

Deep Creek Lake Management Plan  
Sub-Committee Meeting for Accountability  
January 24, 2014

Attendees:

David Myerberg  
Lulu Gonella  
Barbara Beelar  
Paul Weiler  
John Nelson  
Paul Durham  
Ellen Williams  
Catherine Shanks  
Carrie Decker  
Ken Fisher

Draft Goals:

Lulu reviewed the draft goals and asked for comments. Following the discussion the draft goals were revised to read:

- 1). Improve the management structure, coordination and accountability of governance for the lake and its watershed
- 2). Nurture an informed and engaged citizenry regarding the lake and its watershed

Reviewing the Management Strategy Options:

Cathie reviewed all the management options that Carrie and Cathie put together for the Committee. (see attached report.)

- Include HOA/POA under the Non-Profit Option:—Barbara will explore this option and provide language. Membership in the existing Deep Creek Lake POA is voluntary and charges a nominal membership fee. Columbia Lakes Association or Lake Barcroft HOA are good examples to explore.
- Barbara and Paul Durham recommended reviewing COMAR language for Lake regarding for fees/funds.
- David suggested governance approach for consideration by the subcommittee. Have an intergovernmental agreement between the County, DNR, MDE, MDA/SCD and SHA, also maybe PRB. The State agencies could commit some funding. In addition, develop a 501c3 with a parallel program of citizens and government reps that could accept funding and endowments to support the work of the partners:
  - Ken agrees in part—thinks we should explain options and idea to the Steering Committee and they can provide guidance on how we should proceed. Also make sure to include ‘management of the watershed’ focus

- Barbara suggested we look at the components and framework for what we need which may include an intergovernmental agreement , the capacity for fund raising, etc.
- Carrie will send out ERM's Review of Lake Management Options
- John expressed an interest in expanding role of PRB and responsibilities. Augmentation of PRB could be in legislation. A signed agreement may also be needed which may include a funding approach.
- Follow Up to Steering Committee:
  - Present all options to the SC on Feb. 3<sup>rd</sup> and ask for guidance/feedback highlighting the preferred options
  - Express that we are looking at the finding the best marriage between options that would be politically acceptable.
  - We are leaning toward a combination or potential combination of options to include the cooperative agreement and the 501c3 non-profit.
  - Consider expanding the role of the PRB.
  - If none is given, then the Sub-committee will make recommendations.
  - Include a one page Executive Summary of Options for the SC.

#### Next meeting

Barbara recommended that the next steps will be to enumerate features we will be looking for in the proposed governance structure.

Lulu will send calendar requests to set the meetings for the coming months. *(These dates are on the web site.)*