

**UPPER VERDE RIVER WATERSHED PROTECTION COALITION  
PRESCOTT, ARIZONA  
JANUARY 23, 2008**

**MINUTES**

A MEETING OF THE UPPER VERDE RIVER WATERSHED PROTECTION COALITION WAS HELD ON JANUARY 23, 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 Presentations**

**Members present:**

Councilman Floyd Wright, Town of Dewey-Humboldt  
Mayor Jack Wilson, city of Prescott  
Mayor Karen Fann, Town of Chino Valley, Chairman  
Councilman Mike Flannery, Town of Prescott Valley, Vice Chairman  
County Supervisor Carol Springer, Yavapai County  
Ernie Jones, Sr., Prescott-Yavapai Indian Tribe (joins meeting later)

**Staff present:**

Ed Muccillo, Program Manager  
Rick Shroads, Assistant Program Manager  
Daniel Timmons, Town of Chino Valley  
Jim Holt, City of Prescott  
John Rasmussen, Yavapai County  
Chris Moss, Prescott-Yavapai Indian Tribe (joins meeting later)

**Guests Present:**

Prescott City Councilman Bob Bob Luzious  
Prescott City Councilman Jim Lamerson (joins meeting later)  
Jim Lawrence  
Linda Campbell  
Ed Wolfe  
Thomas Slaback  
John Zambrano  
Dan Campbell  
Lou Bellesi  
Ken Janecek  
Chris Moss

Michelle Harrington  
Joanne Oellers  
Derek Von Briesean  
Candace McNulty  
Joanna Dodder  
Georgene Lockwood

## **ITEM NO. 2 Call to Public**

Tom Slaback with the Sierra Club Grand Canyon Chapter distributed handouts. Member Ernie Jones and Staff Chris Moss joined the meeting. Mr. Slaback introduced the topic of dumping sewage sludge as a potential problem affecting the Verde River. He was made aware of this practice about a year and half ago when citizens living near Big Chino starting calling with complaints. He said the Sierra Club thought it was the City of Prescott and asked them where they were having their sludge delivered. They were told that the City is not required to keep records of where they dump. Mr. Slaback said Sierra Club asked Arizona Department of Environment Quality for information under the Freedom of Information Act. ADEQ provided coordinates for four sites in Yavapai County. One of them is the one was the site in Big Chino but it is no longer in use. The other site is below the confluence of Williamson Valley Wash and the Big Chino Wash, about a half mile behind the Paulden Fire Station. They have been trucking sludge to that site since late January.

Chairman Fann asked who is “they?” Mr. Slaback said that in this case it is a private company in Paulden, Southwest Land Reclamation, LLC that contracts with Prescott and Prescott Valley. He went out and inspected the coordinates given by state. In September he photographed the site. With the dumping of sludge there has been a noticeable change in the earth. Instead of the light tan silt it is very dark brown. Irrigation apparatus is being assembled at the upper end and there is a well at the site.

Mr. Slaback said that he has heard from some Paulden residents that this dumping site will be a sod farm. If that is the case, there will be leaching of the toxins from the sludge but sod farms also use a lot of water and toxic pesticides and herbicides. Mr. Slaback said that he would like to see this item placed on next month’s agenda. In the meantime, he would like to see representatives of local entities take this issue back to their respective governments to be addressed. He said Chino Valley is leading in this because they are not spreading the sewage sludge over the land. He emphasized that we need to stop putting our sludge along water ways. There are other sites at Ash Creek and two in the Verde Valley, which are documented in the handout. An ADEQ representative has indicated that responses to notification of violation at Ash Creek site from Southwest

Land Reclamation indicate correction of some items but others have not been corrected. Mr. Slaback asked Yavapai County to take a lead in discussions between all the cities in the County because this is a regional issue.

Chairman Fann asked who owns the land in Paulden. Mr. Slaback answered that he does not know. Mayor Fan also asked why there are not stricter restrictions regarding this sort of dumping. Mr. Slaback indicated it is due to our fairly weak state laws. ADEQ is waiting for a report due back this next Tuesday.

Member Springer suggested that the issue be referred back to TAC. She thinks that they need more background information regarding the statute and what it allows.

