



NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING & AGENDA

**UPPER VERDE RIVER WATERSHED PROTECTION COALITION
WORKSHOP MEETING
PRESCOTT, ARIZONA
November 4, 2009**

MINUTES

A MEETING OF THE UPPER VERDE RIVER WATERSHED PROTECTION COALITION WAS HELD ON NOVEMBER 4, 2009 in the Prescott Municipal Building, 201 S. Cortez Street, Prescott, Arizona.

Chairman Flannery called the meeting to order at 2:01 p.m.

Introductions, Awards, or Presentations

Members Present:

Councilman Mike Flannery, Town of Prescott Valley, Chairman
Supervisor Carol Springer, Yavapai County Board of Supervisors, Vice Chairman
Mayor Jim Bunker, Town of Chino Valley
Mayor Jack Wilson, City of Prescott

Members Absent:

President Ernie Jones, Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe

Staff Present:

Ed Muccillo, Program Manager
Rick Shroads, Assistant Program Manager
Jim Holt, City of Prescott
John Munderloh, Town of Prescott Valley
Mark Holmes, Town of Chino Valley
John Rasmussen, Yavapai County
Lorri Carlson, Program Administrator

Guests Present:

Councilwoman Fran Schumacher, Town of Prescott Valley
Charlie Ester
Charles Hildebrant
John Zambrano
Gary Beverly
Steve Conrad
Edessa Carr
Ken Janacek
Lou Bellesi
Thomas Slaback
Candace McNulty



ITEM NO 1. Introductions, Awards, or Presentations

Councilwoman Fran Schumacher, Town of Prescott Valley

ITEM NO 2. Call to Public

ITEM NO 3. Action – Approval of Minutes of previous Board Meeting – September 23, 2009

Member Jack Wilson moved to approve the minutes of the September 23, 2009 Board Meeting [with spelling corrections]; second by Vice Chairman Carol Springer. Motion passed unanimously.

ITEM NO 4. Discussion – TAC & Safe Yield Workgroup Meeting Summaries – October 14, 2009

Ed Muccillo said with the exception of one item everything will be covered on today's agenda. He said they were not successful with the recent Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) Grant application. He explained that there were three grants awarded and they will be doing some debriefing on why the application was not successful. Mr. Muccillo said the next BOR has been reissued and is due the end of January 2010. He said they were expecting this grant to be \$50,000 but it has been issued for \$30,000. He said last round BOR only awarded about \$100,000 and this time they will be awarding about \$500,000, which should increase the opportunity for an award.

Chairman Flannery asked if they were pursuing why the Coalition was not awarded and grant. Mr. Muccillo said yes and Melody Reifsnnyder is trying to speak with someone from BOR on what they can do better in the application.

Member Wilson asked if they know who received the awards.

Ms. Reifsnnyder said two went to Pima County and one went to Maricopa County and none went to rural Arizona. She said she is trying to find out why and sometimes the grantors will give information and sometimes they will not.

Mr. Muccillo said there is a memo on page 20 of the agenda packet to identify the three of the next grants the Coalition will be pursuing. He said the BOR grant as previously discussed; the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, which is a water quality related grant; and the Kieckhefer/Margaret T. Morris private grant and possibly partnering with the Highlands Center for a public education program. He said these will be discussed further at the next TAC meeting.

ITEM NO 5. Discussion & Possible Action – Consideration of Safe Yield Workgroup Replacement Member

Mr. Muccillo said this item is to consider applicant Gary Beverly as a replacement for the environmental representative on the Safe Yield Workgroup. He said Joanne Oellers with the Center for Biological Diversity had to resign her position a number of months ago. He said he received a letter in early September from



Gary Beverly requesting to fill the vacant environmental position. Mr. Muccillo said it was not on the September TAC agenda but was informally discussed and agreed to be put on the October agenda. He said he failed to have the item put on the October agenda and apologized for the lapse. He said it was discussed to be brought to the November Board Meeting, which is the earliest it could have been brought to the Board anyway.

