



NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING & AGENDA

**UPPER VERDE RIVER WATERSHED PROTECTION COALITION
BOARD MEETING**

**Wednesday, March 28, 2012 - 2:00 p.m.
City of Prescott City Hall, Council Chambers
201 South Cortez Street - Prescott, Arizona**

- ITEM NO 1. Introductions, Awards, or Presentations**
- ITEM NO 2. Communications**
- ITEM NO 3. Call to Public**
Consideration and discussion of general unscheduled comments from the public: Those wishing to address the Coalition need not request permission in advance. Any such remarks shall be addressed to the Coalition as a whole and not to any member thereof. Such remarks shall be limited to three (3) minutes unless additional time is granted by the Chair.
At the conclusion of the unscheduled comments, individual members of the Coalition may respond to the item addressed at the discretion of the Chair, or they may ask Staff to review the matter or ask that the matter be placed on a future agenda.
- ITEM NO 4. Discussion & Possible Action - Approval of Board Meeting Minutes – September 28, 2011 and January 25, 2012**
- ITEM NO 5. Discussion - TAC Meeting Summary for February 1, 2012 and March 7, 2012**
- ITEM NO 6. Discussion - Water Conservation Update**
- ITEM NO 7. Discussion – Water Audit**
- ITEM NO 8. Discussion – Old Home Manor Project Update**
- ITEM NO 9. Discussion – Legislative Update**
- ITEM NO 10. Discussion & Possible Action –Watershed Restoration and Recharge Policy Initiative**
- ITEM NO 11. Discussion – Next Meeting Time / Location / Agenda Items**
- ITEM NO 12. Adjourn Meeting**



**AGENDA ITEM NO. 1
INTRODUCTIONS, AWARDS, OR PRESENTATIONS**

Opportunity for Board members to introduce new members and/or guests, or to make presentations.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 2
COMMUNICATIONS**

Opportunity for Board members to communicate member updates

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 4
DISCUSSION & POSSIBLE ACTION - APPROVAL OF BOARD MEETING MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 28, 2011 AND JANUARY 25, 2012**

Approval of minutes for the previous Regular Board Meetings held on September 28, 2011 and January 25, 2012.



AGENDA ITEM NO. 5
DISCUSSION - TAC MEETING SUMMARY FOR FEBRUARY 1, 2012 AND MARCH 7, 2012

Brief summary of TAC Meetings.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 6
DISCUSSION – WATER CONSERVATION UPDATE

- Shaun Rydell to update the Board on water conservation activities
- WaterSmart card extended use

AGENDA ITEM NO. 7
DISCUSSION – WATER AUDIT

Review and finalize Water Audit



**AGENDA ITEM NO. 8
DISCUSSION – OLD HOME MANOR PROJECT UPDATE**

Current project status

- Agreement with Chino Valley
- Construction documents

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 9
DISCUSSION– LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

Update on water legislation

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 10
DISCUSSION & POSSIBLE ACTION – WATERSHED RESTORATION AND RECHARGE POLICY INITIATIVE**

Introduce rainwater harvesting and watershed restoration policy initiative

- Review initiative



AGENDA ITEM NO. 11
DISCUSSION – NEXT MEETING TIME / LOCATION / AGENDA ITEMS

Board Meeting

The next regularly scheduled Board Meeting is on **May 23, 2012 at 2:00 p.m.** at the City of Prescott City Hall, Council Chambers, 201 South Cortez Street, Prescott, Arizona.

TAC Meetings

The next TAC meeting will be Wednesday, April 4, 2012 at 1:00 p.m. The meeting will be held at the Town of Prescott Valley, Community Room #331, 7501 E. Civic Circle, Prescott Valley, Arizona.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 12
ACTION – ADJOURN MEETING

Meeting to be adjourned



UPPER VERDE RIVER WATERSHED PROTECTION COALITION BOARD MEETING

A MEETING OF THE UPPER VERDE RIVER WATERSHED PROTECTION COALITION WAS HELD ON SEPTEMBER 28, 2011 in PRESCOTT CITY HALL, 201 South Cortez Street, Prescott, Arizona.

