



## **NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING & AGENDA**

### **UPPER VERDE RIVER WATERSHED PROTECTION COALITION**

**Wednesday, March 26, 2008 – 2:00 p.m.  
City of Prescott Town Hall, Council Chambers  
201 South Cortez Street – Prescott, Arizona**

**ITEM NO 1. Introductions, Awards, or Presentations**

**ITEM NO 2. 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 3. Action – Approval of Minutes for Previous Board Meeting**

**ITEM NO 4. Discussion – Program Manager’s Report**

**ITEM NO 5. Discussion – TAC Meeting Summary – March 12, 2008**

**ITEM NO 6. Discussion & Possible Action – Safe Yield Workgroup**

**ITEM NO 7. Discussion – Educational Presentations Schedule & Approach**

**ITEM NO 8. Discussion – Next Meeting Time / Location / Agenda Items**



**AGENDA ITEM NO. 3**

**ACTION – APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR PREVIOUS BOARD MEETING**

---

The meeting minutes for the previous Board Meeting held on February 27, 2008, are attached.

**UPPER VERDE RIVER WATERSHED PROTECTION COALITION  
PRESCOTT, ARIZONA  
FEBRUARY 27, 2008**

**MINUTES**

A MEETING OF THE UPPER VERDE RIVER WATERSHED PROTECTION COALITION WAS HELD ON FEBRUARY 27, 2008 in the Prescott Municipal Building, 201 S. Cortez Street, Prescott, Arizona.

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

**ITEM NO. 1 INTRODUCTIONS, AWARDS OR PRESENTATIONIONS**

**Members present:**

Mayor Karen Fann, Town of Chino Valley, Chairman  
Councilman Mike Flannery, Town of Prescott Valley, Vice-Chairman  
Mayor Jack Wilson, City of Prescott  
County Supervisor Carol Springer, Yavapai County

**Staff present:**

Rick Shroads, Assistant Program Manager  
Jim Campbell, Burgess & Niple  
Mark Holmes, Town of Chino Valley  
Daniel Timmons, Town of Chino Valley  
Jim Holt, City of Prescott  
John Munderloh, Town of Prescott Valley

**Guests Present:**

- Presentation by John Nystedt & Brenda Smith, U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service on Habitat Conservation Plans.

John Nystedt & Brenda Smith gave a PowerPoint presentation, attached hereto as Exhibit A.

Member Springer asked how many endangered species are there in the Upper Verde Watershed. Ms. Smith identified the spikedais , razorback sucker, Colorado pikeminnow, southwestern willow flycatcher in the Verde main stem. She said there are a number of rare and declining species, as well. Ms. Smith explained that a Habitat Conservation Incidental Take Permit will last about 50 years and during that time more species will likely be added. Recovery programs are a main focus of U.S Fish & Wildlife Service for the reestablishment populations in the aquatic systems.

Member Springer asked for the definition and examples of “incidental take.” Ms. Smith cited the Habitat Conservation Plan being developed by Pima County initiated due to legal development activities that removed habitat for the cactus ferruginous pygmy owl in Southern Arizona. This is considered a take that occurred incidentally so they have applied for an incidental take permit. Member Springer asked about the land along the upper strip of the Upper Verde River that is owned by Arizona Game and Fish and has the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service had any discussions with them. Ms. Smith answered that they are looking more at the effects of development in the Upper Watershed, not just the Verde but the Big Chino Watershed that feeds and supports the baseflow for the Verde River. That is where the main impact would likely come from.

Member Wilson asked what Habitat Conservation Plans exist in Arizona other than Pima County. Mr. Nystedt identified Malpai Borderlands; two with the Salt River Project – the Horseshoe/Bartlett and Roosevelt; Lower Colorado River, which is a multi-species HCP; the Sky Ranch Project; and El Coronado Ranch West Turkey Creek. Member Wilson asked why they do the HCPs. Mr. Nystedt said in each case there were listed species that could have been taken by the proposed activities. For example, at Roosevelt fluctuating levels of the reservoir threatened to inundate southwestern willow flycatcher nesting habitat. Mr. Nystedt said in the case of Pinal County, cactus ferruginous pygmy owl habitat was being looked at for development. Removing habitat for the species may have resulted in harm, which is part of the definition for take. In each case, there was the potential for take by the action and the developer wanted to be covered by an incidental take permit in order to move forward with their plans under a Habitat Conservation Plan.

