

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

MINUTES

A MEETING OF THE UPPER VERDE RIVER WATERSHED PROTECTION COALITION WAS HELD ON FEBRUARY 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 Rowle Simmons, City of Prescott  
Bob Greene, Town of Dewey-Humboldt  
Ernie Jones, Sr., Prescott-Yavapai Indian Tribe (New member)

**Members absent:**

None

**Staff present:**

Jim Holt, City of Prescott  
John Munderloh, Town of Prescott Valley  
Mark Holmes, Town of Chino Valley  
John Rasmussen, Yavapai County

**Guests present:**

George Seaman  
Rhuta Richardson  
Richard B. Farnsworth  
Bob Richards  
Tom Atkins  
Joanne Oellers  
Ed Wolfe  
Tom Steele  
John Zambrano  
Louise Bellesi

Chris Moss  
Candace McNulty  
Bob Luzius  
Dan Campbell  
Thomas Slaback  
Jack D. Wilson  
Joanna Dodder  
Ken Janecek  
Ashley Fine  
T. Aldington  
J.G. Brady

**Item 2. Approval of Minutes – January 24, 2007 Meeting**  
[Committee]

Vice Chairman Flannery asked that wording be clarified on page 4, at the end of paragraph 4, to indicate that the suggestion for an Environmental Impact Study came from the audience. Also, on page 3, the audience was asked if anyone knew the last name of “Katy.” It was indicated that her last name was “Nelson.”

VICE CHAIRMAN FLANNERY MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 24, 2007 MEETING AS AMENDED; SECONDED BY MEMBER GREENE; PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

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

Members then reported on their respective discussions regarding monetary participation in the Coalition. Member Greene reported that they discussed this in Dewey-Humboldt, and while there were questions, there was unanimous support of the Coalition and for participating at \$6,000 a year, understanding that they could not commit future councils.

Member Simmons said that the issue had not yet been discussed in Prescott, but he would make sure that it was on the next agenda. Vice Chairman Flannery reported that there was sound endorsement from Prescott Valley. Member Springer reported that Yavapai County did discuss this and ultimately approved the County’s participating for the next three years.

Chairman Fann noted that the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe, represented by Mr. Jones, had just become a member of the Coalition. She said that Chino Valley had discussions, including where the funds would come from, but there was unanimous support of the Coalition. She said that a question

raised was what was being done with regard to the Water Advisory Committee.

Chairman Fann said that they can discuss this further once Prescott has an opportunity to discuss it.

**Item 4. Discussion and Possible Action [Dependent on outcome of Item No. 3] – Fiscal Agent for collection and disbursement of Coalition Funds [Committee]**

Vice Chairman Flannery said that since Prescott is the fiscal agent for CYMPO and the County is for WAC, he would volunteer Prescott Valley to serve as fiscal agent for the collection and disbursement of Coalition funds.

**Item 5. Discussion and Possible Action – Program Plan Manager [Dependent on outcome of Item No. 3]**

- 1. Job Description (Manager, Coordinator, Administrator, etc)**
- 2. Employment Category (Staff or Consultant)**
- 3. Office Location of Program Manager, Coordinator or Administrator (if a Staff position)**

[Committee and Staff]

Mr. Holmes said that staff placed this item on the agenda to get some direction from the Coalition on how they want to proceed, so staff can prepare a more in-depth job description. He then reviewed what each of the different categories would provide, as identified on the attached memo.

Member Springer said that they have already identified a potential list of types of programs and she asked staff if they would anticipate a lot of other types of projects, or if they would be dealing with that list. Mr. Holmes said that the list they developed would be a list to stick with for the first three years.

Member Springer suggested that they prioritize the list and hire a consultant specifically for each program, and kept the intermediate tier under staff. She said she was afraid with getting a staff person too far removed from the current water experts.

Vice Chairman Flannery asked if there was any way that staff could identify the percentage of time associated with having a coordinator, administrator, manager, etc. Mr. Munderloh said that if there was a FTE or consultant, he would estimate 75% of their time would be on the technical end, and 25% on administrative, such as administering contracts, running meetings, posting agendas, etc. Mr. Rasmussen said that, in his view, the 25% is a little small; it would depend on the meetings they attend. He said he spends a lot of his

time in other meetings, but well over 50% of the time could be devoted to the technical work.