Chairman Suttles called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m.

ITEM NO 1. Introductions, Awards, or Presentations

Members Present:

President Ernie Jones, Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe
Vice Mayor Carl Tenney, Town of Chino Valley
Supervisor Carol Springer, Yavapai County Board of Supervisors
Councilwoman Suttles, City of Prescott, Chairman
Councilwoman Lora Lee Nye, Town of Prescott Valley

Members Absent:

None

Staff Present:

Ed Mucillo, Program Manager
Shawn Bradford, Business Development
Rick Shroads, Assistant Program Manager
Kim Webb, City of Prescott
Leslie Graser, City of Prescott
John Munderlow, Town of Prescott Valley
Don Tjiema, Councilman, Prescott Valley, Alternate to Councilwoman Nye

ITEM NO 2. Communications

None

ITEM NO 3. Call to Public

Consideration and discussion of general unscheduled comments from the public: Those wishing to address the Coalition need not request permission in advance. Any such remarks shall be addressed to the Coalition as a whole and not to any member thereof. Such remarks shall be limited to three (3) minutes unless additional time is granted by the Chair.

At the conclusion of the unscheduled comments, individual members of the Coalition may respond to the item addressed at the discretion of the Chair, or they may ask Staff to review the matter or ask that the matter be placed on a future agenda.

Supervisor Springer said Kim Webb was shadowing her that day for the Prescott Area Leadership group.



ITEM NO 4. Discussion & Possible Action - Approval of Board Meeting Minutes – July 27, 2011

SUPERVISOR SPRINGER MOVED TO APPROVE THE BOARD MEETING MINUTES OF JULY 27, 2011; SECONDED BY COUNCILWOMAN NYE; APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

ITEM NO 5. Discussion - TAC Meeting Summary for September 12, 2011

Mr. Bradford noted that the summary was in the packet and there was an item concerning program management on the agenda.

ITEM NO 6. Discussion - Water Audit Update

Mr. Bradford showed a Water Audit PowerPoint that included:

- Information of an internal water audit by the Coalition on the Coalition's larger turf areas.
- Based on 2007 Larson Report
- Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) developing formal water audit program
- Prescott had eight locations
- Prescott Valley had 17 locations
- Benchmarks use best management practices
- WaterSmart guidelines
- Report will include summary of each location
- Recommendations for improvements (if any)

Mr. Bradford said the Coalition was doing everything it could to be water wise. He noted that Prescott was very proactive with internal water auditors who were certified and went out on a quarterly basis to audit the City's facilities. He said Prescott Valley made some changes in 2010 that had drastically reduced their water usage. He noted that the final report would be ready at next board meeting.

Supervisor Springer asked who was doing the work. Mr. Bradford said Burgess & Niple was putting the information together. They got meter reading data from the communities and worked with the TAC members to see how large the turf facilities were. He said the WaterSmart Guidelines laid out what the water usage should be.

Supervisor Springer asked if they only audited areas where large turf. Mr. Bradford said the first draft focused on large turf facilities. Supervisor Springer asked if the golf course was included. Mr. Bradford said that he did not believe so. Mr. Munderlow said that it was not potable water, it was treated effluent. Supervisor Springer said she understood that, but did not know if it was included in the study.



Mr. Bradford said the TAC discussed offering water audits to the general public and partnering with schools and golf courses on their water audits. Chairman Suttles asked if their work was repetitious of what the City was doing with their internal audits. Mr. Bradford said yes. They were trying to confirm the findings and develop a template and a process that they could roll out to schools and golf courses.

Supervisor Springer said she had heard that 50% of the water used was for outdoor purposes. She asked if that was a valid number. She said that the more they tried to work toward things like water harvesting and if they could reduce the amount of treated waste, the better off they would be. She said if the goal was to come to safe yield, she saw it as two pronged: harvesting water and recharging the aquifer and the second would be conservation in terms of taking less out of the aquifer to begin with, so that harvesting would become a significant part of the conservation effort. She said she was trying to get a better handle on how they could measure it and how they could portray it to the public.

