

UPPER VERDE RIVER WATERSHED PROTECTION COALITION
PRESCOTT, ARIZONA
MARCH 28, 2007

MINUTES

A MEETING OF THE UPPER VERDE RIVER WATERSHED PROTECTION COALITION WAS HELD ON MARCH 28, 2007 in the Prescott Municipal Building, 201 S. Cortez Street, Prescott, Arizona.

Chairman Fann called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

Item 1. Introductions

Members present:

Mayor Karen Fann, Town of Chino Valley, Chairman
Vice-Mayor Mike Flannery, Town of Prescott Valley, Vice Chairman
County Supervisor Carol Springer, Yavapai County
Mayor Pro Tem Jim Lamerson City of Prescott
Mayor Bob Greene, Town of Dewey-Humboldt

Members absent:

Ernie Jones, Sr., Prescott-Yavapai Indian Tribe (New member)

Staff present:

John Munderloh, Town of Prescott Valley
Mark Holmes, Town of Chino Valley
John Rasmussen, Yavapai County
Chris Moss, Yavapai Prescott Indian Tribe

Guests present:

Larry Geare
Louis Bellesi
Carmen Stagg
Thomas Slaback
Steve Kling
Ray Newton
Joanne Oellers
Dava Hoffman
George Seaman
Howard Mechanic
Dan Campbell

Ken Janacek
Candace McNulty
Bob Luzius
John Nystedt
Joanna Dodder
Ashley Fine

Item 2. Approval of Minutes – February 28, 2007 Meeting
[Committee]

MEMBER GREENE MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 28, 2007 MEETING; SECONDED BY VICE CHAIRMAN FLANNERY. Vice Mayor Flannery commented on how well the minutes are written of the Coalition. Member Lamerson said that he did not attend the last meeting so he would not be voting on the minutes, but he did read them and was impressed with the comments made with regard to not growing another bureaucracy, and he appreciated the opportunity to sit in Mayor Simmons' spot since he had to be out of town. MOTION PASSED with Member Lamerson abstaining.

Item 3. Discussion & Possible Action – Review of Member's support towards the program and projects
[Committee]

Mr. Holmes reminded the members that at the last meeting they were waiting for the City of Prescott, in their deliberations by Council, to review the Coalition's recommendations.

Member Lamerson said that at their Council meeting referencing the Coalition, the vote was 6-1 to participate financially; however, there was some consternation and concerns over the process with regards to communication, and the fact that the Council as a body hasn't had any interface with the proposed projects, therefore it would be inappropriate for him, on behalf of his Council, to approve anything as a priority at this point in time or say that they agree with the list of projects. They do agree that they have the financial responsibility to participate in the water management process for the Upper Verde River Coalition. He then read the excerpts from the minutes of the City of Prescott's Council Meeting, which indicated that more information would be provided to the Council regarding the projects, prior to action being taken by the Coalition.

Chairman Fann clarified that the Coalition did have the City of Prescott's money, but did not have their full input yet as to what projects should be done and in what priority. Member Lamerson replied that was a fair assessment.

Chairman Fann added that Mr. Moss of the Yavapai Tribe informed her prior to the meeting that the Tribe has offered to contribute \$1,000, which is more than their fair share based on population. She thanked Mr. Moss and President Jones of the Tribe for their contribution.

Item 4. Discussion and Possible Action – Project Priority
[Committee and Staff]

Mr. Munderloh said that at the last meeting the Coalition asked staff for their recommendation on priority of the projects, so staff presented those to them at this time.

Mr. Munderloh said that Year One would include working on water conservation plans and programs, and potentially expand the Big Chino hydrologic monitoring network. He said that the reason for that is that the water conservation programs yield immediate benefits for the aquifer. They know that they are high quality projects. There is not a lot of second guessing that water conservation programs are good. From the network, being that the other projects ranked further down on the list are scientifically based projects, there is potentially a real need to gather baseline information in the Big Chino to help support those other projects.

Mr. Munderloh said that Year Two would include natural recharge and artificial recharge sites, with the concept being that they want to stay ahead of potential development in the Upper Verde area and either protect those sites or preserve them while they can.

