



## NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING & AGENDA

# UPPER VERDE RIVER WATERSHED PROTECTION COALITION BOARD MEETING

UPPER VERDE RIVER WATERSHED PROTECTION COALITION  
PRESCOTT, ARIZONA  
September 23, 2009

### MINUTES

A MEETING OF THE UPPER VERDE RIVER WATERSHED PROTECTION COALITION WAS HELD ON SEPTEMBER 23, 2009 in the Prescott Municipal Building, 201 S. Cortez Street, Prescott, Arizona.

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

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

##### **Members Present:**

Councilman Mike Flannery, Chairman, Town of Prescott Valley  
Supervisor Carol Springer, Vice Chairman, Yavapai County  
Mayor Jim Bunker, Member, Town of Chino Valley  
Councilwoman Mary Ann Suttles, City of Prescott (sitting in for Mayor Jack Wilson)

##### **Members Absent:**

President Ernie Jones Sr., Member, Yavapai - Prescott Indian Tribe

##### **Staff Present:**

Ed Muccillo, Program Manager  
Rick Shroads, Assistant Program Manager  
Jim Holt, City of Prescott  
Mark Holmes, Town of Chino Valley  
John Munderloh, Town of Prescott Valley

##### **Guests Present:**

Councilwoman Fran Schumacher, Town of Prescott Valley  
Councilwoman Linda Hatch, Town of Chino Valley  
Melody Reifsnnyder, Sage Consulting  
Tom Atkins  
Ken Janecek  
Doug McMillan

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

#### **ITEM NO 3. Action – Approval of Minutes for previous Board Meeting – August 26, 2009**



**VICE CHAIRMAN SPRINGER MOVED TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 26, 2009 MINUTES; SECONDED BY MEMBER JIM BUNKER; MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**ITEM NO 4. Discussion – TAC Meeting Summary – September 9, 2009**

Mr. Ed Muccillo said everything that was covered in the TAC meeting is on the agenda today.

**ITEM NO 5. Discussion – Program Manager's Report**

Mr. Muccillo said they are touching every topic of the program manager's report at every meeting and asked the Board if they think this agenda item is necessary anymore.

Vice Chairman Springer said no.

Chairman Flannery said he appreciates the report but it does not have to be on the agenda if everything is being addressed in other agenda items.

Vice Chairman Springer said only topics not addressed in the agenda should be reported.

**ITEM NO 6. Discussion – Budget Update**

Mr. Muccillo said the budget projection is on page 22 of 30 in the agenda packet. He said he would try to provide budget updates about every other meeting just to touch base and let everybody know where they are at. He said the update shows the Coalition tasks and that some of them are complete and others are ongoing. He said each one is showing what the budget amount and expenditures are and then the remaining amount for each budget item. He said Tasks 2 – 5B are pretty specific, succinct tasks for the budget. Mr. Muccillo explained that for Task 1, Program Management and Grant Management, that is an ongoing effort. He said he wanted to caution everybody that there is not an intent to spend \$181,000 between now and July. He said they may spend \$3,000 - \$4,000 on program management in a slow month and \$8,000 - \$9,000 on a high month.

Vice Chairman Springer asked what period of time these numbers cover.

Mr. Muccillo said this update is since Burgess & Niple has been on board, since about the late 2007, so about two years.

Vice Chairman Springer said any time he does a budget it should encompass the timeframe.

Chairman Flannery said he agrees.

Vice Chairman Springer said she would prefer the budget in columns by fiscal year and includes both revenues and expenditures.

**ITEM NO 7. Discussion – Water Conservation Efforts Update**

Mr. Muccillo said everything is in progress – the publications, the distribution racks, and the media campaign.

Lorri Carlson said that the radio spots are playing on KDDL and KAHM rather than the five listed in the agenda.



Member bunker asked how often the commercials are playing. Ms. Carlson said she would send the scheduling information in an email.

Vice Chairman Springer said she has a problem with advertising that has a one day shelf life, which includes radio and newspapers. She said she prefers ongoing advertising like the brochures and rack cards because they have a longer shelf life and the money is not gone is just one day.

Mr. Muccillo presented idea and potential of newsletter and wanted to get some feedback from the Board as to whether they see any value in developing a quarterly.

Mayor Flannery asked to define newsletter.

Mr. Muccillo said he is thinking of an 8½" x 11" with a cover article that can be mailed hard copy, electronically and/or posted the Coalition website.

Vice Chairman Springer said if they are talking about saving money all of the member entities have some sort of mail distribution to their constituents that the UVRWPC can take advantage of.

