



NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING & AGENDA

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

**Wednesday, May 23, 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 March 28, 2012****
- ITEM NO 5. **Discussion - TAC Meeting Summary for April 4, 2012 and May 2, 2012****
- ITEM NO 6. **Discussion – Old Home Manor Project Update****
- ITEM NO 7. **Discussion – Watershed Restoration and Recharge Policy Initiative Update****
- ITEM NO 8. **Discussion & Possible Action – Rainwater Harvesting Technical Workgroup Participation****
- ITEM NO 9. **Discussion – Next Meeting Time / Location / Agenda Items****
- ITEM NO 10. **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 MARCH 28, 2012**

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



AGENDA ITEM NO. 5
DISCUSSION - TAC MEETING SUMMARY FOR APRIL 4, 2012 AND MAY 2, 2012

Brief summary of TAC Meetings.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 6
DISCUSSION – OLD HOME MANOR PROJECT UPDATE

Current project status

- Agreement with Chino Valley
- Construction documents

AGENDA ITEM NO. 7
DISCUSSION – WATERSHED RESTORATION AND RECHARGE POLICY INITIATIVE UPDATE

Update on initiative activities and next steps



**AGENDA ITEM NO. 8
DISCUSSION & POSSIBLE ACTION – RAINWATER HARVESTING TECHNICAL WORKGROUP
PARTICIPATION**

Discuss possible participation

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 9
DISCUSSION – NEXT MEETING TIME / LOCATION / AGENDA ITEMS**

Board Meeting

The next regularly scheduled Board Meeting is on **July 25, 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, June 6, 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. 10
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 March 27, 2012, in PRESCOTT CITY HALL, 201 SOUTH CORTEZ STREET, Prescott, Arizona.

Chairwoman Nye called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

ITEM NO 1. Introductions, Awards, or Presentations

Members Present:

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

Members Absent:

President Ernie Jones, Yavapai- Prescott Indian Tribe

Staff Present:

Ed Muccillo, Program Manager
John Munderloh, Town of Prescott Valley
John Rasmussen, Yavapai County
Shawn Rydell, City of Prescott
Dana Biscan, Project Manager
Rick Shroads, Assistant Program Manager
Elizabeth Burke, City of Prescott

ITEM NO 2. Communications

ITEM NO 3. Call to Public

John Rasmussen noted that during the Board of Supervisors meeting, the Yavapai County Flood Control District approved an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Department of Water Resources to fund some stream flow gauges. He said the gauges were Clarkdale, Sedona, Cornville, Granite Creek, below Watson Lake and Del Rio Springs.



He said, with funding cuts, some of the gauges were in jeopardy. The Flood Control District picked them up last year and redid the agreement to pick them up again. He felt the agreement would be easier to renew in the future.

Councilman Blair asked who maintained the records from the gauges and if they were readily available to the public. Mr. Rasmussen said they were available in real time with the click of a mouse. He said they were maintained by the United States Geological Survey (USGS). He noted that there was a water data web site with all of the gauges for Arizona.

Creighton McConnell, Paulden, asked what considerations would be made for Paulden well owners in the new direction they were going. He said they had been left out in the past and wanted to be a part of the new discussions.

ITEM NO 4. Discussion & Possible Action – Approval of Board Meeting minutes – September 28, 2011 and January 25, 2012

VICE MAYOR TENNEY MOVED TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 28, 2011, BOARD MINUTES; SECONDED BY SUPERVISOR SPRINGER; PASSED 3-0 WITH COUNCILMAN BLAIR ABSTAINING.

COUNCILMAN BLAIR MOVED TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 25, 2012, BOARD MEETING MINUTES; SECONDED BY SUPERVISOR SPRINGER, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

ITEM NO 5. Discussion – TAC Meeting Summary for February 1, 2012 and March 7, 2012

Mr. Muccillo noted that there was nothing that was not agendized in the current meeting.

ITEM NO 6. Discussion – Water Conservation Update

Ms. Rydell, City of Prescott Water Conservation, presented the Water Smart Program. She noted there was consensus among the Coalition members to support water conservation education at a regional level.



The presentation covered:

- REGIONAL WATER EFFICIENCY AND CONSERVATION EDUCATION
- WHAT WE ARE DOING
- ADVERTISING – 2011
- MORE ADVERTISING – NEWCOMER’S GUIDE
- BUILD YAVAPAI
- SUPPORT INDUSTRY
- MEMBERSHIP – MUNICIPAL IRRIGATION ASSOCIATION

Councilman Blair asked if they had considered partnering with Arizona Public Service (APS) or other entities that sent out a monthly bill to Chino Valley, Paulden and Prescott Valley, so other people could get the pamphlets. Ms. Rydell said they were only available by the public interacting at the public venues. She noted that they could be picked up at the library or public works. She said she would look into that with APS. She noted that they printed 23,000 for the City of Prescott which cost .001 to inset them into their water bills.

She said she used to be the only irrigation auditor in the community and there were currently seven auditors.

