



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