Mr. Bradford said there were industry standards that worked on return flow. What they looked at was the amount of water delivered in gallons and inflow into the waste water treatment plant. That would give them a good flow rate. He noted the regional influences, but 50% was a reasonable number.

Vice Mayor Tenney asked if the services extended to Chino valley. Mr. Bradford said that they tried to get data from all of the members, but it was not available for Chino Valley. He said that there may be an opportunity to go outside the member agencies with the audits.

Councilwoman Nye noted that one of the conservation savings efforts Prescott Valley did was to put the artificial turf on the soccer fields and Mountain Valley Park. She said they did not realize what a good decision they made, not only for water conservation, but other savings as well. Mr. Bradford said the key was in educating the general public.

Chairman Suttles asked how often they would do the audit. Mr. Bradford said they would look for direction from the TAC. He thought it should be done at the large turf facilities on an annual basis. He said it was a win/win, even for people with wells. He noted that they could save money by not having to run their pump as often. Councilwoman Nye noted that people did not usually think about the electrical costs associated with wells.

The Board agreed that the audits should be done once a year.

ITEM NO 7. Discussion & Possible Action - Coalition Program Management

Mr. Bradford said part of the original contract with Burgess & Niple included a three year term and two, one year options for renewal. He said the first option was due to be



exercised November of 2010. He said they did not notice that they needed to make an official action at the board level to approve the extension of the contract. He asked if they would like to approve the second extension. He said they created the renewal in the form of a resolution that would extend the contract from 2011 to November of 2012. He said that as a part of their contract with the Coalition, they wanted to add Montgomery and Associates to their team for grant pursuits.

SUPERVISOR SPRINGER MOVED TO EXTEND THE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT CONTRACT WITH BURGESS & NIPLE FROM NOVEMBER 8, 2010 UNTIL NOVEMBER 8, 2011; SECONDED BY COUNCILWOMAN NYE; PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

SUPERVISOR SPRINGER MOVED TO EXTEND THE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT CONTRACT WITH BURGESS & NIPLE FROM NOVEMBER 9, 2011 TO NOVEMBER 8, 2012; SECONDED BY CHAIRMAN SUTTLES; PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

SUPERVISOR SPRINGER MOVED TO APPROVE THE ADDITION OF MONTGOMERY AND ASSOCIATES TO THE BURGESS & NIPLE TEAM FOR THE CONTRACT TERM OF NOVEMBER 8, 2011 TO NOVEMBER 8, 2012; SECONDED BY COUNCILWOMAN NYE; PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

ITEM NO 8. Discussion & Possible Action - Grant Update

Mr. Bradford said that as part of their efforts to find funding, the National Science Foundation (NSF) was attractive because there was no match required. He noted that there was an opportunity with Mountain Front and Mountain Block Recharge. He said the idea of how much water hit the mountain and got into the aquifer was subjective and the information was not conclusive. He wanted to do some additional research and create some modifications to implement ground water recharge. He noted that NSF had a two phase process. He said they were pursuing the first phase which was around \$200,000 - \$300,000. This would allow them to take a survey of the research that had been completed on the subject and bring stakeholders together in workshops. He said they could work on an agreement towards the next phase. The second phase of NSF monies could be up to one million dollars a year, up to a five year period. He said that it was highly competitive and bringing on a firm like Montgomery would bring a scientific approach to the study.

He said they were in the process of completing a Phase I grant application. They would identify additional research and action upon the research for a Phase II grant. He said it would be easier to get the Phase II money after they had done the work with Phase I.

Supervisor Springer asked where they were going to do the study. She said that the only area that came to mind was Big Chino.



Mr. Bradford said the goal was to do it in the region. The key component to the NSF grant was that the science that would be developed needed to be applicable anywhere. Supervisor Springer said that anywhere in the area, the surface water flows that contributed to groundwater recharge was generally water that came off the mountain in some sort of stream and went underground to theoretically recharge the aquifer. She said that all of that water was claimed by Salt River Project (SRP). She asked them if this type of grant application would have to include an agreement by SRP to approve of the project. Mr. Bradford said there was a science that supported that some of the water that fell within the mountain block was recharged into the aquifer, through the mountain. They were looking to quantify what that was, not to argue the quantity. They would like to firm up the science.