Ed Wolfe, Chairman of the Verde River Basin Partnerships Technical Advisory Group provided an update on the Partnership. The Partnership has thousands of dollars contributed by the Verde River communities to initiate work in its Hydrology Science Plan. He provided the board with copies of the Hydrology Science Plan. He said they intend to install or establish 6-10 continuously monitored wells in the Verde River Basin. They will fully cooperate with TAC in monitoring wells in order to compliment UVRWPC efforts.

Mr. Wolfe said the Partnership Plan has an elaborate discussion including analysis of the recharge potential of selected intermittent and ephemeral streams to evaluate the effectiveness of one section of stream over another to accept recharge. Some of the things included in the Partnership Plan, written in 2006, have been undertaken at least in part by the Water Advisory Committee. Mr. Wolfe referred to the plan's call to inventory surface water diversions and returns, which the WAC has begun and is led by Abe Springer with NAU. He also mentioned that with WAC funding the USGS did a seepage run along the Verde River in the Verde Valley. This information is critical for getting hydrologic information necessary for ground water modeling in the Verde Valley.

Mr. Wolfe said the Partnership has no intention of duplicating that kind of work and they have a great deal to offer UVRWPC. The Partnership and the Coalition have great areas of mutual interest, specifically for the Coalition regarding meeting the challenge for the need of mitigation and the interest in protecting Verde River flows. In summary, Mr. Wolfe emphasized that they move to era of collaboration. The Partnership has not yet received Federal funding. Senator McCain has requested funding for FY 2009. Mr. Wolfe said that the Partnerships' opportunity to receive

Federal funding would be greatly enhanced if they all are in this together. The Partnership needs the cities that comprise the Coalition to join them.

Howard Mechanic said that he appreciates intentions of the UVRWPC to protect Upper Verde River and that any projects would be mitigated. The problem is that intentions and promises may have limited effect on the community and other organizations. Mr. Mechanic quoted President Reagan who said, "Trust but verify." He said they need to start thinking about a way to protect the Upper Verde River in a way that is verifiable and enforceable. Mr. Mechanic said they need a project to develop a mitigation plan for all the potential pumping, which according to Director Guenther is about 60,000 acre feet per year projected for developments and export. They need assurances and not promises.

Mr. Mechanic said the Coalition may not be here in five years or there may a change to the Coalition in five years. Mr. Mechanic asked the Coalition to work with all the potential large pumpers who could sell off their interests in 5-10 years. He said the promises to mitigate are uncertain and that everyone in the room wants to protect UVR but we need commitment to mitigate that includes realistic enforcement.

Ken Janecek said he is here to ask the Coalitions' support to sort out the Big Chino discrepancy for long term growth for 2050. He referred to a presentation made by Jody Rooney with CYMPO with the red dot map yesterday at Prescott City Council for population growth. Mr. Janecek said the WAC is doing a study with Hoyt Johnson who is taking input from the cities in order to complete a population forecast. This forecast shows little growth in Big Chino Valley 2040-2050. He said that in Member Springer's area they have forecasted the DES forecast.

Mr. Janecek requested investigation into the CYMPO and WAC forecasts. WAC information will be given to USGS and models will be developed to indicate water shortages and supplies. This will then be plugged into the US Bureau of Reclamation Study and it will define what we are 50 years from now. He said that we need to get is right.

Member Springer explained that they have dealt at the State level with the DES forecasts for a number of years. She said they are consistently low. The numbers that CYMPO uses are very simple; they come from each entity; each city has made its own projections and those have cumulatively been used for their transportation studies. Member Springer said that of the two she would trust cities' more who are working in the trenches to do their number projections. She said that another factor that has consistently the most reliable source of projections for demographic information is APS. The cities work very closely with APS ahead of development to provide the infrastructure.

Mr. Janecek said that the WAC forecast concerns him the most because he is involved in a lot of water activities. He wants them to do a good job with the Bureau of Reclamation Study and with the USGS data. Member Springer said that DES is not going to take their word for it. They have their own method for arriving at their numbers and they have been historically wrong. Mr. Janecek asked if the County is required to use the DES for water. Member Springer answered that for certain calculation they are required to use DES numbers.

Chairman Fann suggested that Mr. Janecek bring this up to the WAC board to write a letter directly to DES regarding this issue. Member Wilson said that Hoyt Johnson's models are in Excel Spreadsheets and are fairly easy to change and they may consider this for multiple scenario development.