Chairman Fann asked how long it takes to complete the HCP Process. Ms. Smith said it depends on how the plan is structured. A large regional plan could take a number of years. The one in Pima County has taken five years; SRP’s Horseshoe/Bartlett took about three years. Ms. Smith explained that developing all of the information to identify what the effects are, identify the mitigation that will take place, monitoring all contribute to the length of time needed in developing a large regional plan. Mayor Fann said that the length of time and complications may run potential developers off who do not have five years to wait. Ms. Smith clarified that she is just referring to a large-scale regional plan, which is the ideal way to go. Mr. Nystedt said that what takes such a long time is identifying all of the developmental elements that they want to have covered when dealing with a large land base.

Ms. Smith added once the draft is submitted to HCP they need to make sure it has all the information needed to make determinations whether it will jeopardize a species. They cannot issue an incidental take permit to any entity if it is going to jeopardize a species. She explained that the Pima County HCP is very complex. They included a number of different stakeholder groups, a science advisory group, and the identification of open space. Ms. Smith said that their HCP is just one part of their broader scale planning effort and includes the entire county.

Chairman Fann said she noticed that 2004 was the last year of figures provided and asked what happened to 2005, 2006, and 2007. Ms. Smith said she does not have the figures for 2005 but in their Fish and Wildlife Service region they did provide Pima County with \$275,000 in fiscal year 2006. Ms. Smith explained that fiscal year 2007 has not been awarded yet but will be approximately \$175,000 to another entity for preparation. Chairman Fann asked for an approximate time frame and cost for an HCP encompassing all of the Verde River from the top to the bottom and considering all of the municipalities involved. Ms. Smith estimated at least 2-3 years and money wise it depends on resources available in-house. A lot of information is already available for this area from studies conducted by USGS and other scientific agencies and hydrologic firms. Ms. Smith explained that it is a matter of synthesizing all of the available information. The difficult part will be addressing and identifying what the applicants can commit to for mitigation.

Mayor Fann asked at what point they as human beings decide what was intended to be here one hundred years, one thousand years from now and what nature intended not to be here at that time. She said that some things went extinct not due to any human activity rather it was part of evolution or normal growth and are they trying to force something be in an area where it is not intended to exist. Ms. Smith responded their responsibility as Fish and Wildlife Service employees is to implement the Endangered Species Act as it is written today, which says that nobody may take an endangered species without a permit. She said that future generations may rewrite it if they choose. Mr. Nystedt said they know that the rate of extinction has increased dramatically in the last 500 years and they also know that there is an intricate interdependence between all living creatures. He said that in order to balance those impacts and it is a decision that has to be made on a societal basis, no individual can say this is the right way to do it.

Member Flannery asked if the actual mitigation has to be applied to that geographic area. Ms. Smith answered no but the mitigation plan needs to be able to offset what is occurring from the actions in the HCP.

Member Springer asked is the participation in an HCP voluntary from the landowners' perspective or is participation voluntary for the landowners' government. Ms. Smith answered that they would be issuing a permit to the applicants; they would be the holders of the permit. The applicants cannot do anything outside of their authorities. Member Springer said the respective governments will then need to pass some sort of ordinance or requirement on the landowner to require his participation and she has some problem with that. Ms. Smith said the individual landowners may end up being de-facto participants through obtaining water from a city water source, for example. The elected officials who hold the permit are the authorities that are responsible for implementing the HCP. Member Springer gave the example of Yavapai County implementing an HCP in Big Chino and a developer wants to develop in that area, which may create a take situation. The Fish and Wildlife Service then comes back to the County and they would have to take some mitigation action in regards to the proposed development costing the developer additional funds. Ms. Smith said the plan would include that sort of scenario upfront and have agreements upfront so that requirements of developers are understood as part of the

mitigation. She said the HCP will need to have some projections of future growth that may occur and identification of what lands may or may not be put into conservation.

Chairman Fann asked when looking at that whole Verde River in Yavapai County they would be considering 1000's of landowners, how would they be able to do something like that since they cannot get 100% buy-in by the landowners and cited Proposition 207. Member Springer clarified that Proposition 207 there is an issue only if an action on the part of government decreases the value of the property. She is not sure if these types of actions would actually cause a decrease in property value.