Councilwoman Mary Ann Suttles said the City of Prescott sometimes has an issue with what is included in the water bill. She said some residents feel their privacy is being invaded. She said she does not know what procedure the City of Prescott needs to do to include a newsletter in their mailings.

Member Bunker said the Town of Chino Valley really does not have all that many on the system, maybe 1500 water customers out of 13,000 residents.

Chairman Flannery said in terms of radio, he thinks it can be used in conjunction with the other methods such as the publications. He said does not think that it is money poorly spent when combined with the other efforts.

Member Bunker said people probably need a variety of venues.

Chairman Flannery said if they are talking about mailing that is very expensive to do that and that it would not be in our best interest to do that. He said if it can be sent as a stuffer I something else then yes but agrees with Councilwoman Suttles.

Mr. Muccillo said there are two questions and the first is if the newsletter would be a good medium. He said it is possible that some of the grants they may be pursuing can possibly fund the cost of mailing and Melody Reifsnyder can help them with that question when they get to the grants agenda item.

Chairman Flannery said he feels they can use the money better in some other means than on postage. He said if they are going to get people to come to the website and further it with more information than what will be in the newsletter it would be advantageous to have them come regularly to the website and that would be the preferable choice.



Vice Chairman Springer said she really has no objection to radio but if they are going to do there are some marketing studies about how to most effectively get a message across. She said she has always been taught that if you are trying to get the public to absorb a message then it has to be done a certain amount of times before it starts to really penetrate. She suggests that if they are going to do radio rather than do one or two spots per week when they have no idea who is hearing it pick one day week or one day a month and do saturation over a 24 – 48 hour period. She said it should be a new message every month or so.

Ms. Carlson explained that the radio spots are being played with specific programs at specific times as much as possible.

Chairman Flannery asked that Ms. Carlson find out the times for the radio spots and to forward that information to the Board.

Councilwoman Suttles asked if the Board has considered billboard type signage that would be visible for a length of time for repeated exposure to the information.

Member Bunker said they need variety of venues.

Tom Atkins, Prescott, asked if the radio spots can be made available on the UVRWPC website. Mr. Muccillo and Chairman Flannery both indicated that can be done.

**ITEM NO 8. Discussion & Possible Action – Grant Funding Plan**

Chairman Flannery addressed Melody Reifsnyder and told her that the Board praised her for the work she put into the Grant Funding Plan and that it was an outstanding application. He thanked her very much on behalf of the Board.

Mr. Muccillo said the Grant Funding Plan will be a living document, that it will be monitored and updated as needed. He said the Bureau of Reclamation Grant has been completed and submitted.

Ms. Reifsnyder said they should here the results of the grant awards at the end of the month.

Mr. Muccillo said the other grant efforts include working to be registered as the Coalition on Grants.gov and to get their Federally Negotiated Indirect Cost Rate. He said they are also working on developing some relationships with private foundations that provide grants. Mr. Muccillo said one of the main things he wanted to address is on pages 5-6 of the agenda packet. He said there are eight grants listed that they are considering targeting. He said the next one in particular is the Bureau of Reclamation Grant, which is pretty much the same grant only the grant would be for \$50,000. He said there are some other grants such as the Kieckhefer/Morris, ADEQ grants, Bureau of Reclamation System Optimization Grant, Laura Jane Musser, WIFA, and others. He said he asking the Board to preauthorize him to pursue grants that have previously committed funds for a required match, if there is not a match required, or if they can fulfill the match with in-kind services and/or their Federally Negotiated Indirect Cost Rate. Mr. Muccillo said some of these grants come up quickly and they want to be able to go after them.

Chairman Flannery asked if they did not have this discussion last time.



Vice Chairman Springer said she thinks the Board gave him specific authority to go forward with the one grant but she does not think they gave him a blanket authority.

Chairman Flannery said they gave Mr. Muccillo certain parameters.

Vice Chairman Springer said what was just outlined are excellent because it does not commit them to actually spending any money until they have a chance to review.

Mr. Muccillo said those would be on a case by case basis.

Chairman Flannery said the one thing that is missing is the chart does not specifically say what the grants are for. He said he would appreciate knowing what the grants are for.

Mr. Muccillo said some of the grants can be specific but some are relatively broad but the assumption is they can rest assured that he is not going to give a green light if the grant is not for conservation or recharge or watershed management. He said it needs to be pretty clear that the purpose of the grant purpose is a Coalition Goal.

Chairman Flannery said that is why at the last meeting he tried to lay it out in terms of the Coalition's mission statement, which can be used as kind of guiding principal.