Vice Chairman Flannery said that there is a lot of minutia that needs to be done. If they are going to outsource, then they lose some quality control. Member Springer said that since these are different types of programs, they could get a different type of expertise for each program. Member Simmons agreed with Member Springer.

Member Greene asked, as an example, one of the projects is identifying artificial recharge sites and access, if there wouldn't be information available from the government to identify those areas. Mr. Holmes said that the Bureau of Reclamation has various grants available and they could explore all of the options of writing grants.

Member Springer said that if they delegated, it would appear that the "gap" could be in whatever assistance they need in preparing agendas, etc. She asked if that part of the work that is what was bogging down staff. Mr. Holmes said that right now staff members from the various agencies have been taking turns. The administration of the meetings, etc. is not really bogging them down much, but the project management, grant writing, etc. will require time that none of the staff members have available.

Chairman Fann said that she hates creating another level of bureaucracy and spending the taxpayer dollars foolishly so she wants to make sure that whatever direction they do is going to be money well spent. She said the list presented is just the beginning; it will grow and be expanded, but for now these are the projects; she asked if they to be handled one at a time or simultaneously. She's looking at the timing element because if they're doing six at once, it can become overwhelming; if they do one at a time, not so much. If they went with an employee, she asked if it should be part-time or full-time, or if they should do the consultant and a part-time position. The duties and definitions of what they're looking for still need to be defined more before they determine which way they want to go.

Member Springer agreed, but said she was concerned with getting too far away from the hands-on. She wanted to be sure that the current staff members remained involved. Mr. Holmes said that staff will come back with a more defined amount of time required for projects, management time, writing, grant seeking, and interaction with each project. He said that minimally they're looking at potentially two projects a year, or so.

Chairman Fann said that she understood that President Jones was a brand new member, and she didn't want to put him in a situation, but asked if he had any comments. President Jones said that most of the Tribe's water comes from the City of Prescott; they're like their big brother. Chairman Fann

said that first, they (the Tribe) are part of the family and that's why they wanted them involved and second, in looking at a long range plan, the Tribe owns a lot of land and they are involved in economic development, so they felt that as a family member, and as part of the Active Management Area, the Tribe should be part of some of the decisions being made, based on what their plans may be for the next 20 or 30 years, and the needs that they may have.

Mr. Moss said that he is not in a position to volunteer the Tribe for anything; the Tribe does handle many of these types of functions. It is not as clean as suggested with having a consultant. Such as with federal grants, they take nine percent off the top for incidentals, so there is a lot of administration involved.

Member Greene said that the first two projects are very similar, realizing that one is artificial and one is natural; however, if they were to look at those projects as singular projects and critical path manage them, and do the same thing with the water development program and watershed management program, he asked if there was a possibility of combining those programs so they could be critically path managed to benefit both of the projects. The second part of the question would be what the feasibility would be if they were to do that, to use interns and possibly graduate students help in those programs. Mr. Holmes said that to answer the first part of the question, it will depend on the interrelationship between some of the projects, and those will be flushed out when they start identifying the specific details and scope of work to be accomplished. With regard to interns/graduate students, he would be all for that type of academia being involved as long as their roles are identified clearly.

Member Springer said that before they bite off a whole lot of projects, it would be a good idea to demonstrate to the public that they are serious about these projects and what they may be able to accomplish; perhaps they should pick one or two and proceed cautiously until they have established to the public that they are beneficial. She has a favorite—the flood detention project. She said it is on the list for a feasibility study; she would like to go ahead and do it, not study it. She asked what it would take for them to do that, in terms of staff, consultants, etc. to demonstrate what Chairman Fann is talking about, as far as how they would go about it, the most cost-effective way to do it.

Mr. Holmes said that first they would want to make sure staff was an integral part with whatever the outcome would be. From the staff perspective, they would probably need to create another technical advisory group under the Coalition that would interact with the consultant or FTE on a regular basis to ensure that the project's progress is going forward. The list of projects is feasibility; they're based on a cost and a benefit. They need to first understand whether there really is a benefit to, and then how much they want

to spend for that benefit. These projects are only to identify in a feasible manner what potential exists in the various parts of the watershed. Staff could come back with a more detailed analysis of what it would take for them to try and come up with the projects—the scope, the time involved, at the same time that they're trying to determine whether to go with a consultant or FTE.