Supervisor Springer asked if he was saying that they did not need the approval from SRP. Mr. Bradford said that Phase I was a simple review of the literature and science that had been done to date and then identify an opportunity to develop a new approach to identify Mountain Block and how much it was.

Supervisor Springer asked where they would do the study. She said the mountains around Big Chino would be a logical place to do it, as opposed to some of the mountains around Prescott, where there were two different groundwater situations. She noted that there was no deficit in Big Chino. The ground water that went in there was already safe yield. She said the Prescott Active Management Area was in a deficit situation. She noted that they were trying to compare apples to oranges.

Mr. Bradford said the goal was to identify an approach to quantify the amount of water that was recharged. He noted that Phase II would identify some specific sites.

Mr. Munderloh said they had to go through a scientific progression of thought if they got the grant. He said they could not predetermine where their Category II Project would be, until they went through the progression.

Supervisor Springer said the study was similar to the study done in the San Pedro area. She noted that they were trying to find out how much water went into the aquifer from the mountain discharge. She asked if anyone had looked at that study.

Mr. Munderloh said that the Coalitions process was different. They looked at what they did not know. He said that Montgomery and Associates helped them look at the body of knowledge about Mountain Front and Mountain Recharge. He said that everyone tried to quantify that number. He noted that, to date, it was still a number that was developed as the derivative of everything else known. He said they assume that the unknown quantity at the end of their budget was recharge. No one really understood the process. He noted that it had never been approached scientifically. They wanted to look at it in a new light and present it to the NSF.



Supervisor Springer said if they were looking at a theory that would apply everywhere, the results would depend on the age of the body under the surface at that point of recharge. She asked if the results would be deeper if it was an older element, than from a newer geological formation where it did not have the depth.

Mr. Munderloh said that would have some impact but the primary impact would be around the root zone and above. He said what they knew was that 98% of the water received from precipitation was lost via evaporation and transpiration. He said those processes occurred at the surface of the ground or in the root zone. He noted that they had to be broad minded in their approach. He said that was where they had to focus the studies. If they could get the water past the root zone, before it evaporated, it would have a chance to move to the aquifer.

Mr. Bradford said the results would be different in different regions of the country. He said the approach they took to quantify the information would be universal. He noted that there would be many differing variables in different areas of the country.

Supervisor Springer said that it sound like an interesting study. She asked who else had studied it and what their results were.

Mr. Munderloh said it would be part of the process to do literature reviews. He said it had not been approached this way. He noted that the approaches, thus far, were to create more run off, which was a different process than how to create more recharge in the watershed.

He said they may look into the restoration of a plant species that was there prior to another species. He noted that non native plants may take water weeks earlier than native plants and the weeks may be critical to induce recharge. He noted that native plants may shorten growing periods.

Councilwoman Nye said that the potential body of knowledge they may gain from the studies was very exciting and they did not know how they may use the information in the future.

Chairman Suttles asked Mr. Bradford when they would know if the grant was awarded. Mr. Bradford said he thought it would be early 2012. He said that Phase I could lead to a dead end, but he did not think so. He wanted to have the information behind them for Phase II.

Chairman Suttles asked how many other groups applied for the grant. Mr. Bradford said that a lot of colleges went after that money. Supervisor Springer said that part of their Macro Water Harvesting Program was convincing the public that 98% of the water was lost through transpiration and evaporation.



ITEM NO 9. Discussion & Possible Action - Appointment of New Board Chairperson

Chairman Suttles said her last day in Council would be the day before the next meeting. She would try to find out who would take her place on the Board.

SUPERVISOR SPRINGER NOMINATED COUNCILWOMAN NYE AS CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD; SECONDED BY CHAIRMAN SUTTLES; PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Councilwoman Nye noted that it might be her last term of office and she was happy to put a lot of energy towards water issues.