Michelle Harrington with the Center for Biological Diversity, asked if the Coalition would be discussing the letter from Salt River Project and some of the concerns they have for protecting the Upper Verde River? Chairman Fann said that it is not on their agenda, this is the right time to bring it up, and this is direct communication between SRP and the three municipalities involved. At this point it is not a Coalition issue.

Ms. Harrington said that one issue SRP brought up was requesting mitigation prior to pumping and that she would suggest that a mitigation plan is needed prior to construction. She also said she read in the newspaper recently that Chino Valley was hoping to begin construction on their pipeline possibly this summer and she has a hard time believing that a mitigation plan would be in place prior to then.

Chairman Fann said this cannot be discussed at this meeting and needs to be addressed in other forum. She said that she would be glad to discuss it with Ms. Harrington at any other time. The Coalition is concerned but is not involved with the direct issues with the pipeline and SRP. Ms. Harrington said she went through the agenda items and is encouraged that the Coalition will be hearing a Habitat Conservation Plan Presentation next month.

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

**MEMBER WILSON MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS SUBMITTED; SECONDED BY VICE CHAIRMAN FLANNERY; PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

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

Mr. Mucillo, Program Manger, said since the November Board meeting they have had two TAC Meetings, one on December 12, 2007 and one on January 15, 2008. A lot of work has been done between the Program Management Team and the TAC to prepare this agenda.

Member Wilson asked where does the Program Management Team stand on website development? Also, will documents like these be posted for the public? Mr. Mucillo answered yes, and also digital recordings of the meetings will also be available. Member Wilson asked if they have a page for getting that website up. Mr. Mucillo said he is hoping that they will have it in about two – four weeks depending on the web hosting facility. City of Prescott Councilman Jim Lamerson joined the meeting.

**ITEM NO. 5 Discussion – Update on Yavapai County TAC Appointment & Safe-Yield Action**

Mr. Mucillo said in review of the last Board meeting in November some had questioned if there was going to be TAC appointment by the County and did the County actually adopt adding safe-yield as a coalition goal. Basically, the answer to both of those questions is yes. At the November 5, 2007 Board of Supervisors Meeting, the Board did verify that they approve safe-yield as a coalition goal. Regarding a TAC appointment, there was some discussion and John Rasmussen is going to be the representative for the County for a three-month trial basis, at which time the County will reevaluate.

**ITEM NO. 6 Discussion – TAC Meeting Summaries**

Mr. Mucillo explained that the TAC strategy when they left the last UVRWPC Board meeting was to compile a list of potential projects to undertake, which were they discussed at the December 12, 2007 TAC meeting. He said their purpose was to make a prioritization list, decide the top tasks, and then come up with a scope of work and a cost estimate. The following came out of the December TAC meeting: Water conservation plans and programs; the Big Chino Hydrologic Monitoring Network; recharge mapping; website management; safe-yield, which looks like it will eventually work into a work-group or subcommittee of the TAC; education, as referred to under Agenda Item No. 9. Mr. Mucillo said once the other projects get under way they can come up with a schedule for education, both for the Board and the public

Chairman asked when the TAC will be able to narrow this down into priorities, timelines, and how these will be accomplished. Mr. Mucillo said he thinks they have taken the first step as far as website management, conservation programs, mapping and hydrologic monitoring.

Member Springer said this organization has done a lot of good preliminary work but it is missing an important step. They have set specific goals to protect the base flow of the Verde River and to achieve safe-yield yet they have failed to talk about how to measure results. She said monitoring is the most important on this list. Test wells exist in the County and the AMA and the Big Chino. Member Springer recommended that they stop to figure out how to measure whether we are there and the only way to do that is to achieve consensus on how they measure results. She suggests that they do some research on the monitoring wells such as identifying key well sites in order to gage our progress. Where are we and where do we need to get to? A lot of the projects they are proposing are very difficult to measure.

Mr. Mucillo agreed and asked Member Springer if she thinks the TAC is moving towards that and was there something in the report that made her think differently?

Member Springer answered that when they had talked about this they were talking about new wells. She said she is not talking about new wells because they are expensive. She said she is talking about the data they already have available in all types of reports and determining which wells would be the most appropriate to use as a sample measure.