Chairman Flannery thanked Mr. Muccillo for the clarification regarding Joanne Oellers and apologized for the confusion related to the process although frankly he does not think they have had a process for replacement of a member. He said regarding the lateness of this request and that it was discussed at the last Board Meeting that a final report is due in January 2010. He said he has some concerns about bringing someone on board at this late date. Chairman Flannery said he does feel somewhat at ease that Mr. Beverly has been a participant for some time now and he does not know if it is absolutely necessary for a process for replacement because comments are still being accepted by the public and would be included. He said he does not necessarily approve of going forward with an official replacement of somebody at this late date but he will not oppose it. He said in reviewing some of the minutes Safe Yield needs to get down to business here because he sees that some of the debates that are being bandied about right now are things that should have been occurring early early on. He said come January that committee will cease to exist and that report will have been written or not. He said legal and legislative issues need to be dismissed with and get down to what the workgroup is about.

Mr. Muccillo said from his memory he thought the report was due in February or March and that he does not remember it being due in January.

Chairman Flannery and Vice Chairman Springer both said it was due in January.

Member Bunker said he does not Gary Beverly at all but believes it is correct that he is involved in a lawsuit against the City of Prescott and the Town of Prescott Valley. He said he likes to include all points of view but he would be concerned if they have someone who is not willing to work together in order to reach a solution.

Chairman Flannery said he is not sure it is a lawsuit.

Gary Beverly said he has lived for 35 years in Chino Valley and he has a Ph.D. in Physical Chemistry. He said he taught chemistry and physics and alternative energy at Yavapai College for years. He said he launched off into various businesses including being a licensed contractor, an artist, a farmer, and operator of a computer retail store. He said he is now retired from business and he focuses his energies on conservation and environmental issues. Mr. Beverly said he is a conservationist and an environmentalist, look at me – there are no horns, there's no tail. He said he thinks that some people in town think of environmentalists as being the devil incarnate and he is not. He said he has



been happily married to one woman for 42 years, he has one child, he pays his taxes, and he is a good citizen to this county. He said he cares very much for their quality of life here.

Mr. Beverly said he works with the Sierra Club, the Center for Biological Diversity, the Arizona Wilderness Coalition, and with several other national conservation organizations. He said his major interest here is in preserving and protecting the Verde River, which is maintaining the base flow, preserving the habitats, and restoring a native fishery to this precious local resource that is a great quality of life resource for this county. Mr. Beverly said he is also interested in a sustainable world, resources and energy, and that means water and that means local water. He said as Mr. Bunker indicated and as everyone knows he has some involvement as an objector, it is not a lawsuit, to ADWR's draft decision on Prescott's application for assured water supply permit. He said those kinds of legal, oppositional approaches are a tactical last resort. He said it is absolutely the most unsatisfactory way to possible to resolving any problems. He said it is much preferable to meet with people, to cooperate, to collaborate, to communicate, and to seek a common solution. He said he thinks they are smart enough to find solutions to their problems if they will just take the time to do it. He said he is coming to the Board with that approach. Mr. Beverly said at this time he is working on various collaborative, cooperative projects with Drake Cement, with Arizona Game and Fish Department, with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and heavily with Prescott National Forest Department. He said he is working with people that he has fundamental disagreements with. He said this is the civilized way to make progress and to proceed. He said that is what he hopes to do on the Safe Yield Committee.

Mr. Beverly said what he can bring to the Safe Yield Committee is an environmental perspective, which is not there now, and it needs to be there; it is important to every citizen in this county. He said he has a good background in Arizona Water Law, he has very good basis of understanding of the hydrology and water resources and demands on the Little Chino Aquifer and the Big Chino Aquifer. He said he has a determination to find a solution where they can all win and not have to look the other way when you walk down the street in this nice small town when you see somebody you disagree with. He said he does not think it is too late to participate in this committee. Mr. Beverly said the committee goal is the report and the report is in its formative stages now. He said he is admittedly coming in the nick of time but not too late to have a positive impact.

Chairman Flannery said he has known Mr. Beverly for years and this is not a Johnny come lately for him because he has been involved in it for years. He said he recognizes Mayor Bunker's concern and that is something that has to be dealt with and that Mr. Beverly has to admit that as well from the Board's perspective. Chairman Flannery said if they had a committee in which a wall was set up and only the committee members were being heard it would be one thing but they are welcoming input from the public as well. He said Mr. Beverly knows that because he has been participating for months now. He said his issue is whether



it is necessary to go through a replacement process or are those concerns being heard now anyway.