Chairman Fann asked if staff could set up a construction/study schedule based on a three-year period of time, and first have staff prioritize what they feel is the most important to get started, then whether to start another, or wait, etc. If the feasibility study of the flood detention project is on everyone's top list, she doesn't want to wait for three years to get started. If they have the information, they could get that started. Perhaps that could be part of the construction schedule. If they could outline that and, in addition to the other responsibilities identified as to the management end of it, once they set that in place then they may have a better concept of how much time it is really going to take to handle all of it. If they ascertain that it is going to take 20 hours a week, then that will help them identify what type of help they need.

Mr. Holmes said that based on what has been discussed staff will come back on a future agenda item and present a more outlined list of activities that would be associated with the projects, and also with regards to a potential priority list.

Mr. Holt said that it might be beneficial for staff if the Coalition members would look at their list of projects, and each share with them their first and second priority off that list. They could take those numbers and incorporate them, and give staff some priority.

Chairman Fann said that based on that, she would like to open it up to public comment, before they decide.

Jack Wilson – He attended the last meeting and asked John Munderloh about the basis of calling these “best management practices.” In talking from that context, normally when they do BMP study, part of the process tells you the potential payback technique to be used. Before they do project selection, they should do some rational cost benefit analysis, what it is going to cost and what the range is of potential benefits. With that, they have a basis for doing project selection. He doesn't see a real basis other than “I like it.”

Chairman Fann said that she assumed that when staff was going to come back, that would be part of that. Mr. Munderloh said that is why these are all feasibility level studies. They will all include cost benefit analysis, and they'll be able to make the next evaluation on whether to move forward based on that cost and benefit analysis.

Jerry Brady – would like to give a reference for CBDEOG, Community Block Development Grants or Economic Opportunity Grants, are all available for all of the purposes discussed today. They are not processed by NACOG; the focal point is the US Department of Agriculture Rural Economic Development Corporation. They have an office in Prescott Valley, but grants, including those to hire a grants administrator, all come through the USDA REDI office in Phoenix.

Mr. Brady has suggested to the Yavapai County Recorder that they may wish to get a CBDG to review their archives. No one in Yavapai County has reviewed the titles of deeds for water resources since 1974. The index to the titles has been missing since 1979. If they look at the actual records in the archives it is quite a lot different than the operation of assumption they're working on now. First, they want to get the index. It will be especially important to compare them—the Arizona Supreme Court is adjudicating the water resources in Yavapai County at this time.

Mr. Brady said the State Legislature terminated all existing water resources in 1974 and made a reassignment of them on a legislative basis. The State Supreme Court said they could not do that. They're going to be especially interested in Paddleford & Cline because it will affect 96% of the recorded water resources in this County. The vast majority of water resources in this county are known as promiscuous claims. The County Recorder and the Arizona Department of Water Resources were not required to judge the validity of claims at the time they were filed. Anyone could file a claim. In many cases they have three to six claims filed on a single water resource and sometimes 160 claims on a single resource. He suggested that none of the Coalition members have seen the document and know what is in it and they have not seen the titles and deeds for the water resources; no one has since 1974.

Howard Mechanic – He supports the Coalition following through on the projects and studying how effective they can be as far as a cost benefit analysis; however, the concern he has follows through with what he discussed at the last meeting, and what he's learned since then confirms it. Member Springer asked earlier if the list was going to be it for the next three years and the staff said yes. These projects are limited to increasing supply of water and as addressed last time, he's concerned that they are not addressing the other part of the equation—the demand for groundwater in the Big Chino area. He's heard that they will not be spending money on that issue in the next three years.

Chairman Fann asked Mr. Mechanic to clarify. Mr. Mechanic said that after the last meeting, in the February 6 Courier, Supervisor Springer was quoted as saying the projects to increase the base flow recharge would prevent river damage so “no mitigation would be required” when Prescott and Prescott

Valley start pumping water from the aquifer above the headwaters. He said that what she was addressing was that the efforts of the Coalition are to mitigate the proposed pipeline from the Big Chino. The other side of the story is what they are not mitigating. If that is true, and what he's heard so far, is they will not be mitigating any of the new demands on the Big Chino from pumping from large developments.

Mr. Mechanic said that staff, in a previous draft statement, said "although a number of strategies exist to increase available water supply, insufficient water management policies will likely offset any gains in the water supply." He said that means what they are talking about today is increasing available water supply only. If their goal is to protect the Upper Verde River, they must address the new demands on the groundwater of the Big Chino. If ignored, with the huge developments in that area, their efforts will go in vain.