Mr. Mucillo said the general approach on technical issues such as this is to go into a half a day or day long workshop with the TAC and some members of the Program Management Team and do exactly what you are talking about. Member Springer suggested perhaps on an annual basis or a semi-annual basis if they had graphs, charts with those sample wells. She said she thinks everyone agrees we all want to work from a factual scientific basis but the problem is that everybody has a different concept of what these projects may or may not achieve. Member Springer said she believes this is a good place to start, that number one, they find out what our goal is and how we measure it.

Mr. Mucillo said that consensus and consistency will be key to getting others to agree of buy into what they come up with. Member Springer said this should be their first priority of our TAC is to do that kind of an outreach to the stakeholders.

Member Wilson said he wanted to check his knowledge of water hydrology; he believes base flow is measured by a gage in the river itself, not a well, is that correct. Mr. Mucillo confirmed that is correct. Member Wilson said the other thing he sees the City of Prescott is doing is putting new wells in the Big Chino because we have a lack of well data to monitor anything. The real problem he sees is that they do not have enough wells in terms of the Big Chino Water Ranch. In his opinion they will have a

problem agreeing on the determining the right monitoring wells. Member Springer responded they also are dealing with the AMA and they have a lot of data there. Member Wilson agreed but when talking about the Big Chino they have a major problem in having accurate data to do forecasting and trending because they do not have a baseline.

Vice Chairman Flannery said there is a great deal of merit in what's being said and if we want to measure how successful we are we need to know where we are going to start from. He said he concurs with Member Springer that they need to have some baseline data in order to agree on and measure that success.

John Rasmussen said that page 27 of the packet under Hydrologic Monitoring is really getting at that by identifying and reviewing current and planned monitoring networks and activities. He said this is putting all of the data on a map so we can all look at it and see where wells are. The next phase is to meet with technical experts and key stakeholders to identify specific areas. The third phase is implementing those ideas. Mr. Rasmussen said he thinks they are thinking along the same lines.

Member Springer said she wants to move it up to a first priority because it establishes a base. The TAC was supposed to come back with prioritized list. Mr. Mucillo responded that the numbering on the list is random. The items on the list are to be started concurrently, all starting simultaneously.

Member Wilson said regarding the issue of talking to the stakeholders in terms of establishing the well sites and monitoring, he wanted to be sure Ed Wolfe will also be included along with Howard Mechanic.

Mr. Mechanic said he cannot recommend well sites. Despite what Member Wilson said, Mr. Mechanic said do not consult with him on that particular issue. He cannot recommend which wells to look at. He said he agrees with what others said previously, that they need to understand what's happening in the Big Chino. Member Wilson mentioned they pretty much understand what is happening in the AMA; they have an overdraft of approximately 10,000 acre feet and that is their baseline. Mr. Mechanic said that when the overdraft is lessened they are making results. If the overdraft increases over the long term average they are going the wrong direction, which looks like what they are doing now.

Mr. Mechanic agrees with Member Wilson that the way to measure results in the Upper Verde River is to measure ground water level and how that affects the flow of the Upper Verde River. Member Springer said that hopefully that is what the monitoring will tell them. Mr. Mechanic complimented the Coalition for putting some money into this and supports

all three projects. Mr. Mechanic said while the Coalition is making progress it is not fast enough for him.

John Zambrano said they need to distinguish between the AMA and the Big Chino regarding measuring. In the AMA they have the ADWR who has a protocol dated August 21, 1998 for determining whether safe yield has been achieved. Mr. Zambrano said due to the various measuring resources they utilized, the ADWR can be relied upon to determine whether the goal of safe yield is being achieved. He said concerning the Big Chino the overarching goal is to protect the base flow in the Verde River and that can be measured in various models as well as the stream gages. Mr. Zambrano said that he thinks the Coalition wants to consider whether their particular projects are doing what they would like them to achieve. Member Springer responded the ADWR is looking at it from an overall basis and that she is more interested in the variances within the AMA, for example not all of the monitoring wells are falling. Some are rising. She said it would be helpful to us to know where within the AMA rising levels are taking place in order to identify where the best recharge occurs.