Member Wilson asked the TAC if they are recommending the appointment of Mr. Beverly or are they just forwarding the application.

John Munderloh said they are forwarding the application because they did not have it formally agendaized at the last TAC meeting. He said in an informal sense he does not think anyone objected to it.

Member Wilson said he first wanted to address Mayor Bunker's comment. He said Mr. Beverly was one of three surrogates for SRP in the City of Prescott's application for modification of their assured water supply with the Arizona Department of Water Resources. He said the City of Prescott was awarded 8060 some acre feet of water and that was awarded by Judge Shedden. Member Wilson said after that was awarded, and that was actually a major front page story in the Courier, Mr. Beverly posted on the blog that particular story, "Prescott, don't drink your champagne yet. There are more lawsuits coming." He said he would question his integrity, his principles, his morality. Member Wilson said he also believes Mr. Beverly is closed minded and that is because he advocates how they are going to get to safe yield is by everybody in the community getting down to 35 gallons per capita per day, which is ludicrous as far as he is concerned. Member Wilson said his vote is no.

Chairman Flannery said he would like to suggest to Member Wilson that as member of the public his ideas and comments are being incorporated anyway.

Member Bunker said he does not know that he was so concerned about Mr. Beverly's legal objections rather his concern is if he would be willing to work collaboratively and according to Mr. Beverly's statement he would be. He said he thinks it would be good to hear all points of view up front instead of later so he supports Mr. Beverly officially being on the group.

Vice Chairman Springer said she has no objection to Mr. Beverly being on the Safe Yield Workgroup. She said in reading over the report from the subcommittee's last discussion it appears that they are pretty far from what she believes was the original goal or assignment. She said the assignment was to try to come up with some possible solutions that would help them achieve safe yield in the Prescott AMA. Vice Chairman Springer said the notes indicate that the discussions have ranged way beyond that to include Big Chino, the whole watershed, and other issues including some ideas that might take legislation. She said she would caution the subcommittee that their goal was to try to come up with some goals or some projects that they could actually do here to try to help achieve safe yield. She said the more barriers they put in the report, in other words if they will require legislation in order to achieve the goal then the less likely it is they will actually be able to use the report. Vice Chairman said that is just a fact. She said they can look at it in a smaller sense or they can look



at it in a long range, broad brush view if they want because their report is their report. She said she is just trying to be realistic and say they are going to have evaluate the report and if they really want to accomplish something with it the Safe Yield Workgroup better make it something the Board can work with.

Chairman Flannery said to echo that it would seem to him that they would want to write something that would be within the Board's power to do something about rather than not. He said he does not mind the suggestion of things that may need legislative change but he would not concentrate on something like that. He said he does not mind if they itemize something those things as long range or whatever. He said in terms of what they can do locally those are things that need to be emphasized.

Howard Mechanic said first, he understood it was February or March and in any case it would be pushing to complete it in January and suggested checking the minutes. He said if they are insisting on it that's one thing but the other committee members might want to give their opinion but he thinks February or March is a good time period. Mr. Mechanic said secondly, as the Board recalls the position being discussed now was held by Joanne Oellers who was employed by the Center for Biological Diversity. He said when she was appointed the Center had already filed a notice of intent to sue the City of Prescott and that did not disqualify her. He said she was interested in sitting down and working together in working together and that as Mayor Bunker commented he wanted somebody who is willing to come in and sit down and work out a solution. He said the fact the Mayor Wilson is bringing up something that Gary may have done that disagreed with the Mayor's position does not really mean that he would be disqualified as far as he is concerned. Mr. Mechanic said he does not think they are just looking for people who agree with one point of view and do not ask government to consider alternatives. He said he thinks the committee, as Supervisor Springer said, the committee is definitely charged with dealing with Safe Yield in the AMA and he has mentioned that on a couple of occasions. He said if they are going to mention other areas it is only in relation to furthering certain goals but the focus of the report should definitely be how to reach safe yield in the AMA and to not talk about anything else except that maybe the Board would like to expand something that would be workable in the AMA since they have a jurisdiction there. Mr. Mechanic said as far as the other point the committee spent over a year working on the issue and basically the committee has come up with one direction and that is to form a district as the Board has read in the minutes. He said under his understanding that would require assistance from the state legislature. He asked if that means they should not do that because it requires legislation and he said no, because if that is the best suggestion then that is what they recommend. Mr. Mechanic said Supervisor Springer and Councilman Flannery said they should only do what they can do without assistance from other. He said he is saying they may need assistance from others to get the best solution.