Jim Lamerson asked if the flycatcher lives in man-made lakes, where did it live prior to man making those lakes. Mr. Nystedt said that flycatchers are riparian obligates and they have to live in trees and other vegetation associated with rivers, a habitat that can grow up wherever there is water. Mr. Lamerson said if man diligently puts in resources for people to have water and a bunch of birds move in they have a problem and that if the lakes were not there then the birds would not be there. Ms. Smith said at least 90% of the riparian habitat has been lost in the state over the last 150 years; therefore, a lot of the areas the birds used in the past are gone and the plan is designed to make sure other properties are being managed to support that species. Mr. Lamerson said he appreciated the comments.

George Seaman asked Mr. Nystedt to explain how having a Habitat Conservation Plan decreases the potential for litigation to the people who are involved with forming such a plan. Mr. Nystedt take, even incidental take that is unpermitted under the Endangered Species Act is a violation of Section 9, so if there is any taking or the threat of take an action would be subject to litigation. Habitat Conservation Plan provides a mechanism to legally allow the proposed action to go forward as long as the plan is well developed and is being fully implemented in good faith.

Howard Mechanic asked if a mitigation plan not related to a Habitat Conservation Plan purporting to protect the river does not protect them from all chances of legal liability but if the same plan is structured under a Habitat Conservation Plan provides a larger protection the jurisdictions in the event of a take. Mr. Nystedt answered yes, that under the Endangered Species Act, they would want to go under the Habitat Conservation planning process with that mitigation plan as a part of the HCP. Mr. Mechanic asked if the jurisdictions plan to apply and a developer such as Suncor does not voluntarily participate in the plan and then they conduct legal pumping who is responsible. Mr. Mechanic explained that the developer cannot be forced to participate in the Habitat Conservation Plan that under state law the County cannot set restrictions on them pumping. Ms. Smith answered yes; the party who is actually doing the pumping is the one responsible for the effects of that pumping. Mr. Mechanic said the people there that set up the plan are not going to be held responsible and they cannot make a developer participate. He said according to Mr. Guenther with ADWR at this time the applications in front of him represent approximately the pumping of 60,000 acre feet out of the Big Chino and asked if that type of pumping will cause a take. Ms. Smith said that based on the studies she has reviewed there is a risk due to reduced flows in the Upper Verde

River, which would lead to take. Mr. Mechanic also added that the extinction rate at this time is close to 1000 times higher than it was 1000 years ago and human caused extinction accounts for the vast amount of extinction.

Michelle Harrington said the scope of the Habitat Conservation Plan does not have to be the entire watershed and all of the activities in the watershed; it could relate just directly to the pipeline projects and address just the pumping from those specific activities. She said that so many studies have been done already it would not necessarily require new studies rather compiling it in a digestible format that indicates what actions will be taken to prevent or mitigate or lessen impacts to the baseflow of the Upper Verde River. Ms. Harrington said as soon as the Center for Biological Diversity heard of the pipeline they said it would result in future incidental take of species and therefore, they require a mitigation plan or a Habitat Conservation Plan be put in place. She said this is what will protect the entities from future litigation from the Center. They would be happy to sit on advisory panels as they did with SRP. Ms. Smith said they would be happy to set up a working meeting and include representatives from Pima County if that would be helpful.

#### **ITEM NO. 2 CALL TO PUBLIC**

#### **ITEM NO. 3 ACTION – APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR PREVIOUS BOARD MEETING**

Member Flannery provided corrections to the minutes.

**MEMBER FLANNERY MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTS AS AMENDED. SECONDED BY MEMBER WILSON; PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

#### **ITEM NO. 4 DISCUSSION – PROGRAM MANAGER’S REPORT**

Rick Shroads, assistant program manager, said they have five tasks they are currently working on. General Program Management is Task 1. The other tasks, Website, Water Conservation, Hydrologic Monitoring, and Recharge Mapping are all being worked on concurrently. Mr. Shroads said during the past month Task 1 was mainly the review and correction of minutes for the November 28, 2008 Board Meeting, preparation of agenda, distributions and postings of agenda, preparation and attachments for the TAC, distributions and postings agenda and attachments for the January 15, 2008 TAC Meeting, facilitate the January 15, 2008 TAC Meeting, completion of scope of work and budget estimates for a number of different tasks, and preparation of notes and minutes for the TAC Meeting in addition to general conference calls and meetings. Mr. Shroads said regarding Website Management, Task 2, the website is up and running and is at UVRWPC.ORG including the links to participating cities. Mr. Shroads said Task 3, Water Conservation, has been started by Keith Larson who has developed a spreadsheet to compile the water conservation survey data and has received approximately half of the surveys he has sent out. Mr. Shroads said Mr. Larson has scheduled follow up meetings

with most of the survey holders for March 10, 11, and 12, 2008. Mr. Larson has begun work researching the following topics:

- ADWR and California BMP Programs for alignment analysis (Scope Item 1.6, 1.7)
- Review and Analysis of Prescott Regional Conservation Opinion Survey Results (Scope Item 1)
- Water conservation programs in place in other Arizona cities and western states cities (Scope Item 4.2)
- GPCD and GPHUD water use rate trends in Arizona's AMAs and selected western cities (Scope Item 2)
- Conservation program cost-effectiveness (Scope Item 4)

Mr. Shroads said Task 4, Hydrologic Monitoring, and Task 5, Recharge Mapping are both just getting underway. He said Burgess & Niple have an invoice in for \$6,297 and the current balance for the Upper Verde River Watershed Protection Coalition is \$192,175.

Member Flannery said he has visited the website and it is a looking, easy to traverse website.

#### **ITEM NO. 5 DISCUSSION – TAC MEETING SUMMARY – FEBRUARY 13, 2008**

Rick Shroads reported that the first part of the TAC Meeting was review of previous board minutes; the second portion was discussion relative to water conservation, hydraulic monitoring and recharge mapping tasks. Mr. Shroads said they discussed the CWAG and ADWR correspondence for their third agenda item and the no action was taken regarding that. He said the people on the TAC discussed the fact the safe-yield is a goal and not a compliance requirement and that Mr. Holmes said these things need to happen regionally and individually. ADWR will be quantifying natural recharge but no timeline was given. Mr. Shroads said the TAC feels this type of topic could be a good possibility for discussion by the new safe-yield workgroup.

Mr. Shroads said the fourth item was a discussion of educational possibilities including hydraulic monitoring, green development techniques, water districts, Bureau of Reclamation planning, water harvesting, USGS Regional Model, ADWR assured water supply, water conservation, and ADWR Recharge Program. He said the TAC has not developed a schedule for how often the Board would like to see these presentations.

Chairman Fann asked the board if they have any suggestions or comments regarding education presentations. Member Flannery responded that he does have some concern that this same presentation was made to the WAC recently and would prefer to hear something fresh rather than duplication.

Chairman Fann asked if guidelines should be given by the Board regarding length of presentation time. Member Wilson said they should always give guidelines and that he

favors going ahead with the education, he favors water districts as the first one. Member Springer said her interest is specifically in learning more about the projects they have already established, for example the different types of recharge projects that might be options. Member Flannery added he agrees and that they need to remain on target. Mr. Shroads asked in terms of priority, would the Board rather see hydrologic monitoring, recharge, conservation and water districts. Member Springer answered yes, for example green development pertains to green construction and they are not doing construction. She said they are not talking about a water district at this point. Chairman Fann agreed and said that they do not have enough hydrology reports or monitoring and identified conservation as a priority. Member Flannery recommended that when they reshape priorities for the next year the other suggestions can be considered at that time.

Rick Shroads reported that the fifth item discussed the TAC was the dumping of sludge in areas upstream of UVR and they concluded that water quality is beyond the current mission of the Coalition. He said the TAC advised Sierra Club representative to approach the individual entities and to consider adding water quality to the Coalition's mission.

Mr. Shroads said the sixth item discussed by the TAC was the formation of the Safe-Yield Workgroup. He said the TAC has some general ideas and identified the goal of a Safe-Yield Workgroup should be to develop a plan for reaching safe-yield. The TAC agreed the workgroup should act on the recommendations of the Groundwater Users Advisory Council data as a starting point and that the workgroup should report back to the TAC on a consensus basis or a majority/minority basis if consensus cannot be achieved. Mr. Shroads said the TAC discussed the membership of the workgroup at length with the six member agencies as part of the workgroup, stakeholders including private water companies, citizens' water interests, environmental interests and ADWR. The TAC discussed establishing advisory subcommittees for exempt well representatives, growth interests, and agricultural groups.