Chairman Fann said that she thought part of their goals were to, as they're studying the Upper Verde River and Big Chino area, take that pumping into consideration, along with new growth. Mr. Munderloh said that he believes that what Mr. Mechanic was talking about was involvement in state and local policy. He doesn't believe they have direction from the Coalition to get into policy issues at this point. Chairman Fann said that she wasn't referring so much to policy as she was that if they're going to study the Big Chino, then obviously those considerations need to be given.

Member Springer said that she sees those as two different issues. Her understanding of what they're discussing is first, the need to replenish the groundwater in the AMA requires the transfer of water from the Big Chino Basin. It is that particular amount of water, around 8700 acre feet, that has been the issue of contention with a lot of folks. By transferring that water out of the basin, it is believed that it will actually affect the base flow of the Verde River, and the Coalition's purpose was to prevent that from happening. Their contention has been that if the pumping takes place, mitigation would ultimately take place because there will be a reduction in the base flow. If they do the projects, the goal then is to retain that same level of base flow so no future mitigation would be necessary. That is to offset a particular amount of water—that's one issue.

Member Springer continued that an additional benefit of the projects could be that they increase the amount of water retained in the basin, in the way of recharge, in excess of that amount. What Mr. Mechanic is talking about is a growth issue; that's a separate issue, having to do with actual development over the Big Chino aquifer and those people that have a current right to develop their property. The inference that she gets from Mr. Mechanic's remarks is that he would like the Coalition to address the issue of reducing that potential demand under current law. That's a policy issue which is totally separate.

Mr. Mechanic replied that he's not saying they specifically have to address the problem by restricting growth if they can provide mitigation for that growth. He thought they were there to protect the Upper Verde, not to protect the pipeline. The pipeline is one aspect of it. If they're saying that the group has nothing to do with anything else up there, or shouldn't, then he's suggesting that the Coalition needs to ask staff to study the potential additional groundwater demand in that area and how can they protect the Upper Verde River from that potential demand. If the Coalition doesn't want to deal with that, then they should call it the Pipeline Protection Association.

Member Springer said that she totally disagreed because all of the projects would serve to increase the recharge and that is a benefit to the whole area. Anything they do in the way of conservation plans certainly is a benefit to the whole area.

Chairman Fann asked staff if their goal is to make sure that everybody in the AMA does nothing to harm the flows of the Verde River, based on something they may or may not do, then if there were future development, whether the Yavapai Ranch, CVCF Ranch, etc. are they not responsible that they do no harm also. Mr. Holmes said that the property owners have a right to do what they want to do with their property. He wants to point out that the studies will hopefully show them where they can go under the feasibility potential to increase recharge, reduce use, taking into consideration all of their potential impacts.

Mr. Holmes said that by the end of the third year, they may have some good tools that they can move forward with, or may have already moved forward with. On year number four, the Coalition may determine that they want to proceed with some types of activity that may address other Big Chino activities, or AMA activities. It is what they can do right now today, with the studies.

Chairman Fann asked if someone has a piece of property and they decide they're going to build 20,000 houses, hypothetically, if wouldn't have a responsibility to make sure they do no harm to someone else. Mr. Holmes said that she is probably touching in the realm of water adequacy. One aspect they should keep in mind is that one of the studies looks at natural recharge areas that are critical to the Big Chino and the AMA, and they'd like to have development occur there because of the natural recharge, there are development planning steps through the County and municipal governments that the information could be a tool. That is the initial first step.

Member Springer said that one of the reasons that the County takes a position to encourage some of the developments as opposed to lot splits is simply because some of the larger developments coming into the area have

the financial capability of doing things like wastewater treatment plants, and certainly there is a benefit to that. The alternative, under current law, is what is happening today, lot splits so in any part of the incorporated areas of the County, if they have a two-acre parcel, they can drill a well and put in a septic tank. That is what they are trying to find ways to direct the growth toward a more managed and planned growth. She thinks they are all looking for that alternative.

John Zambrano – Some of the projects they are considering are meant to enhance recharge. It would seem difficult to quantify the amount of recharge they'll get from some of these projects. He asked if staff has considered how they might quantify the amount of recharged enhanced. Mr. Holmes said that part of the feasibility study will look at the benefits of recharging. In looking at the various species of trees, how much water they consume annually, replacement of those trees which is currently being undertaken by Forest Service. There are a number of mechanisms available to use to determine the cost and the benefit.