ITEM NO 10. Discussion & Possible Action - Next Meeting Time / Location / Agenda Items

Mr. Bradford said the next regularly scheduled meeting would be Wednesday, November 23, 2011, which was the Wednesday before Thanksgiving. Supervisor Springer asked what action they would have to take at that meeting. Mr. Bradford said there would not be anything that they had to do. Supervisor Springer said she would rather cancel the meeting. Councilwoman Nye agreed.

Mr. Bradford said January would be the next meeting. He noted that the only thing on the schedule was a presentation from the Project Wet teachers, which could be moved to January. All members agreed to meet on January 25, 2012.

ITEM NO 11. Adjourn Meeting

The meeting adjourned at 2:59 p.m.

Councilwoman Lora Lee Nye, Chairman

ATTEST:

Kim Webb, Assistant Clerk



A MEETING OF THE UPPER VERDE RIVER WATERSHED PROTECTION COALITION WAS HELD ON JANUARY 25, 2012, in PRESCOTT CITY HALL, 201 SOUTH CORTEZ STREET, Prescott, Arizona.

ITEM NO 1. Introductions, Awards, or Presentations

Chairman Nye called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m.

Members Present:

Councilwoman Lora Lee Nye, Town of Prescott Valley, Chairman
Supervisor Carol Springer, Yavapai County Board of Supervisors, Vice Chairman
Councilman Steve Blair, City of Prescott

Members Absent:

President Ernie Jones, Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe

Staff Present:

Ed Mucillo, Program Manager
Dana Biscan, Project Manager
Rick Shroads, Assistant Program Manager
John Munderloh, Town of Prescott Valley
John Rasmussen, Yavapai County
Leslie Graser, City Of Prescott
Amber Tyson, Yavapai-Prescott Tribe
Kim Webb, City of Prescott

Mr. Mucillo introduced Linda Zanolli, who presented her Project Wet Program and book that she did for the sixth grade students in Verde Valley, Chino Valley, Cottonwood, Prescott Valley Prescott and all but one class in Sedona. She handed the booklet out to the members and went through each chapter. She noted that it was a three day program and said she asked the parents to sign their sons or daughters workbook, so that they may also get the training.

ITEM NO 2. Communications

Vice Chairman Springer asked Mr. Mucillo if he was monitoring Water Legislation. She noted that there were some bills of interest. She asked if Mr. Rasmussen could do a report on the current bills and said that she was especially interested in the Macro Water Harvesting. Mr. Mucillo said that he had been keeping track of the bills.



ITEM NO 3. Call to Public

Consideration and discussion of general unscheduled comments from the public: Those wishing to address the Coalition need not request permission in advance. Any such remarks shall be addressed to the Coalition as a whole and not to any member thereof. Such remarks shall be limited to three (3) minutes unless additional time is granted by the Chair.

At the conclusion of the unscheduled comments, individual members of the Coalition may respond to the item addressed at the discretion of the Chair, or they may ask Staff to review the matter or ask that the matter be placed on a future agenda.

ITEM NO 4. Discussion & Possible Action - Approval of Board Meeting Minutes – September 28, 2011

The approval of the minutes was tabled until the next meeting because Councilman Blair was unable to vote, since he was not present for the September 28, 2011 meeting.

ITEM NO 5. Discussion - TAC Meeting Summary for October 12, 2011, December 7, 2011, and January 4, 2012

Mr. Mucillo noted that the meetings of October 12, 2011 and January 4, 2012 did not have a quorum and the notes from the December 7, 2011 meeting were included in the packet and would be discussed.

ITEM NO 6. Discussion & Possible Action – Budget Update and FY 2012/2013 Dues

Mr. Mucillo gave a budget update with current and projected numbers. He noted that the member's dues would continue to drop an additional 20 percent and that less money would be allotted to water conservation. He noted that \$50,000 was originally budgeted and it was backed down to \$35,000.

Chairman Nye asked if the reductions made in the budget would cover the 20 percent reduction or membership dues. Mr. Mucillo said yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN SPRINGER MOVED TO ADOPT THE BUDGET RECOMMENDATION; SECONDED BY COUNCILMAN BLAIR; PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

ITEM NO 7. Discussion – Grant Update

Mr. Mucillo noted that they had not heard back from the National Science Foundation on the grant proposal submitted in October 2011. He noted that they were pursuing a partnering with Natural Resources Conservation Service NRCS for watershed management, restoration of watershed and vegetation and were also exploring private foundations for funding.