Member Springer said she appreciates the work that has been done but does not necessarily agree. She said this should not be used as a starting point because of a number of issues that should be discussed further and asked who the TAC sees as members of the Safe-Yield Workgroup. Mr. Shroads answered that the TAC would be glad to develop a draft and bring it to the Board if they prefer. Member Flannery said his concern is the group reporting back to TAC and that his vision when they set this up was that the workgroup would not work independent of TAC rather in concert with TAC and the workgroup would report to the Board. Mr. Shroads explained that the six entities would comprise the workgroup and the reason it was brought up to have them report back to the TAC is due to the structure of the By-laws for the Coalition. Mr. Flannery said he would like to revisit that.

Chairman Fann said it is a good idea to come up with a draft for the Board. Member Springer said she will not support using the report as a premise for where they start and if they are going to start a new group they should start from scratch and she has a problem with adopting someone else's conclusions without this specifically discussing the issues

in that report. Member Wilson said he prefers bringing the report to the Board for review and not thrown in the garbage can. Chairman Fann recommended that the TAC provide the report to the Coalition Board for review and comment to determine if the Board is in agreement with the report. She said the Board's goal is to try and work toward a common goal rather than getting into a situation where their respective residents are pitted against each other.

Mark Holmes said the TAC is actually trying to form the workgroup's mission statement, the goals, and membership and they would like to proceed with the Board's approval in creating the workgroup first. Mr. Holmes said the GUAC document that was referenced is all inclusive; it has every possible scenario for conclusions in reference to all the options that exist and obviously they can not do all of them. Mr. Holmes asked if the Board would allow the TAC to form the workgroup first and then come back identifying the missions, the goals and where they want to go with that document for discussion at a later date. Member Springer asked to go over the list of potential members again, recommending that they hear from a broad base rather than hearing from the same people over and over. Mr. Holmes agreed with Member Springer said they will come back, hopefully at the next Board meeting, with the list and then have a full discussion of why those representatives of the various organizations or agencies are being recommended as members of the workgroup. He said there is to be one workgroup consisting of approximately 10 members but some groups are not represented by a single entity, for example exempt well owners and that is why the TAC is recommending sub-committees to report back to the workgroup. Member Springer referred to her work with the legislature and often there is no entity or body that represents those kinds of folks unless it is a lobbyist and that is why she is confused as to who will be speaking for the many people who do not have a voice. Mr. Holmes said the TAC is hoping to have that more defined for the next Board meeting and that they are making progress.

Chairman Fann said the TAC will come back with a draft of who will comprise the workgroup and the Safe-Yield report previously mentioned. Member Flannery favors interests being represented rather than getting locked into numbers being represented and is concerned that there will not be a broad enough representation. It was determined that the TAC send out the report first and then a presentation for next time. Mr. Shroads said the report is already available on the website.

#### **ITEM NO. 6 DISCUSSION – EDUCATIONAL PRESENTATIONS SCHEDULE**

Mark Holmes asked what kind of time frame the Board would prefer for presentations. The Board determined to include presentations as needed with the discretion on the part of the TAC.

## **ITEM NO. 7 DISCUSSION - DISCUSS ADDING WATER QUALITY TO THE COALITION'S MISSION**

Mark Holmes referred to the issue of bio-solids being discharged into the Verde River area brought before the Coalition at the last meeting by the Sierra Club and said that the TAC had a very lengthy discussion about this. Mr. Holmes asked where the Coalition would like to go in reference to a water quality component. Member Flannery said he was totally surprised by the presentation last month, that Prescott Valley does have a contract with the company. It is somewhat loose allowing for land-fill or land-applied. He said they are going to work with the company to improve what is currently being done. Member Flannery said it is an ADEQ issue rather than the Coalition issue and that best management practices covers the list of what can be done.

Member Springer said the Coalition's primary issue is quantity and not quality and that they have plenty on their plate. She said the County is a completely different situation than municipalities that are water providers. The consensus of the Board is that they do not want to add water quality to their mission.

Tom Slaback said if they allow the Verde River to be flowing as a sewer it is the same result as if they have no water at all flowing in the Verde. He said the name of the Coalition means they are protecting more than flow, they are protecting a clean flow and if the Board decides that water quality is outside of the scope of what the Coalition is able to do then they should rename the Coalition removing the part about watershed protection.