Chairman Flannery said he does not mind that being itemized as one of those things that needs to be done or should or could be done. He said the Board cannot do that within their own body and they would need to go to the legislature to do that and it would be an enabling act from the legislature in order to do that. He said if that means this body can assist in that then that is fine but to build an entire report around that singular he thinks that is probably not assisting in getting them where they need to go.

Mr. Mechanic said the committee has considered other alternatives and if there was a better alternative that is easier to achieve he is sure the committee would suggest that as an easier way to reach that goal. He said his personal opinion is it is not going to be easy and this is the easiest way to do it and it is what the Board can do. He said his position has been for about two years if the Coalition agrees unanimously to ask the legislature to set up a district that there is a good chance it would happen if they all agree to do that. He said they are jumping the gun on the report and his understanding is, as Supervisor Springer said, this committee is there to do a report and they are independent and the Board will accept the report the committee comes up with. He said at this late stage to say that the committee is totally going in the wrong direction ...

Vice Chairman Springer said she did not say they could not do that and come up with goals that require legislation rather she said those are going to be the ones least likely to be able to be achieved by the Board. She said she asked the committee to try to focus on things they can do, which is basically the same thing Chairman Flannery is saying. She said if they cannot come up with anything the Board can do that is within their power to do without additional legislation or some other participation over which they have no control then it is just less likely it is going to be achieved. Vice Chairman Springer said if that is their report then that is their report and that is fine and the Board will accept the report. She said the Board will accept the report no matter what it is but that does not necessarily mean that they are accepting the idea they are going to try to implement everything the committee suggests because the Board has to have time to review the report.

Mr. Mechanic said he understands that. He said the question is when she says it is less likely to happen then the question becomes 'less likely to achieve safe yield than what?' He asked what is the alternative. He said they have looked at the other options and they are less likely and as far as he is concerned the other options are less likely to achieve a positive result.

Supervisor Springer said then that should be in the report.

Chairman Flannery said one of the things he found was the working group, not a committee, was getting bogged down in things that are beyond the scope and this body's control and that is the issue of the definition of safe yield. He said it is something that is beyond them and he knows that it is an ongoing argument and that it has been going on for some time.



Mr. Mechanic said the definition of safe yield is in state law and he does not think there is much debate over what the safe yield definition is.

Chairman Flannery asked Mr. Mechanic if he had read the minutes.

Mr. Mechanic said yes, he as read the minutes and he has been at all of the meetings as a matter of fact.

Chairman Flannery said the minutes are what he has to go by.

Mr. Mechanic said what Chairman Flannery may be referring to is that there are different ways they can qualify as achieving safe yield and one way to reach safe yield is to assure flow goes to the Verde River from this area and allocate a certain amount of the natural recharge to the Verde River. He said they are using the state's definition for safe yield.

Mr. Muccillo said he has nothing to add.

Chairman Flannery called for the vote on approving Gary Beverly to represent the environmental position on the Safe Yield Workgroup. Member Bunker moved to appoint Gary Beverly as the replacement for the environmental replacement on the Safe Yield Workgroup. Second by Vice Chairman Springer. Passed 3 – 1 with Member Jack Wilson opposing.

ITEM NO 6. Discussion – Recharge & Source Water Pilot Projects Study Presentation

Rick Shroads said he is providing an update on where the TAC is regarding the Recharge & Source Water Pilot Projects Study. He said as a reminder the goals for the Pilot Project are to focus on two areas:

- Developed areas
 - To equip an existing impervious site with storage and recharge
 - Improving the recharge potential of a site that already has rainfall emanating it from the site.
- Undeveloped areas
 - Focus on the capture and measurement of rainfall above and below the ground before it evaporates

Mr. Shroads said their objectives are basically measurement and with measurement they can get cost benefit numbers. He said they will measure the rainfall harvesting yields for open space, residential, commercial, and institutional watersheds using both surface and subsurface methods. He said they will also measure the effectiveness of how to do this.