ITEM NO 8. Discussion & Possible Action – Potential Projects

Mr. Shroads gave a PowerPoint presentation entitled Pilot Projects for Source Water Capture and Recharge that covered:

- GOAL
- OBJECTIVES
- PILOT SITE LOCATIONS
- PILOT DETAILS

He noted that the Board had approved all projects to date. He said there was \$125,000.00 available to match grants or to use for a new pilot project and he wanted the Board to vote on where they would like to spend the money.

He said that the Old Home Manor site was perfect for the pilot project as the catchments were already dug. The project would create five types of catchment systems to allow water to drain into the dry ponds. The five would include a control area. He described each type of catchment. He said that each site was one half acre and they would build channels around the plots so offsite water would not be a part of the measurement.

He noted that plans were complete and had been reviewed by the Town of Chino Valley.

He said they planned to have pipes from plots going into manholes so area velocity sensors could check pressure for depth of flow and flow rate. Data would be transmitted through cell phones for real time data and there would be a rain gauge at the site. He noted that the manufacturer's representative was there for questions.

Councilman Blair asked how long the project would be and when they would begin. Mr. Shroads said that it would be ongoing for five years and added that they would use solar panels for power.

Vice Chairman Springer said it was extremely important to do the project. She noted that when they supported the Rain Water Harvesting Bill it was shot down and then it turned into a study committee which was then also shot down. She said Representative Fann was reintroducing the bill to start the committee. The stumbling block was the actual data. She said this would be a pilot program for the entire state. It would be a basis to substantiate the feasibility of doing macro harvesting. She appreciated Mr. Shroads and his firm for the behind the scenes work they had done. She said it was the answer for the Prescott area safe yield situation.



Councilman Blair thought it was a great project. He said the more accurate the records, the better. He asked what they were going to do with the water they were collecting. Mr. Shroads said it would go into the dry basins in Chino. He noted that the soil was conducive to infiltration. Councilman Blair said it would be interesting to see if 100 percent of all water caught would go into the aquifer. Mr. Shroads said they had discussed whether or not they could predict that number. He said the main goal of the project was to see which plot produced the most run off.

Vice Chairman Springer said that it boiled down to establishing new water and that there was a monetary value to that water. She said they would not be able to get into water harvesting until they could show there was a new product.

Chairman Nye said it behooved them to move forward. She asked if any of the guests had comments on the project.

Councilman Blair asked if after the five years there would be value of a placement like Sullivan Lake. He asked if they should harvest closer to the headwater of the Verde River. Mr. Shroads said he would like to see harvesting systems throughout the region. He said that the geology of the soil would dictate where they could recharge. He said the slope in the Chino Valley location was an engineers dream and the dry basins were just waiting for water.

Vice Chairman Springer said they had talked about recharging at Sullivan, but had shifted their focus to harvesting and it was important to focus on that. Councilman Blair said it would be opportune to do the project at the watershed by the airport.

Dennis Gamache of Western Environmental Company said the equipment to be installed would transmit the data to a server automatically.

COUNCILMAN BLAIR MOVED TO GO FORWARD WITH THE PILOT PROJECTS; SECONDED BY VICE CHAIRMAN SPRINGER; PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Vice Chairman Springer left the Council Chambers at 2:52 p.m.

ITEM NO 9. Discussion – Montgomery & Associates White Paper Summary and Talking Points

Mr. Mucillo noted that he provided Mountain Front and Mountain Block Recharge information in the packet and noted that there had not been a lot of research done.

He noted that areas of interest were: how tree canopies affected the relationship between evapotranspiration and precipitation and recharge, how long it took for different plants to adapt to hydrologic changes and if communities could be designed to include plant communities that provided an optimal balance of habitat, efficient water use and soil stability in semi-arid environments. He said they did some exploratory



research to go with a Category 1 application for the grant. He mentioned that there had been discussions about them partnering with the Forest Service.