George Seaman said during Prescott's mitigation meetings that ended about two years ago U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service specifically indicated they would actively oppose recharging effluent close to the headwaters of Verde River because of water quality standards. Mr. Seaman said if the Coalition does not have some concern with water quality then the Coalition may be creating a problem for what it is established to do. He explained that without water quality as part of protecting the River then they have a potential litigant sitting out there and urged that somehow this should be addressed.

Member Flannery said he did not hear anyone say they did not respect the water quality issue but the specific issue brought to the Board is a land use issue specifically between the applicant and ADEQ. Mr. Seaman said that if the Coalition makes water quality part of its mission it may make their mission easier in the future. Member Flannery said that in terms of what they are responsible for and have any control over, it is small by comparison. Mr. Seaman said that one of the main reasons for doing a Habitat Conservation Plan is to accomplish a task and not be bogged down with litigation and by not including water quality it could affect the outcome of what they are trying to do. Member Fann said the consensus stands regarding water quality but that it will continue to be a part of best management practices.

John Zambrano said the Board's decision to not include water quality is understandable. He said that in protection of surface water quality is covered by a lot of state laws, federal

laws and permits, which should be able to protect the Upper Verde if applied properly. The same protections do not exist for quantity so the Coalition's focus on quantity is the way to go.

**ITEM NO. 8 DISCUSSION – NEXT MEETING TIME / LOCATION / AGENDA ITEMS**

The next regularly scheduled meeting is March 26, 2:00 p.m. at City of Prescott City Hall. The next regularly scheduled TAC meeting is March 12 1:00 p.m. at Yavapai County Administration Services Building in the Gladys Gardner Room.

Chairman Fann said the agenda items for the next meeting include the Safe-Yield Report from the GUAC and a draft list of potential representatives for the Safe-Yield Workgroup. Mark Holmes said they will be reporting monthly regarding the progress on the approved tasks and will provide the information in the form of a TAC Report.

Michelle Harrington, Center for Biological Diversity, asked whether the Coalition will have a discussion and possible action on whether or not they will be undertaking such a project. Chairman Fann said she would need to go back to the Town of Chino Valley for their feedback. Member Springer said she is not willing to go much further due to the large agenda they have already adopted and would prefer to focus on action to get going with the projects they have now. Member Flannery said it would be premature at this time. Chairman Fann said they are not ready to put on next month's agenda.

Ms. Harrington said the best management practices that have been discussed can be part of the HCP to work with the process rather than separate from it.

Howard Mechanic asked about the agenda packet. Mark Holmes said from here on all material will be on the website.

There being no further discussion, the meeting of the Upper Verde River Water Protection Coalition Board adjourned at 4:09 p.m.

---

KAREN FANN, Chairman

ATTEST:

---

ELIZABETH A. BURKE, Clerk



## AGENDA ITEM NO. 4

### DISCUSSION – PROGRAM MANAGER’S REPORT

---

#### **Task 1 – Program Management**

##### **Board Meeting Preparation & Facilitation**

- Preparation of agenda and attachments for February 27<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting
- Facilitate February 27<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting
- Review and correction of minutes for February 27<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting
- Preparation of agenda and attachments for March 26<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting

##### **TAC Meeting Preparation & Facilitation**

- Preparation of agenda and attachments for March 12<sup>th</sup> TAC Meeting
- Facilitate March 12<sup>th</sup> TAC Meeting
- Preparation of summary for March 12<sup>th</sup> TAC Meeting

##### **Other**

- Conduct B&N project team conference calls

#### **Task 2 – Website Management**

- Website launched on February 20, 2008
- Posting of agenda and attachments for February 27<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting
- Posting of agenda and attachments for March 12<sup>th</sup> TAC Meeting
- Posting of agenda and attachments for March 26<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting

#### **Task 3 – Water Conservation Programs**

- Ready to conduct a mini-workshop with the TAC at the April 9<sup>th</sup> TAC Meeting



## AGENDA ITEM NO. 4

### DISCUSSION – PROGRAM MANAGER’S REPORT

---

#### Task 4 – Hydrologic Monitoring

- Contacting and compiling data from federal, state and local agencies on current and planned monitoring programs
- Available to update the TAC at the April 9<sup>th</sup> TAC Meeting

#### Task 5 – Recharge Mapping

- Compilation of GIS data for land ownership, topography, soils, geology complete for Yavapai County
- Contacting Coconino County
- Awaiting GIS files from USGS for recharge areas
- Available to update the TAC at the April 9<sup>th</sup> TAC Meeting

#### Financial Report

##### Invoices Received

- An invoice for \$21,111.34 was issued by Burgess & Niple, Inc. on March 5, 2008, for program management work and tasks performed through February 17, 2008.