Mr. Shroads said they have three general sites:

- Embry Riddle Aeronautical University in Prescott
- Viewpoint Park and Pronghorn in Prescott Valley
- Old Home Manor in Chino Valley



Mr. Shroads showed the concept maps to refresh the Board's memory. He said they are still in the throes of working with Embry Riddle in terms of getting permission agreements and a Memorandum of Understanding. He said he met four times with ERAU officials and twice with APS due to the solar farm on the northeast portion of the campus. He said APS is very excited about working with them.

Member Wilson asked if the change in the top-level management at Embry Riddle has had any effect on the discussions.

Mr. Shroads said yes, quite a bit. He said they have had to start over with the discussions with the new set of folks over there and they have some new requirements. He said they have moved forward with APS and the idea is to capture rainfall off of the solar panels. He said due to the structural issues of the panels and the fact that they are not built really strong on the edges APS officials were hesitant to go along with that idea. He said the panels are spaced strategically and rotate with the sun so any shade from one panel to another panel it decreases the efficiency. Mr. Shroads said APS is afraid of extending the panels with some kind of gutter as originally thought would cause inefficiency to happen. He said the option they are looking at is a series of channels underneath the panels.

Mr. Shroads said Doug McMillan with Civiltec is the Project Engineer and has been leading the design efforts at Viewpoint and Pronghorn Ranch in Prescott Valley. He presented the current plans for the Prescott Valley sites. He said regarding the channel in Viewpoint there are a series of subsurface drains designed to be equal to one another to facilitate measurements. Mr. McMillan said the discharge will go to a holding tank. Mr. Shroads said at the detention basin on the school property in Pronghorn there is a section of the detention basin that is separated by a berm. He said this is an excellent opportunity to look at saturated soil conditions, how under normal stormwater runoff conditions the water will pond up which will increase the catchment ability. He said they are going to measure the amount of flow they get from the saturated soils, take them to a basin, and since they are already in a basin discharge right into that detention basin. Mr. Shroads said in this case they have to use pumps because the pipes are down deep in the ground.

Mr. Shroads showed more design plans including detailed cross sections and profiles. He said the way they measure is very important because they need to be accurate as they comparing methods to see what is the most effective. He said they have honed in on the Flo-tote system, which will measure flow in pipes based upon Faraday's Law. He said basically if water is flowing over the surface of a magnetic field it creates voltage and it measures that voltage very accurately. Mr. Shroads said that along with a pressure sensor can tell them exactly how much flow is in the pipe. He said the nice thing about them is when the pilot projects cease and are no longer needed to go forward, the Flo-tote



systems can be used by the individual towns, cities, or counties to measure sewer flows. He said this is often done by engineers when they are trying to upgrade sewer systems.

Mr. Shroads said rain gages will also be an important part of each site. He said they have chosen the data-logger type of rain gauges that will actually sense when there is something in it and send the data to a data logger, which is basically a battery powered on-site electrical logger. He said this information can then be downloaded onto a laptop.

Mr. Shroads said moving on to Old Home Manor in Chino Valley the idea is to increase the repellency of soils, which is another concept toward rainwater capture. He said that water can then be diverted into the ground and then use it for recharge. He presented the actual project plans and identified the three existing dry ponds and the wet ponds. He said the six catchments are arranged so that they are perpendicular to the contours of the land in order to get maximum slope on them. Mr. Shroads said the land out there is quite perfect being about 2% natural grade, which is an engineer's dream. He explained two of the pads are roaded catchments and are similar to what is being used in Western Australia for capturing runoff, increasing it by virtue of channelization. He said he calls it the washboard effect because it looks kind of like a washboard. Mr. Shroads explained the different repellency methods and said there are two ways to compact soil; modified proctor and standard proctor. He identified one of the pad designs and said this is 95% modified proctor – a very hard compaction. He said another one is a polyethylene geomembrane covered with rock and very similar to some of the landscaping seen around the region. Mr. Shroads said another one is a chemical treatment, which does not sound positive but it really is not that bad. He said the chemicals they are looking at consist of paraffin wax sprayed on soil; sodium carbonate, which interacts with soil very well and does not produce as much salt runoff in the water as one might think; and soybean oil, which is being used as a dust control method on streets. He said they will pick two out of the three chemical treatments that they think will be effective. Mr. Shroads said they will also have one control pad where they do nothing to the soil. He said the whole tier has an upstream channel because they do not want any offsite drainage coming from the hillside and altering the effect of their results.