Mr. Rasmussen said there had been some research on runoff, focused on increasing runoff so that Salt River Project could get the water into the reservoirs. He noted that only two percent of the water received went to recharge and they were trying to understand why.

Councilman Blair asked if they would do the study in the woods around Ash Fork or Seligman. Mr. Rasmussen said they could not do the study in wilderness areas. Chairman Nye said that she liked that there was a lot of room for improvement in monitoring of recharge. She said that so little was understood in that area.

ITEM NO 10. Discussion & Possible Action - Next Meeting Time / Location / Agenda Items

Mr. Mucillo said the next meeting would be March 28, 2012, at 2:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting would be February 1, 2012 in Prescott Valley.

Councilman Blair asked for a time frame for the Water Capture and Recharge project. Mr. Mucillo said they had to talk to the Town of Chino Valley but should be able to report back by the March meeting. He noted that at the next Board Meeting they would give updates to that project, water conservation and grant efforts and the water audits for the member entities. In addition, they would bring back the minutes from September 28, 2011, for approval.

ITEM NO 11. Adjourn Meeting

There being no further business to be discussed, the Upper Verde River Watershed Protection Coalition Board Meeting on January 25, 2012, adjourned at 3:03 p.m.

Councilwoman Lora Lee Nye, Chairman

ATTEST:

Kim Webb, Assistant Clerk



UPPER VERDE RIVER WATERSHED PROTECTION COALITION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) MEETING

Wednesday, January 4, 2012 - 1:00 p.m.
Town of Prescott Valley, Community Room # 331
7501 E. Civic Circle - Prescott Valley, Arizona

TAC Meeting – 1:00 p.m.

Attendees:

TAC Members: John Munderloh, John Rasmussen

Program Management Team: Ed Muccillo, Rick Shroads

- Meeting called to order at 1:02 p.m.

- A quorum of TAC members was not in attendance. Meeting adjourned at 1:11 p.m.

- Next Meeting Time / Location / Agenda Items
 - The next TAC meeting will be on Wednesday, March 7, 2012 at 1:00 p.m. at the Town of Prescott Valley, Community Room # 331; 7501 E. Civic Circle – Prescott Valley, Arizona
 - The next Board meeting is Wednesday March 28, 2012 at 2:00 p.m. at City of Prescott Council Chambers, 201 S. Cortez Street – Prescott, Arizona



UPPER VERDE RIVER WATERSHED PROTECTION COALITION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) MEETING

Wednesday, March 7, 2012 - 1:00 p.m.
Town of Prescott Valley, Community Room # 331
7501 E. Civic Circle - Prescott Valley, Arizona

TAC Meeting – 1:00 p.m.

Attendees:

TAC Members: John Munderloh, John Rasmussen, Leslie Graser

Program Management Team: Rick Shroads, Dana Biscan

Guests: Edessa Carr

- **Meeting called to order at 1:02 p.m.**
- **Project WET**
 - Dana to follow up with SRP regarding grant
 - Edessa believes Project WET grants to teachers continues to be an effective program
 - Due to possible date of fund receipt, grant will be used for following school year
 - “Coming soon” letter in May (include application)
 - Notice to teachers – August 1
 - Proposals due September 15
 - Award near October 15
 - Grant to say something about \$500-\$600 is the typical award amount, but additional funding may be awarded based upon justification
 - Verde will be included this year, so all 22 certified teachers can apply
 - Edessa to send information regarding private well owner workshop education
 - Also mentioned expanding the WaterSmart program to Sedona... have offered to help develop materials, but not printing
- **Old Home Manor Update**
 - Chino Valley is requiring that all coalition entities, B&N, and CivilTec name Chino Valley as an additional insured as part of the project
 - Coalition members will have their attorneys review signature page and who should sign it
 - Town of Prescott Valley will procure the project
 - The agreement is the only loose piece right now, plans and specifications have been updated



- **WaterSmart Materials Update**
 - Map for banner to be revised to delete reservoirs, add north arrow. Generally tweak to use on booth
 - Shaun is working on a flyer for The Spot to promote sponsored group admissions