#### **ITEM NO. 7 Action – tasks/Projects Recommended by TAC for Authorization**

Mr. Mucillo said the TAC has four proposed tasks. Task #1 is Program Management and that funding research is going to be buried within the Program Management as an ongoing task. Chairman Fann explained that Mr. Mucillo is referring to pages 22, 24, 27 and 30 of the packet. Mr. Mucillo continued with Task #2 on page 22 stating that the goal is to create a central website for the Coalition that would be separate from any of the participating entities. He said this will be more conducive to immediately being able to post agendas, minutes, audio recordings and other information without having to impose on a local government and that all of this can be done with relatively little cost.

Chairman Fann said given the reality that this separate entity is comprised of the same municipalities and the same tax payers, is there a way this website could add links to specific local governments' water related updates? Mr. Mucillo answered yes, from a functional standpoint that is completely doable.

Member Springer said that having a link to each entity is a good idea as opposed to information from each entity but is hesitant about each entity have individual information posted separately on the UVRWPC website. Mr. Mucillo asked to verify if UVRWPC.ORG is an acceptable domain name for the Coalition. Member Wilson said simpler is better. Chairman Fann asked the Board if they want to vote on the tasks individually or lump them all together. The consensus was to lump the items into one vote.

Mr. Mucillo said Task #3 is Water Conservation Programs. After a good deal of discussion by the TAC, they determined they want action not just research. They came up with six groups of scope items:

1. Review and evaluate existing conservation programs.
2. Develop and employ metrics to determine program effectiveness.
3. Write technical memorandums summarizing Scope Items 1 & 2
4. Identifying additional regional conservation opportunities
5. Develop conservation program recommendations.
6. Write Final Project Report

Chairman Fann said to clarify they do not want to duplicate efforts expenses for the taxpayers and asked if there are other things that could be done that they have left out? Mr. Mucillo answered that Keith Larson who is not present today but is their conservation expert can bring some experience from outside the region.

Mr. Mechanic said he was at the TAC meeting when this was discussed and had suggested a change to Scope Item 1.2 to include holding interview meetings with other stakeholders in addition to the meetings with program managers. Member Wilson said he thought that fell under Item 1.1. Mr. Mucillo agreed with Mr. Mechanic and said that Item 1.2 should include meetings with stakeholders also. Mr. Mechanic asked that they also revise Item 4.3 to include interviews with conservation stakeholders as well.

Mr. Mucillo said Task #4 is Hydrologic Monitoring consisting of three phases as addressed in the packet. He explained that with this task and the next task of recharge they plan to use the TAC's time in a meeting and workshop and get the Program Management Team's technical experts to analyze the data and come up with the consensus and consistency Member Springer suggested. Phase 1 is to identify and review current and planned monitoring networks and activities; to prioritize those networks and activities that relate most directly to potential changes in the Upper Verde River baseflow.

Member Wilson said under scope of work he wanted to make sure and get Ed Wolfe involved in that one since he is the Chairman of the TAC for the Verde River Basin Partnership and they have done a lot of work in that area.

Mr. Dan Campbell with the Nature Conservancy referred to page 27 of 46, under Scope of Work – Phase 1. He reminded the Coalition that the Nature Conservancy has just bought first mile of the Upper Verde River at a strategic location where the Big Chino Basin, which is where

groundwater comes up as headwater springs, and Williamson Valley and is the confluence where it meets Granite Creek. This is the specific location where water comes out of the ground and goes from groundwater to surface water, from .4 CFS to 19 CFS in that first mile. The Nature Conservancy fully intends to be monitoring both the water quantity from both of those streams and the water quality. Mr. Campbell said that he thinks it is important that they watch over the next two decades to see if in any way the habitat down below is being affected. He said the Nature Conservancy now has a five million dollar stake in monitoring and would like to be added as stakeholders.

Mr. Slaback reminded the Board that the Sierra Club has been monitoring the site at the confluence of the Verde River and Granite Creek for biological and chemical activity for over a year would also like to be on the stakeholders list. Mr. Mucillo said he will add Ed Wolfe with the Upper Verde Basin Partnership, Dan Campbell with the Nature Conservancy and Tom Slaback with the Sierra Club.

Mr. Mucillo said Task #5 is Recharge Mapping. The TAC discussed natural and artificial recharge separately and then together. He explained that the TAC determined to produce maps identifying areas of potential existing natural recharge and some areas that lend themselves to artificial recharge. Mr. Mucillo said that all of these tasks added up to approximately \$90,000 – \$95,000.

