion Policy," and "Water Quality Policy" to recommend any modifications and to develop a consistent CRWCD Policy format and edit these Policies accordingly.

Finally, the Board decided in July to "develop a schedule to review and readopt roughly one-third of its policies annually." If you concur with my recommendations above, you'll have less than a dozen Policies in total to consider. The Board may decide it can reasonably and thoroughly consider at least six policies a year, resulting in a two-year review process, or you may decide that review of a dozen policies is not onerous and direct that all policies be prepared for review in 2005. Of course, the Board should also identify subject areas that are missing entirely from our current policies and direct preliminary development of draft policies addressing such topics.

[1] We do not appear to have a policy #30.