He said that Year Three included the feasibility of flood detention project, which was tough because from a scientific perspective it is not as critical, but from a perspective of providing health, safety and welfare of the community, it is. Finally, he said, the watershed management approach was last, not seeing that as time sensitive as the others.

Chairman Fann asked of the six projects on the original worksheet, if the three years encompassed all six of those; Mr. Munderloh replied they did.

Member Springer asked if the proposal regarding hydrologic monitoring network was to drill more wells. She asked for more information on what that would produce. Mr. Munderloh replied that the concept is to assess whether they need additional monitoring points in the Big Chino. The City of Prescott went through a process to evaluate hydrologic monitoring network issues as they relate to the Big Chino Water Ranch, and so quite a few things have been put into place, but they did not expand throughout the whole Big Chino area to see where they have data lacking. They'll be getting some information from the USGS reports that are already out there and their model later this year to help them assess where they may have big gaps in their

knowledge, and then potentially they would either put in additional monitoring wells, equip wells that are already there for water level data, etc., perhaps put in surface water flow measuring stations, weather stations, etc. They don't actually know right now what they would need.

Member Springer said that from the wells that Prescott already drilled, are they being monitored for the groundwater level or for the quality. Mr. Munderloh said that initial water quality is being tested and primarily they're being put in place for water level monitoring.

Member Springer said that the idea is to expand them from the upper Big Chino area down to the lower end. She asked if they are measuring and hope to capture information regarding recharge in those areas as well. Mr. Munderloh said that potentially that could be a point of examination, or whether they need a monitoring point at a given location. Mr. Munderloh said that the first phase of this would be to evaluate what they need; it is possible that they don't need much more data than what they're already collecting.

Member Lamerson asked about the water conservation plans and programs. He asked what the projected costs were to develop those. Mr. Munderloh said that he didn't have in front of him, however they did come up with a budget estimate for each project. Chairman Fann said that it was \$30,000. Member Lamerson said that he would like an opportunity to suggest to his Council that water conservation is real important, but it's important for him to have the council say that is the way they want their contribution spent.

Chairman Fann said that these six items were identified earlier, and the budget they initially came up with and the contributions coincided with these projects. She said that they have had a lot of input from the public regarding other suggestions, i.e. environmental studies and a few others that were noted in the minutes. She asked if they were able to receive some grants, if they would be able to institute some of the other programs that they would like to add also. Mr. Munderloh said that is a key part of all of the programs is to work with other associations, water groups, etc. to apply for grants. An example is with the water conservation programs, the Water Advisory Committee is working on conservation programs that could apply to the whole county, so there would be some nice overlap.

Member Springer said that the Corp of Engineers has just completed a report in the Big Chino area that will be released shortly, and it's come to their attention that as a result of some of that work being done, there could be a potential for them to use flood control money which all of Yavapai County citizens pay into through a tax, for a detention or retention basin discussed previously. She noted that Ken Spedding in the County's Development Services Department is the contact person.

Member Lamerson said that he appreciated those comments. He asked Mr. Munderloh if he was coordinating with the other groups, such as WAC, to ensure to that the Coalition's money is not being spent on a duplication of efforts. Mr. Munderloh said that is a key component of what will be presented in a few minutes, through the Program Manager position.

Joanne Oellers, representing the Center for Biological Diversity, thanked everyone for inviting the public to communicate with them. She said that she did have a question about the timeline. She said that the date of July 2009 is the date being set forth as the "start pump" date for the pipeline. Mr. Munderloh said that was the current schedule. In looking at the project priority she said she sees a three-year schedule and during the third year she sees what needs to be looked at for recharge issues would be looked at after that date of 2009. She is trying to understand how that fits together that if the pipeline was ready to roll before the actual projects had been completed or even examined, how that would come into play in protecting the Upper Verde River.

Mr. Munderloh said that he's not sure that there is a response; it appears to be more of a complaint than anything; however, what he believes the person does not fully understand is that as the pipeline pumping begins, it will not likely begin pumping 8700 acre feet at once. Furthermore, they have designed in a significant cost burden for moving the location of pumping some 18 miles away from potential impacts on the Verde River. That, in itself, gives them decades of time to respond to any impact.