Chairman Flannery asked the Board if they are willing to give Mr. Muccillo the authority to go forward under the conditions he just laid out.

Member Bunker said yes, so long as the grant is within the scope of the Coalition.

Chairman Flannery asked if anyone in the audience had any comments. There were none. He asked Mr. Muccillo when possible to give the Board a general area the grant is for in the grants outline.

Vice Chairman Springer asked Mr. Muccillo to restate the three categories. Mr. Muccillo said grants that have previously committed funds for a required match, if there is not a match required, or if they can fulfill the match with in-kind services and/or their Federally Negotiated Indirect Cost Rate.

**VICE CHAIRMAN SPRINGER MOVED TO AUTHORIZE STAFF THE ABILITY TO APPLY FOR GRANTS USING THE PREVIOUSLY OUTLINED CRITERIA; SECONDED BY MEMBER BUNKER; MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**ITEM NO 9. Discussion – Recharge & Source Water Pilot Projects Study Update**

Rick Shroads provided a brief update on the Recharge Pilot Study projects. He said they have developed site and undeveloped site projects. He said the developed site is the Embry Riddle Aeronautical University project and they have met with APS twice on site at their solar farm. He said they are very interested in this new concept. Mr. Shroads said there are some regulatory things they have to go through with APS, such as the fact that APS is leasing that land from ERAU and if something is done on the solar panel site APS wants to make sure that does not violate that lease. He said the good news is that they have as-built plans of the solar facility from APS so they can see what is actually on the site. He said they are also coordinating with new management and that he did not realize that Mike Willinger had retired and the new person is Dave Hall. He said Mr. Hall is very interested in continuing with the idea and they will be meeting with him next week.



Mr. Shroads said on the undeveloped sites the project in Chino Valley is about 40% complete with the design of the plans and specifications. He said they have a topographic survey of site, they have laid out the plats, and the piping has been preliminarily designed. He said Prescott Valley, the Viewpoint and Pronghorn, is also about 40% with those plans and specifications. Mr. Shroads said they have completed shallow soil testing in the Viewpoint channel to verify the sandy clay content of the soil. He said they met with the Town Council for a briefing and a study session in Prescott Valley. He said they have also done some soil testing at the Pronghorn site and it is just as they suspected, heavy clays out there, which is good and what they wanted. He said he would like to bring PDF files of pre-final plans to put on a visual screen for the Board to see.

Chairman Flannery asked if the one at Pronghorn is with the school district.

Mr. Shroads said they have met with the school district and they are excited about it. He said Doug McMillan has been the one to talk to them. He said both the school district and ERAU have expressed an interest in possibly using some of this information as curriculum for the students to learn more about recharge.

**ITEM NO 10. Discussion & Possible Action– Development of Water Smart Facility / Project Application Process**

Mr. Muccillo said he has a new generation of the application. He said the first one he reviewed with the Board he was just looking for some feedback on the questions and took the comments under consideration. He said the revised application is on page 23 of the agenda packet. He said this application includes a lead in page with introductory text about what they are trying to do regarding the Water Smart application and where to submit on the final page. Mr. Muccillo said he wanted to get a little bit more of a discussion.

Vice Chairman Springer said Mr. Muccillo did a good job on the front page and that it is a good explanation of who they are and what they are trying to do. She said she still has some questions about the questions because it seems to her that some of them would be very difficult to know how to answer. She suggested that questions possibly be categorized, such as education.

Mr. Muccillo said he liked that and each category could include a little bit of introductory text to coach them through the application.

Chairman Flannery said it seems like they need some contact information as follow up should be on front page.

Member Bunker said he thinks the questions look pretty good. He said they are going to get a whole wide range of projects and that some the questions will make sense to the applicants who are doing that sort of thing.

Mr. Muccillo said he has two questions. He said there has been discussion at the Board meeting and the TAC meeting about recognizing what type of facility and if that should be identified. He said the other question is if they want to tip their hand as to how the applications will be evaluated.



Chairman Flanner said he would prefer not including how the applications will be evaluated and that really they are not prepared to do that. He said he thought they had a great deal of discussion last time that they do not want to group all potential applicants in one category and that they did want to see other ones such as government and industry separated out. He said for one thing government ought to be the leader on this anyway.

Vice Chairman said by adding the paragraph with a description of the project on the very first page that pretty much covers it. She said all you have to do is read their descriptive paragraph and you will know what kind of a project it is.

Mr. Shroads said on the third sentence of the first page it may be worthwhile to add "to also achieve safe yield."

Vice Chairman Springer said it is the last line of the first paragraph.

Chairman Flannery said he remembers the discussion last month and they did not want to group it together.