- NURSERY RETAIL OUTREACH
- HOTELS/MOTELS – NEW PROGRAM
- PUBLIC EDUCATION
- 2012 IRRIGATION EDUCATION – NEW DOCUMENTS
- IRRIGATION EDUCATION



- WATERING GUIDELINE
- RAIN HARVESTING WORKBOOK
- BOOTH IMAGE
- DESKTOP WATER AUDIT
- YOUTH EDUCATION K-12
- CLASSROOM MAPS
- A CHILD'S MUSEUM
- 2012 COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES
- QUESTIONS

Chairman Nye said the program was well conceived and executed.

Mr. Muccillo noted that Cottonwood placed an order for the Water Smart Cards.

ITEM NO 7. Discussion – Water Audit

Mr. Muccillo said the new water audit had been finalized.

Dana Biscan gave a brief history of the water audit. She noted that they had talked about doing water audits for large turf facilities and then decided to conduct them internally before offering them to others. She said they reviewed the water records within the years 2008 to 2011, for all of the large turf parks and compared it to the Water Smart guidelines and the ADWR Management Plan Recommendations. They found that Prescott and Prescott Valley were within the recommended ranges. She noticed that a few parks could be more efficient, if they looked at xeriscaping. She noted that, as a whole, everyone was efficient and they could move forward.



Chairman Nye said they were very happy with their artificial turf at Mountain Valley Park and were bringing in tournaments that they did not have previously.

Ms. Biscan said they did not audit the parks that were already implementing those things because they were so far below the average.

ITEM NO 8. Discussion – Old Home Manor Project Update

Rick Shroads said they were looking forward to breaking ground in Chino Valley. He noted that they had been working on contracts for the past few months and had a right of entry and construction easement contract that had been reviewed by Ivan Legler. He noted that it had been submitted to the Public Works Director in Chino Valley for his review.

Vice Mayor Tenney asked what he needed from the Town of Chino. Mr. Shroads said that the contract would probably have to go to Council for approval.

ITEM NO 9. Discussion– Legislative Update

Mr. Rasmussen gave a handout to the member. He described the bills that were most relevant to the Coalition:

House Bill (HB) 2025 related to water supply disclosure for home sales. He noted that it had not gone anywhere for awhile.

HB2363 passed and was on the Governor's desk. He said it was Karen Fann's bill that would establish a macro harvesting water study committee which had four components 1) define what macro harvested water was 2) evaluate all of the issues associated with it 3) review relevant Department of Water Resources rules and guidelines related to recharge in Active Management Areas (AMA) and 4) reporting requirements.

He said they anticipated questions about who was on the committee and how the area would be represented. He noted that within the bill, there was a list of positions on the committee, but no names were provided.

Supervisor Springer said that all of the bills with the money tied to them would probably go through with the budget process.



HB 2830 was the only Blue Ribbon Panel bill that was still in existence. He said that it was retained and set guidelines to establish accounts for energy water savings.

HB2825 represented the municipal fee. He said the Governor was hesitant to put ADWR on the General Fund and may not sign that bill.

Senate Bill (SB) 1236 was the Harvested Water Recharge bill that was dealing with surface water management which almost turned into a “strike all”, but they left a section on harvested water. There were stipulations for two pilot projects related to macro harvesting. One would be in Yavapai County and the other in Cochise County. He noted that the Cochise County project was underway and the Yavapai County project was subject to available funds. He noted that it may work well with Karen Fann’s bill.

SB1288 was the repeal of the municipal water fees which looked like it would go through to the Governor.

SB 1418 was about public private partnership infrastructure and had not moved since March. He noted that it might open door for the County to get involved in the water business, which still had limitations by State statute.

HB2332 - Healthy Forest Enterprise Incentives, looked like it was going through and had tax incentives for ventures that related to healthy forest projects. He did not think that it included public lands.

SB2658 - Flood Control Authority, would make the County Flood Control Districts not liable for things done on systems that were turned over to the district before they were turned over to the County. He said that it looked like it would pass.

Supervisor Springer noted that he did a good job of summarizing and said that many of them would go through the next day or following week, which would be the end of the session.

She noted that she was concerned with some items on the Federal level. She said the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was working on rules concerning the Clean Water Act, which was extremely significant because, historically, the concept had been that states regulated their own waters, except on navigable waterways. She noted that it would be the Colorado River, in Arizona. She noted that the document would apply to



every ditch and pond in the entire country. She said they were taking over all of the water in the United States and it was an extremely serious issue.

She said she was most bothered because neither Congress nor any of the Presidential candidates had picked up on it. She said it seemed to be under the radar and they should all be aware of it. She noted that it would involve the amount of Federal permits that would be required.

Chairman Nye said that it was Federal interference in state affairs. She said those things would take them over if they sat and did nothing. She asked them to call their legislators.

ITEM NO. 10 Discussion & Possible Action – Watershed Restoration and Recharge Policy Initiative

Mr. Munderloh said they started the policy initiative some time ago, based off of the information from the USGS and ADWR. He said they knew that within the Big Chino sub basin and the Prescott AMA, they got between 2.2 million acre feet of precipitation per year. He said the average annual recharge was 38,000 acre feet, which was less than 2 percent of the total. He noted that it was what the people, rivers and environment lived on during the dry times.