Chairman Fann said that it is somewhat out of her jurisdiction, but things she has heard over the past two years regarding this pipeline project, when the pipeline is complete, the amount of pumping that is going to happen initially is going to be a small amount. This would allow Prescott and Prescott Valley to monitor any impacts that the pumping is going to do. Mr. Munderloh said that is one part of the total picture, also realizing that at least 3600 acre feet of the pumping impact is already offset by Prescott City Council action to retire irrigated land on the Big Chino Water Ranch.

Ms. Oellers said that the only way they are going to learn about what is going on to a large degree is in sessions like this. The public needs to feel safe to simply ask questions and be informed and not be viewed as complaining about situations. It is healthy to have their questions be answered in a straight forward manner. She said that what was just learned by her at this meeting is new to her and she believes they can all benefit from hearing about more of those nuances involved in the plan. She's also curious to know about the "decades of time" and that there's no rush. She said she's somewhat concerned about that.

Member Springer said that as she recalls, in the USGS report there were several timetables for water moving through and it was from one end to the other up to 10,000 years. Mr. Munderloh said that was portrayed as the average time of a water molecule in the basin.

Mr. Holmes said that in the heyday of pumping of agriculture out of the Big Chino, the Department of Water Resource studies have shown 15,000 acre feet or more were pumped during the 60's and early 70's. When plotted on a graph, the base flow of the Upper Verde at the Paulden Gauge, never showed once any drop, so he believes that the reference to decades is a safe assumption.

Prescott Councilman Bob Luzius, speaking as a citizen, asked about the three-year priority plan outline, since all of the projects are being financed by the public taxpayers' monies, he asked if they would be made aware of the results of all of the tests and also the Verde River Basin Partnership. Chairman Fann said absolutely; they will be public reports and available for reproduction and they'll be sharing with the other water groups.

Thomas Slaback said, in regards to the third year priority projects, healthy watershed management, there is a memo and map that has been circulating around from Chino Valley basically saying that the Forest Service is in support of PJ Forest Thinning Management on various lands and the map shows on the Forest Service, on steep land slopes, some of this occurring. It also shows it in wilderness areas, such as the juniper wilderness area. He would like to know who at Chino Valley has been in contact with the Forest Service over this and who they were in contact with at the Forest Service.

Mr. Holmes said that he would like to see the map and documentation. There has been some preliminary means with the Forest Service in reference to the concept of watershed management in reference to what the Forest Service is currently conducting around the Prescott National Forest in reference to the elimination of specific species of trees that are becoming very prolific and invasive, and trying to restore those areas to native and natural grasslands that once existed for a number of reasons, such as habitat restorations. Looking at big concepts, any map that may have been generated is purely conceptual in design. He said that one of the individuals was Alan Kuan.

Howard Mechanic said that there was no Call to the Public on the agenda. Chairman Fann replied that it was an error, but the thinking was whether it was necessary or not. Mr. Mechanic said that he did have something to bring up regarding an issue not on the agenda, so he appreciated the opportunity to have that available.

Mr. Mechanic said that t he's been working in the water conservation element for that for a long time. He's presently serving on the Water Allocation

Committee's conservation committee and it's been mentioned that there are proposals that will be presented to the WAC in a few weeks, which would ultimately be coming to the Board of Supervisors.

Realizing that, he believes it is better to let WAC's work take its course, perhaps in six months before the Board of Supervisors. He's questioning what this person (coordinator) would need to do, and then they're talking about spending \$30,000 for a consultant to work on this. He believes that there are two levels there that he doesn't see a need for at this time. The reason is, when they're talking about conservation out there, the people using water are agriculture use. They can talk about efforts to save water on agriculture use up there, but he expects that a lot of those lands will be developed over a period of time, and that's only a temporary solution. The long term solution for conservation is dealing with new residential that's going to go in there—Codes that would deal with new residential. Most conservation efforts come from rates.