Chairman Fann asked Mr. Zambrano if he had any preference of what should be at the top of the list. Mr. Zambrano said that he has not studied the list, and he would suggest that staff be the best ones to do that, even more than the Coalition members themselves.

George Seaman – The Coalition is considering the prioritization of the projects and he's asking if anyone has asked if SRP is signing off on these natural recharge projects. He said that he owns a parcel that has a creek, and if he puts a dam on that creek, or even slows the water down, he can be sued by SRP because as soon as the water hits the ground, it belongs to SRP and what they do with it, they dictate. If they haven't signed off on this, then prioritizing the projects for natural recharge seems to be putting the cart before the horse. He thinks that the very first thing they need to do is get SRP on their side.

Joanne Oellers – She said that they've been hearing the word "Best Management Practices" frequently and she believes there is some confusion as to what that means. She knows that when she hears that, she assumes there is a certain sequence of events that has taken place for that label to be put on a plan. She asked if there was a document that would be available for the public to view that outlines those practices. If it is not a standard BMP, then she's confused as to why it would be called that. Communication is very important. Secondly, in comparing the construction pipeline timeline to the feasibility studies, it appears that they may be putting the cart before the horse. If the BMP are not what they would assume, with cost benefit analysis, then she's wondering how projects could be proceeded at this time.

Ms. Oellers said, with regard to recharge, that there are questions about it these days with regard to how much money it would cost to actually clean it enough to put back into the system without environmental impacts.

Mr. Munderloh said that best management practices are developed over time, and that is what they are proposing to do. They are working on the feasibility aspects of the projects; they'll find out how they'll play out as they move forward.

Ashley Fine – With regard to the pipeline timeline, it seems that they're aggressively moving forward with the pipeline before they can actually offset the impacts to the River. She thinks if there was no evidence that a significant amount of pumping in that area would affect the River, the dialogue would be entirely different, but there is a considerable amount of evidence that suggests there will be an impact. Mr. Guenther with the Arizona Department of Water Resources acknowledged that there would very likely be an impact to the River because the pumping would be in excess of what has been historically pumped in that area. She wants to acknowledge that there is a great deal of concern in the public with the project and there are a few things that the Coalition could do to alleviate those concerns. First, they could determine what percentage of the water would be going to safe yield and what percentage would be going to new growth. Without that clearly defined, they don't know if they're expanding the safe yield issue and making it worse, or whether they're actually going to be able to alleviate the overdraft in the Little Chino that is occurring.

Second, if it is proven, and there continues to be proven, that there will be an impact on the Upper Verde River, it would give the public confidence to know that the Coalition would aggressively seek alternate water resources, rather than continuing along the path of wanting to construction a pipeline and pump from the Big Chino aquifer.

Finally, the public would like to see an environmental impact study, a formal mitigation plan, and regardless of whether there's a Federal nexus triggered and that becomes a requirement, there really needs to be a habitat conservation plan. Incidental take permits because of the presence of endangered species need to be filed for and with those permits there needs to be a habitat conservation plan that is prepared and addressed. That can be a very lengthy process.

Bob Richards – He said he's a little confused on mitigation. He understands that mitigation studies have been carried out. Apparently letter was sent from the US Fish and Game Department to Prescott and Prescott Valley in April of 2005 and in the letter it stated that Carol Johnson, representative for the City of Prescott, was committed to completing a mitigation plan which would address the effects of pumping on the Big Chino on the Verde River within a

year. If there has been a mitigation study completed, he'd like to know why they aren't discussing it. If there isn't a study, he'd like to know the status of that plan.

Chairman Fann said that she is somewhat out of that realm, but she knows that Prescott and Prescott Valley have been doing studies, but they are not yet done. Mr. Richards asked when they would be done. Member Simmons said that he did not have a timeline at this time.

Ken Janecek – He said that there is a train about to leave a station—called a long term solution to all of the needs of the Prescott AMA and the Big Chino. That train is perhaps a pipeline. He'd like to offer that six years ago Coconino County decided that they didn't really understand what their water supply is going to be and they hired the US Bureau of Reclamation to do a study for them; a study to figure out if they have a problem and if they had a long-term solution. He said that many of the communities in the southwest have been doing this. The Navajo Nation has decided in New Mexico that they want a straw into the San Juan arm of the Colorado River. All of these straws are going forward. Coconino said that they'd like to understand if they need a straw. They have completed the study that outlines what water they have, population, growth, etc. and some of the solutions available. The result was a very comprehensive study that shows three key alternatives. Unfortunately, it's not the easiest path, but perhaps the only viable path—Colorado River water.