Member Wilson made a motion to authorize expenditures for the four items so discussed and at the funds so depicted in the packet. Vice Chairman Flannery seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Fann said Member Wilson had to leave for a prior commitment and asked him if he had anything to add to next month's agenda items. Member Wilson said that Mr. Slaback's topic previously mentioned be referred to the TAC to evaluate the legality of the dumping and of the material provided by Tom Slayback. He said the TAC should then provide feedback back to the Board.

#### **ITEM NO. 8 Discussion – Review Correspondence between CWAG and ADWR**

Mr. Mucillo said this correspondence was provided to the TAC on the day of the last TAC meeting and they have not had time to fully react to it. The correspondence is included at the end of the packet. Mr. Mucillo provided highlights of a letter from CWAG to ADWR and dated October 10, 2007, which requested a clearer definition of safe-yield; quantification of natural recharge; compliance with safe-yield; and leadership. Mr. Mucillo said ADWR responded in December 2007 addressing each of these points.

Chairman Fann said they understand CWAG's concerns on this and they are an important part of this Coalition, however she is confused as to why we would want to put on agenda next month for discussion when each of the components are being addressed through everything they just approved.

Member Springer agreed and that the thrust of the letter was to ask a number of questions of ADWR, which they answered. Chairman Fann said these are important items and CWAG received documentation and information valuable to the Board. Member Springer said one key point mentioned in the response by ADWR is that safe-yield is a goal and not a mandate and there are no penalties for non-compliance. She said it will come up in the questions what is safe-yield and what is sustainability.

Mr. Mucillo said that in the final response letter from CWAG back to ADWR they did ask for clarification on safe-yield. Vice Chairman Flannery said he acknowledges CWAG and Mr. Zambrano in the pursuit of answers from ADWR and Herb Guenther, who compliments CWAG on their commitment to the achievement of sustainable water for the future of the Prescott AMA. He said the Board also commends them for that.

Mr. Mechanic said he addressed the Coalition about 6 months earlier and coined the term "safe-yield plus" to define a situation where they would continue their contribution to the Upper Verde River, which is a goal of the Coalition. He said our AMA is contributing about 15% and it is mostly underground flow to the Verde River. Mr. Mechanic said it is a specific safe-yield program. In safe-yield, as the director defined, the amount of water that is leaving naturally is computed and that is part of the safe-yield equation. This equation includes the 3,000 CFS going out that leaves the balance for human use. Mr. Mechanic said this is a safe-yield program that will fulfill both of the Coalitions' goals by having a safe-yield program but not just any safe-yield program. He said that they do not have to come up with a definition of safe-yield because it is defined under state law and they are not talking about sustainability of keeping all the creeks going. Mr. Mechanic said they are talking about both of the Coalition's goals and trying to fit it into this program.

Mr. Zambrano agrees the Board is right in not putting it on their agenda. Chairman Fann said whatever the TAC wants to do is fine but this should not go on next month's agenda.

#### **ITEM NO. 9 Discussion – Next Meeting Time/Location/Agenda**

Mr. Mucillo said the next regularly scheduled TAC Meeting is Wednesday, February 13, 2008 at 1:00 p.m. at the Yavapai County Administrative Services building in the Gladys Gardner Room, 1015 Fair Street, Prescott,

Arizona. He said the general schedule is intended for the TAC to meet the 2<sup>nd</sup> Wednesday of every month at that location. Mr. Mucillo said the four agenda items for the next meeting are to discuss correspondence between CWAG and ADWR, educational presentation schedule, formation of a safe-yield workgroup for the TAC, and Sierra Club's question about sewage sludge dumping.

Chairman Fann said the UVRWPC Board Meeting will be Wednesday, February 27, 2008 at 2:00 p.m. at City of Prescott City Hall in Council Chambers, 201 S. Cortez Street, Prescott, Arizona. Chairman Fann said the potential agenda items for the next meeting are the Habitat Conservation Plan, the Educational Presentation Schedule, Safe-Yield Workgroup, and Sewage Sludge Dumping.

There being no further business to be brought before the Upper Verde River Watershed Protection Coalition, the meeting adjourned at 3:33 p.m.