Chairman Fann asked Mr. Mechanic to come back to the specific agenda item. Mr. Mechanic asked what can be done beside agriculture use being conserved, which is only a temporary thing right now, without the Board of Supervisors.

Chairman Fann said that obviously it is going to have to go through the Board of Supervisors, and anything they do will have to go through their respective municipalities. That's part of the Coalition, agreeing to work together whether they're in the AMA or not. She said that its better that they're working together as a team and this is an item that they're all aware of and concerned about.

Chairman Fann said that future growth is going to be an issue that the Board of Supervisors is going to have to deal with. Something the Coalition might look at is whether there's a mechanism to buy some of the land in the Big Chino that would prevent some of the growth that could go on.

Mr. Mechanic asked if buying water conservation easements would be covered under this topic. Chairman Fann said that she believed that when the projects are done, anybody that is any good at this would bring back setting back water conservation districts.

Doug Wall said that he appeared before the City of Prescott a year or so ago supporting the purchase of the Big Chino Water Ranch. He congratulates the Coalition on the work they're doing on a very difficult subject. He's had for some time some history with the Central Arizona Project and has felt, since he moved up here three years ago, something that is basically unfair, that the State of Arizona and all rural areas supported the Central Arizona Project and without people like Sam Steiger, and others up here from Prescott, the rural

area, that wouldn't have happened. A couple of things have triggered him to come forward at this time. He's not representing anybody but himself.

He sees where Nevada is going to put in a pipeline to bring in water from Northern Nevada to Las Vegas; Utah is talking about a pipeline, a reclamation project to take water out of Lake Powell to St. George. In 1964 the State of Arizona had a study done on bringing water from the Columbia River. They had a study done on bringing it from the Great Lakes; from Central Canada. All of them were feasible, but financially they were not. He sees where Nevada wants to buy water in northwest Arizona to transport there. He thinks that in the long run they're going to have to bring water into the area to the Verde system, but he thinks there are ways to do it on a bigger scale than what they're looking at. He asked that they give some thought to getting the State to work with them to do a reclamation project from Mohave County to Kingman, to Prescott, or the Verde Valley watershed. Peabody Coal transports water from the Mesa to the Colorado River. Flagstaff has bought a ranch east of town that has a lot of water under it and they're going to transport it into Flagstaff. The Navajo and Hopi Indians need water on their reservations. Northern Arizona should get together and figure out and say to the State of Arizona that they need help. He said they're going to have one-half million people up here. Chairman Fann noted that is something that is being looked at in the future.

Chairman Fann said that since some of the councils have not had an opportunity to discuss the projects, it was agreed by the members that each member would take this list back to their respective agencies to review and bring back their position. Member Springer said that it is too late to put on the next agenda, so they won't be able to put on until the first Monday in May, after the next meeting. Mr. Munderloh said that it should not be a problem delaying, since they wouldn't be starting these projects until the first of July, and he suspects that some of these may change in the future.

MEMBER LAMERSON MOVED THAT THE LIST OF STAFF-RECOMMENDED PROJECTS AND PRIORITIES BE TAKEN BACK BY THE RESPECTIVE COUNCIL/BOARD MEMBERS TO THEIR COUNCILS/BOARDS FOR DISCUSSION AND CONSENSUS ON THESE ITEMS, TO BE BROUGHT BACK TO THE FIRST AVAILABLE MEETING; SECONDED BY MEMBER GREENE; PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Item 5. Discussion and Possible Action – Type of Project Facilitation Project Coordinator, manager, consultant or consulting company
[Committee and Staff]

Chairman Fann said that there was a comment made under the last agenda item that there may be duplicate funds spent. She asked that staff define

what money is going to be spent, how it is going to be spent, and how it is not going to be duplicated or wasting their dollars.

Mr. Holmes asked if they could table this item number and proceed to Item 6 to discuss job descriptions.

Chairman Fann said that if there was no objection she would move to Item 6.