He said the Verde Valley sub basin had about a five percent rate of recharge rate. He asked if something had changed in the area and if there was something they could do about it.

The presentation covered:

- WATERSHED RESTORATION AND RECHARGE INITIATIVE
- AVERAGE
- PHOTOS
- SIX FOOT TALL SCRUB OAK
- A NUMBER...
- COALITION GROUNDWORK



- GOALS
- THE EFFORT MOVING FORWARD

He said they would start out with some individual resolutions from the Coalition communities and work with staff and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members to coordinate with other partners like the Forest Service, Natural Resources Conservation Service, DWR, State Land Department and various other land owners, to name a few.

He said they were doing things with more of a focus on water and recharge, rather than just focusing on one element. He noted they did not know if controlled burns increased runoff. He said, in the future, they may be able to create a situation where they would know that.

He said he wanted to make the research scientifically valid and there may be a need for some legislative activity. He said it would also depend on the ability to obtain grant funding.

Vice Mayor Tenney asked how they would go about getting more water to recharge. He asked what they would do differently in a controlled burn to encourage more recharge. Mr. Munderloh said that it was not his forte, but there were people who knew what to do. He noted that they could start with a paired controlled burn in a small watershed.

Vice Mayor Tenney asked what his opinion was concerning why it was so much more heavily vegetated. Mr. Munderloh said that it was probably all of their land management practices. He said there was an encroachment of species on the land was not there previously. He noted the Junipers encroaching onto the grasslands and said the Junipers used more water than the grasslands.

Supervisor Springer asked if he would go back to SB1236 regarding the two pilot programs the DWR was supposed to do before December 1, 2012. She noted that the bill said subject to funding and it was interesting that it did not say, subject to appropriation. She asked if there was one of the projects that they could work on with DWR.

She noted that if they just let DWR do it, DWR would not do it. She said if they pushed them, based on the legislation, they could have one of the projects be the monitor project. She said it would be important to decide



quickly if one of the projects would be suitable and whether they might be able to get some funding for it. She said they may be able to put DWR in the area where DWR may have to help fund the project.

She said she wanted to keep the water harvesting alive and that was a good opportunity to do that.

Mr. Munderloh said DWR would be an important partner moving forward. He said the Chino Valley project was ready for them. Supervisor Springer said that December 1 was not far away and they should move quickly.

Councilman Blair asked who the lead was to get a group together to do Juniper management like they did 50 years ago. Mr. Munderloh said there was a lack of overall leadership and he felt that was what the coalition could provide. He said things had changed since the studies on the watershed runoff in the 1950's through the 1970's. He noted that the technology to measure water had improved. He said the land manager at the Long View Ranch was actively harvesting Junipers and they invited the coalition to go out and put their instruments in the ground.

Mr. Blair thought it should be done. Supervisor Springer said she spoke to the owner, who was very open to the idea of testing as much land as they wanted to do. She said he was having the Juniper removed as a biofuel for the Drake Cement Plant. She said they should move forward on it.

Chairman Nye said they had not put the energy toward some of the opportunities they have had. She noted that it was a positive way to come together and do something positive for the community. Councilman Blair asked who would take the lead in getting everyone together to do all of the things that they were talking about doing. Mr. Munderloh said that, based on the Board's direction, it would be the program manager and the Technical Advisory Committee. Councilman Blair said the sooner the better.

VICE MAYOR TENNEY MOVED TO ACCEPT THE WATERSHED RESTORATION AND RETENTION POLICY INITIATIVE, AS PRESENTED; SECONDED BY COUNCILMAN BLAIR; PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.



Gary Beverly, representing the Sierra Club and Citizens Water Advocacy Group, said the project was interesting and they would like to work with the TAC as a coordinating partner.

Creighton McConnell said that they would like to help out in any way.

ITEMNO.11 Discussion & Possible Action– Next Meeting Time / Location / Agenda / Items

Board Meeting

The next regularly scheduled Board Meeting was scheduled for 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 was scheduled for Wednesday April 4, 2012.

Ed Muccillo said they would continue to do agenda updates on the Old Home Manor Project and the Water Restoration Recharge Policy Initiative. He noted that they could add items on water conservation efforts. It was working well to have two TAC meetings between each Board Meeting.

Betty Mathews, Forest Supervisor for the Prescott National Forest, said that she had been in her position for a year and has had the opportunity to speak with Leslie Graser and John Munderloh. She said she was very interested in working with the communities to figure out some solutions. She noted that she was very aware of the water issues and the new Forest Plan would be in alignment with the community's restoration plans.

ITEM NO. 12 ACTION – ADJOURN MEETING

There being no further business to be discussed, the Upper Verde River Watershed Protection Coalition meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Councilwoman Lora Lee Nye, Chairman



ATTEST:

Kim Webb, Assistant Clerk



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

**Wednesday, April 4, 2012
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, Dana Biscan, Raymond Buettner

- **Meeting called to order at 1:10 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, May 2, 2011 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