The Navajo Tribe in Cameron has already said they are going to have a pipeline from the Colorado River; now there's a pipe from Lake Powell to Cameron. Flagstaff and Coconino County said they're only 50-60 miles down the road, they could put their efforts in as well. Bureau of Reclamation developed a map to show where they could put the pipe and the costs associated. William jumped on it and said they'd like to be included. The train that's leaving the station is a pipe from Colorado River. It wouldn't take that much to continue that pipeline down to this area. They offered to the WAC already to do the study. Five years ago and three years ago, the response has been no response. He offers that there is a solution available and he'd hate to be five or ten years down the road saying that there's no more to do with the mitigation and it isn't enough.

Member Springer said that since the Colorado River is already over 100% subscribed, she asked whose water this study assumed would be bought. Mr. Janacek said that Coconino County has addressed the issue and it's up to the County to be doing the work to determine. It is absolutely overallocated right now. It is supposed to supply 16.5 million acre feet to Arizona and they're doing somewhere between 12 and 14; sooner or later the people are going to have to take a hit and Arizona will be first.

Mr. Janacek said that he doesn't know that a pipe is the best answer but if it is, then the first people to talk to would be the Coconino County Supervisors because they are the ones that feel strongly that they can build the pipe. They have talked to the Colorado River Indian Tribe, the CAP people, the Ak Chin, etc. They know what water is available and how much they have to pay to buy it.

Mr. Munderloh said that Yavapai County did initiate conversations with the Bureau of Reclamations on October 17, 2001. The Bureau came to a WAC meeting and the WAC requested that they be put in a queue for a similar feasibility study. They told them at the time that they did not have the resources to do it, and would come back to them when they did. In the meantime, the NAMWUA group has moved forward on designs to develop Colorado River or CAP supply.

Chairman Fann said that they've already moved into Item No. 6, and she asked if there was anyone else that wanted to address the Coalition under that item.

**Item 6. Discussion and Possible Action – Legislative Update**  
[Committee and Staff]

No discussion held.

**Item 7. 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 Chairman.*

*At the conclusion of the unscheduled comments, individual members of the Coalition may respond to the item addressed at the discretion of the Chairman, or they may ask Staff to review the matter or ask that the matter be placed on a future agenda.*

[Committee]

Tom Steele – He wanted to piggyback what Mr. Janacek said in that they could avoid a lot of litigation as well as mitigation on the pipeline project because the first source of the water would be to pay California the cost for them to produce consolidation plants for their water and in turn get allocation from them to make up this replacement.

Mr. Mechanic – He appreciated Supervisor Springer's comments about trying to get recharge from capturing sewage in the developments up there. That might mitigate 60% of the water, but the other 40% is an additional draw from the Big Chino. He would like to have it clarified whether the only thing they're there for in the next three years is to mitigate for Prescott and Prescott Valley.

He said that just because they're not talking about the other 100 pound gorilla, the development, then he asked who was.

To conclude, Chairman Fann said that there are a lot of intelligent, smart people in the room and many know more about water than she does and others on the Coalition. They really need to work together on this. They really need to have a "can do" attitude. The reality is that the AMA is in an overdraft. There are more people here now than the water will sustain if they do nothing. Obviously it is their job to make sure they reach safe yield and make sure that there's going to be enough water there for the people that want to move there tomorrow. Whether they want them here or not, they do have property rights, and they cannot stop it. They can manage it, and try to do good growth management, but they can't stop them. Their job is to work together and get on the same page. If that means bringing in water from the Colorado River, or from the Big Chino that won't affect anyone else, if it means conservation, mitigation, they have to work together. She said that if they continue to argue, nothing will get done and the water table will continue to go down.

Chairman Fann said that there was a suggestion earlier that staff is the water experts, and they should come back with a suggested prioritization and why. Member Simmons said that he agreed with John (Z) in that staff is really the ones to bring forth some suggestions.

Member Simmons reported that the Coalition funding from the City of Prescott would be on their agenda next week.

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

The next meeting will be March 28, 2007. Mr. Holmes said that staff would bring back a suggested prioritization of projects as well as a breakdown of the position, hours associated with each project, etc.

Chairman Fann adjourned the meeting at 3:38 P.M.

---

KAREN FANN, Chairman

ATTEST:

---

ELIZABETH A. BURKE, Clerk