Item 6. Discussion and Possible Action – Program Manager

1. Job Description
 2. Job Duties, Tasks and Anticipated Workload
 3. Employment Category (Staff Recommendation – Consulting Firm)
 4. Office Location of Program Manager, Coordinator or Administrator (unless consulting services are used)
- [Committee and Staff]

Mr. Munderloh reviewed the highlights of the job descriptions; concepts of staff that would apply to either a consultant or staff person. They reviewed the essential functions; e.g. coordinating activities of the Coalition – meetings, budget, annual report, effective communication for decision process, other tasks as assigned; development and manage Coalition projects; provide technical and policy assistance.

Mr. Munderloh reviewed skills they'd be looking for—project management, technical capabilities in water resources, hydrology and engineering, good communication, ability to coordinate and ability to understand geographic information.

Minimum qualifications would be at least a BS in civil engineer, hydrology, geology, water resources and ten years of professional level experience; preferred someone with a Professional Engineering certification. He then reviewed examples of tasks.

Mr. Holmes said that there has been some discussion in previous meetings on what it would take for the facilitation of this entity, whether coordinator, manager or consulting firm. He said that staff tried to put together some tasks that would be mandated from the entity. He reviewed specific tasks as presented in the outline. Mr. Holmes then reviewed a possible project timeline.

Mr. Holmes said that the amount of time to manage these projects would be somewhat overwhelming for one person. In looking at what was done in the past, what is going on today and what is going to happen in the future, it will take time to do it right.

He said that staff believes that they would not have the time to take this on with what they each have going on in their own municipalities/organizations.

Mr. Munderloh briefly reviewed a suggested organizational chart. He said that based on their findings, staff is recommending that they lean toward a consulting firm, rather than a staff person. He said that the reason is that they can provide a wide range of services from a consulting firm, which is difficult and/or expensive to find in any one person. Their contract would be contingent on performance; potential will see a cost savings because of the specialization within the firm i.e. administrative staff. He said that they see that with the NAMWUA format. A consulting firm can deal with most issues in a less bureaucratic fashion than the Coalition could do with a staff person.

Member Lamerson said that he liked the concept of contract based on performance. He would like to have his Council consider this issue as well, as they have not yet discussed it. He said that he knows that he has people on his council concerned about hiring people; others are concerned about hiring consultants. Knowing that, he would like to have a discussion with his Council.

Vice Chairman Flannery said that he appreciates the amount of work that has gone into this. He has seen the structure in the way that consultants have been used and he believes it is very efficient and a great way to use taxpayer dollars. He does have some concerns about this being the third meeting that these items have come before the Coalition and if this is going to be a standard operating procedure, it is going to slow the process down.

At this time, Chairman Fann returned to Item 5, and said she would take comments on either Items 5 or 6.

Mr. Holmes said that staff believes they have discussed both Items 5 and 6. He noted that staff is recommending that they obtain a consulting firm.

Member Springer said that she doesn't honestly know the best way to go. Her question was whether there were consulting firms locally that would satisfy all of these qualifications. Mr. Munderloh said that he has had conversations with firms, both locally and in the region, to gauge their level of interest, and received positive responses. All of them did say that they probably didn't have expertise to fill every aspect of every project, but they can easily, on a case-by-case basis, get that expertise from another firm. He said that they use the same model right now with NAMWUA with a firm that works for them to do the minutes, administrative work, policy issues regarding legislation as well as the technical end, and it has worked well so far and the costs have been less than anticipated thus far.

Member Springer said that if such firms were available, she would ask if they can set it up on an annual contract to see how it works out. Mr. Munderloh said that he didn't ask that question of the firms, but they could contact them. She said that she can see why that would be the most cost-effective and would also lessen the time frame involved.

George Seaman, referring to the organizational chart, said that he understands the cost-effectiveness and the efficiency, but if they're talking about a governmental bureaucracy being set up to do all of the work, the stakeholders wouldn't have any access to the consulting firm. The problem with having a consulting firm is that the citizens have a much more difficult time accessing what is going on. He said that he knows that the staff people and Coalition members realize that there are some members of the public that are real pains to deal with, and it would be nice to say there's a consulting firm doing this, but the fact is that they are elected and paid to deal with the public. The reason they pay them is so they have access to governmental agencies. If they farm the entire project out to a consulting firm and there's no go-to person that the citizens can talk with about their concerns, what they've done is moved the control of government further away from the citizens.