- **Water Audit**
 - Finalize for the next Board meeting
 - John Munderloh has submitted comments, others?
 - If any additional comments, submit to B&N by the 21st or 23rd, depending how extensive

- **March Board Meeting**
 - Legislative Update (John Rasmussen)
 - Update on Old Home Manor project (Rick)
 - Update on Project WET (Ed)
 - Water conservation update (Shaun Rydell)
 - Update on Water Audit

- **Next Meeting Time / Location / Agenda Items**
 - The next TAC meeting will be on Wednesday, April 4, 2012 at 1:00 p.m. at the Town of Prescott Valley, Community Room # 331; 7501 E. Civic Circle – Prescott Valley, Arizona
 - The next Board meeting is Wednesday May 23, 2012 at 2:00 p.m. at City of Prescott Council Chambers, 201 S. Cortez Street – Prescott, Arizona

Water Audit Summary

History: UVRWPC is considering offering water audits to owners of large private turf areas. Prior to conducting external audits, the member entities decided to conduct water audits of their own large turf facilities.

Process: Water usage data was collected from 2008-2010 for each of the large turf facilities in Prescott and Prescott Valley. The usage was compared to the WaterSmart guidelines and ADWR's Third Management Plan recommendations.

Results: The average irrigation rate across all facilities within Prescott and Prescott Valley falls within the recommendations established. A few parks in each municipality exceeded the recommended usage and were identified for possible action. The municipalities may want to review the costs associated with technology upgrades, rainwater harvesting, artificial turf, or xeriscaping these facilities. At a minimum, system operators at public facilities should be instructed on how to properly operate their irrigation systems and what the appropriate levels of irrigation are. The Coalition has continued to be active in the community to help reduce water use by businesses and residents.

UPPER VERDE RIVER WATERSHED PROTECTION COALITION

Watershed Restoration and Recharge Policy Initiative

RECITALS

The Upper Verde River Watershed Protection Coalition (Coalition) was formed by the Town of Chino Valley, Town of Prescott Valley, City of Prescott, Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe, and Yavapai County in acknowledgement of the importance of the Verde River and their joint stewardship of the Upper Verde River Watershed Area (Watershed Area).

The Coalition has since engaged in collaborative efforts to help protect the Verde River by recommending Best Management Practices (BMPs) that protect the base flow of the Upper Verde River and contribute to safe yield in the Prescott Active Management Area. These BMPs include an aquifer recharge pilot project.

The Coalition desires now to expand these efforts by reaching out to other land and water resource stakeholders and large-scale private landowners to collaboratively increase water supplies through a concerted watershed restoration and aquifer recharge effort within the Watershed Area.

INITIATIVE

The Executive Board of the Coalition hereby recommends that the Coalition now apply its resources to significantly expand its efforts to encourage watershed restoration efforts that lead to increased aquifer recharge in the Watershed Area. This will involve reaching out to and coordinating with other partners to research and implement a broad-ranging program of Watershed Area restoration and forest and rangeland management. These efforts would include identification of and application for funding, project development and administration, legislation, and public relations. Potential partners include the U.S. Forest Service, the Arizona Department of Water Resources, Northern Arizona University, the Natural Resource Conservation Service, the Arizona State Land Department, large-scale private landowners and others.

The preliminary goal is to increase groundwater recharge from 2% of total precipitation to 3% of total precipitation. It is believed that this would generate up to 20,000 acre-feet per year of additional water supplies across the Big Chino subbasin and Prescott Active Management Area (PrAMA), and will greatly ameliorate the current overdraft of 10,000 acre feet in the PrAMA. This goal is subject to modification and refinement as research and program administration mature.

Specific initial actions by the Coalition include: (a) adoption of resolutions by individual Coalition member boards and councils, and (b) Coalition staff and Technical

Advisory Committee contacts and cooperation with potential partners to design and implement agreements, scientific research, capital projects, and legislative efforts, and identify funding sources and apply for funding.

RECOMMENDED this ____ day of _____, 2012, by the Executive Committee of the Upper Verde River Watershed Protection Coalition, in accordance with §§4 & 16 of its June 8, 2006 Intergovernmental Agreement.

, Chair