Vice Chairman Springer asked why they would structure it any differently if it was a commercial building as opposed to residential in terms of the questions. She asked if he was talking about developing a different questionnaire. She said the application says the project facility name, the responsible party, and a description of the project on the first page and that should clearly identify whether it is government, commercial, or residential.

Chairman Flannery asked if she thinks residential ought to be competing with commercial or industrial.

Vice Chairman Springer said she does not think anybody is competing rather they are trying to achieve a designation on the merits of that program.

Mr. Muccillo said he thinks quite a few of the questions do not apply to residential as they do to the other three of government, industry and commercial.

Jim Munderloh said he just wants to be sure they are all on the same page with the application process. He said his understanding is that they want to get the Water Smart logo and programs out there to as many people as possible so the main purpose of the application is make sure there are no abuses of that name, logo, and brand. He said they want to make sure the applicants are doing something that is smart in the water conservation sense and not put the logo in front of a fountain or something like that. He said it is really supposed to be a very simple process to make sure the applicants are not going to be abusive of the program and to get it out there.

Chairman Flannery said he is assuming get it out there with certain standards.

Vice Chairman Springer said she just noticed the application form does not have a line for an email contact.

Mr. Muccillo said it would also be good to include a place for a website address as well.

Vice Chairman Springer said she assumes that in some instances maybe the Program Manager, the TAC, or even in some cases the Board, might want to tour the project. She



asked if there should be anything on the form that part of the application process might include personal review and that a tour might take place.

Mr. Muccillo agreed that would definitely help and prevent them from putting a sign in front of a fountain.

Vice Chairman said if it is on some minor portion of the building and they find that the applicant is saving a little water here but wasting a whole lot of water over there they would not want their Water Smart logo on that project.

Mark Holmes said to bring another point they discussed last time and a different opinion from his esteemed colleague, they also talked about not having the Water Smart logo at every home and business because it would basically become an oversaturated commodity. He said looking at this as they talked about, setting the bar, then from his standpoint and from the development/residential view having an established bar to meet and if they do then having a Water Smart community sign versus every development simply because they have installed a energy efficient fixture in the house. Mr. Holmes said he is leaning towards setting that bar.

Chairman Flanner said he does remember the discussion that the work has established a certain expectation of Water Smart and they did not want to lessen that.

Mr. Atkins, Prescott, asked if the end the product of this is sign in front of the building or site and what does it say.

Chairman Flannery said it is not in this but it is a Water Smart logo that says the business is Water Smart.

Mr. Muccillo said we could also recognize a list on the website. He said he has enough feedback to get this looking even better for next month.

Chairman Flannery said he has heard that they have some broadening of the questions and a couple of changes with the application.

Vice Chairman Springer said a little more meat on the questions.

Councilwoman Suttles said they discussed about getting this information out and about branding so the more visibility they get the more buy in they are going to get. She asked if there is any type of timeline they are going to get this out. She said the last time she saw the logo was at a council meeting and from her point how are they getting this out to the public.

Mr. Muccillo said he thinks it is going to be in the Water Smart racks, the radio spots; it could be in a newsletter or other such points of sale, places where a point of transaction or something new happens. He said they can do a press release.

Vice Chairman Springer said it should be on the website so it can be downloadable.

Councilwoman Suttles what she is doing is tailing on his question of what is it that you get this in front of your home or business. She said they need to get the brand out there first so they know when they do this they are coming on.



Mr. Muccillo said what he can present next month is a marketing plan / distribution plan.

Mr. Atkins, Prescott, asked if when they put the application they will put it on the internet so that it can be filled in.

Mr. Muccillo said they can make available either way.

**ITEM NO 11. Discussion & Possible Action – Next Meeting Time / Location / Agenda Items**

Mr. Muccillo said they have three months left – October, November, and December. He said with the way December falls they most certainly are not going to have that meeting. He said his sense is there will be a brief water conservation update, more detail on the grants they will be pursuing, more detail on the Recharge Pilot Project Study, and then the Water Smart applications.

Vice Chairman Springer said she and Supervisor Thurman will be at a County Supervisors Conference and will not be able to attend.

Mr. Muccillo and the Board discussed available meeting dates. The consensus was to reschedule the next Board meeting on the first Wednesday in November and the second Wednesday in December. The final dates agreed upon for the next two meetings were November 4<sup>th</sup> and December 9<sup>th</sup>.

**Meeting adjourned at 3:04 p.m.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
COUNCILMAN MIKE FLANNERY, Chairman

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
LORRI CARLSON, Administrative Assistant