Chairman Fann said that the public access is going to be there, such as with CYMPO. She said the firm is hired to do the project and then they go through an entire public process so that the public does have the opportunity to respond to what is in a report. Mr. Seaman said that his point is that the citizens want human beings to deal with and if they go to a consulting firm, it will be every one of the members of the Coalition and staff dealing with the citizens' concerns.

Mr. Munderloh said that they can easily deal with that concern with building into the RFP the requirement that a designated person in the consulting firm be the point person for citizens' concerns. Mr. Seaman said that if that firm is not local and the go-to person is not someone that he knows, then he has a problem with it and most citizens do.

Chairman Fann said that is why the project schedules included an opportunity for the public, and the point persons from the firm would be at all of the meetings. Mr. Seaman said that those people are not accessible to the public and it creates a problem.

Lou Bellisi, said that he hasn't heard anything about the Partnership. He said that he has their science plan evaluated. Chairman Fann said that is not an agenda item so they cannot talk about it. Mr. Bellisi asked if any consideration was given to reviewing the science plan that the Partnership did to see if there was any duplication. Member Springer said that her position is that she doesn't recognize what the Partnership is doing. Mr. Munderloh said

that they have stated many times during their presentations that coordination with other groups is going to be a key aspect of any of it. If the Partnership has similar projects, or WAC, there'll be coordination and cooperation to get those projects done.

MEMBER LAMERSON MOVED TO TAKE THIS ISSUE BACK TO THEIR RESPECTIVE COUNCILS/BOARDS TO GET THEIR INPUT ON THEIR POSITION AND REPORT THAT BACK TO THE COALITION; SECONDED BY MEMBER GREENE; PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Item 7. Discussion and Possible Action – Direct Staff to advertise for or develop & post RFQ for Program Manager Position
[Committee and Staff]

MEMBER FLANNERY MOVED TO TABLE THIS ITEM UNTIL ALL MEMBERS CAN COME BACK WITH DIRECTION FROM THEIR RESPECTIVE COUNCILS/BOARDS; SECONDED BY MEMBER LAMERSON; PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Item 8. Next Meeting Time / Location / Agenda Items
[Committee]

The next meeting will be April 25, 2007. Chairman Fann said that most items discussed today will be placed on that agenda. She said that she is not going to be able to attend the April 25 meeting as she is receiving a State award for Subcontractor of the Year.

Howard Mechanic asked if the Coalition has any problem with televising future meetings, and if the City of Prescott would have any problems for access television. He said that he is the Chair of Access 13; however, he's not there in that capacity. He had asked the station manager if the station was interested in televising the meetings and she indicated they would be interested, with no cost involved. Chairman Fann and members of the Coalition said they had no problem, so they would just need to confirm with the City of Prescott. Vice Chairman asked if it would be under Government or Public Access. Mr. Mechanic replied it would be under Public Access, unless they chose otherwise. He said that he would prefer to continue having Call to the Public since there are some times that he has items to bring forward that are not on the agenda. Chairman Fann said that they will discuss that issue further.

Mr. Mechanic said that he has heard at past meetings that the chairman wanted to see a "can do" attitude and he's there with a "can-do" attitude. He said that the goal to protect the Upper Verde is something they can do if they want to do it, and he hopes the people there agree with that and the public needs to be able to participate. He said that one thing he can do is state that

rather than pay \$30,000 for a consultant to look at a conservation plan, first ask if there can be a conservation committee working with the project manager. The City of Prescott has a volunteer conservation committee, they didn't pay a consultant. The WAC also has a volunteer committee and they didn't pay a consultant. That is one area in which he thinks he can help.

Member Lamerson said that he appreciated the indulgence of the Coalition and he would make sure to get these items on a future agenda.

MEMBER GREENE MOVED TO ADJOURN; SECONDED BY MEMBER LAMERSON; PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. Chairman Fann adjourned the meeting at 3:35 p.m.

KAREN FANN, Chairman

ATTEST:

ELIZABETH A. BURKE, Clerk