##### Current Balance

- The current balance of the Upper Verde River Watershed Protection Coalition is \$185,878.10.



**AGENDA ITEM NO. 5**

**DISCUSSION – TAC MEETING SUMMARY – MARCH 12, 2008**

---

The meeting summary for the previous TAC Meeting held on March 12, 2008, is attached.





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

Tuesday, March 12<sup>th</sup>, 2008 – 1:00 p.m.

Yavapai County Administrative Services Building, Gladys Gardner Room  
1015 Fair Street – Prescott, Arizona

---

- **Educational Presentations Schedule** – In response to the discussion at the previous Board Meeting, the approach for future educational presentations will be to schedule topics relevant to active tasks/projects underway. For example, water conservation, hydrologic monitoring, and recharge would now be priority tasks under this approach. Also, in order to keep presentations on target, we will pursue using program management team members as presenters.
  
- **Review Next Board Meeting Agenda Items** – The next regularly scheduled Board Meeting is on March 26, 2008, at 2:00 p.m., at the City of Prescott Town Hall, Council Chambers, 201 South Cortez Street, Prescott, Arizona. Topics recommended for the March Board Meeting in addition to regular agenda items include:
  - Safe Yield Workgroup Structure
  - Educational Presentations Schedule & Approach
  
- **Review Next TAC Meeting Agenda Items** – The next regularly scheduled TAC meeting is on April 9, 2008, at Yavapai County Administrative Services Building, Gladys Gardner Room, 1015 Fair Street, Prescott, Arizona, at 1:30 p.m., unless otherwise posted. Topics recommended for the April TAC Meeting in addition to regular agenda items include:
  - Discuss Safe-Yield Workgroup
  - Water Conservation Update/Workshop
  - Potential Recharge Task Update



## AGENDA ITEM NO. 6

### DISCUSSION & POSSIBLE ACTION – SAFE YIELD WORKGROUP

---

- The structure of the workgroup was discussed. After discussion, the following conclusions were reached to be discussed with the Board:
  - The structure of the workgroup would include:
    - § Six TAC members
    - § Seven other individuals representing the following interests:
      - Citizens Water
      - Environmental
      - Private Water Companies
      - Private Water Well Owners
      - Growth Interests
      - Agricultural
      - ADWR
      - A press release soliciting candidates for these seven positions would be utilized. Once received, the TAC would select individuals from these candidates to fill the positions.
  - The workgroup will meet monthly in conjunction with the monthly TAC meeting to avoid additional time and cost burdens on those participating.
  - The GUAC report will be one of many tools that the workgroup will use, but it will not be the starting point for discussions.



## **AGENDA ITEM NO. 7**

### **DISCUSSION – EDUCATIONAL PRESENTATIONS SCHEDULE & APPROACH**

---

- In response to the discussion at the previous Board Meeting, the approach for future educational presentations will be to schedule topics relevant to active tasks/projects underway. For example, water conservation, hydrologic monitoring, and recharge would now be priority tasks under this approach. Also, in order to keep presentations on target, we will pursue using program management team members as presenters.



## AGENDA ITEM NO. 8

### DISCUSSION – NEXT MEETING TIME / LOCATION / AGENDA ITEMS

---

#### **Board Meeting**

The next regularly scheduled Board Meeting is on April 23, 2008, at 2:00 p.m., at the City of Prescott Town Hall, Council Chambers, 201 South Cortez Street, Prescott, Arizona. Agenda items proposed for the next Board Meeting include:

- Potential Educational Presentation
- Safe-Yield Workgroup Structure
- Update on Water Conservation Task

#### **TAC Meeting**

The next regularly scheduled TAC Meeting is on April 9, 2008, at 1:30 p.m., at the Yavapai County Administrative Services Building, Gladys Garner Room, 1015 Fair Street, Prescott, Arizona. Agenda items proposed for the next TAC Meeting include:

- Discuss Safe-Yield Workgroup
- Water Conservation Update/Workshop
- Potential Recharge Task Update