Member Bunker asked about the size of the pads.

Mr. Shroads said about 1/3 of an acre each.

Vice Chairman Springer asked if they are inventing the wheel here or is it something used by someone else and it is being adapted for local conditions.

Mr. Shroads said it is a combination. He said the subterranean perorations have been used in the Midwest for dewatering soils but they have never actually been used for extracting water out of soil. He said some of the soil repellency projects



have been used elsewhere and they have lots of data on those methods. He said the data varies so widely depending on soil type, rainfall patterns, topography, and just amongst themselves with 50% - 90% range of increase in runoff. He said they would like to narrow that gap and have more data so they can get some accurate costs associated with the methods.

Member Wilson said this sounds like it is one-third of the way. He said when they conclude this they will have some measurements to be used to run across a much larger area but they still have to figure out how to do transportation and then recharge.

Mr. Shroads said the transportation element and the recharge element are not as mysterious; they do it all the time. He said transport is a matter of what size pipe, what size channel, what size pumps and where they go. He said recharge is being done by Town of Prescott Valley, City of Prescott, and the Town of Chino Valley and they know that part of it. He said it is the capture part of it that no one has ever really focused on heavily like they hope to do.

Vice Chairman Springer said she thinks that is the most important thing because that is exactly what they are trying to do is to capture the 98.5% of rainfall they are losing.

Mr. Muccillo said speaking from experience on recharge projects the two biggest challenges on any recharge project are the source water and the regulatory aspect. He said he is personally excited about the soil amendment thing because he thinks that has the potential to be the most portable and the easiest to implement on a large scale.

Vice Chairman Springer said her big thing has always been how they measure what they are able to accomplish. She said what she is looking for is to get to a simplistic formula that the general public can understand. She said, for instance, they now are all hearing the message of having say 1000 square foot house roof and there X inches of rain you can expect to collect say 600 gallons of water or whatever the numbers are. She said after they hear that over and over people begin to realize that is a lot of water they could save. Vice Chairman Springer said if they can come up with similar kinds of formulas that can be used in multiples then they can somewhat quantify the amount of water captured.

Mr. Shroads said simplified is the key word because if there is a desire by the Board or their successors to implement some sort of ordinance(s) for rainwater capturing it would be nice to have the criteria available that gives specific methods depending on the soil type.

Member Wilson asked where they stand in coordinating this with ADWR both at the local level and at the Phoenix level so if they actually are successful they do not run into a roadblock and not get any credit.



Mr. Shroads said regarding the credit issue he has a couple of discussions with John Bodenchuk, Recharge and Recovery Manager, about rainwater runoff credits. He said he is probably not the best guy to talk to about this, John Munderloh or Mark Holmes are more versed in it than he is. It is his understanding that there has been discussion between Mark Holmes and his attorney counsel and ADWR attorney counsel to try to determine whether rainfall runoff can be used as surface water storage credits – not long term but maybe short term storage credits. He said they are still trying to figure that out before they report on the credit issue back to the Board.

Member Wilson said it is extremely important because they cannot go to the bottom-line and then find out they are not going to get anything because the objective is to reach safe yield.

Mr. Munderloh said he wanted to clarify one little issue and that is what they are developing here is a previously undefined type of water in Arizona law. He said he thinks that is what they are really running up against in issues with ADWR and that they only deal with things that clearly defined statute. He said they know what effluent, surface water, groundwater, safety water is but they really do not know what this is. He said the question that has been posed by Mark will hopefully answer some of those questions for them.

Member Bunker said they also like the look of the possibilities on a much bigger scale and he is sure some of this data will speak to that also.

Councilwoman Fan Schumacher, Town of Prescott Valley, asked if the pads are slanted, are they on the surface of the ground or are they slightly recessed.

Mr. Shroads said to think of them as tilted pool tables and they will basically be on the surface of the ground.

John Zambrano said they have used the term credit and he wants them to clarify what they mean by that. He said if they mean assured water supply credits they should be using that term because that term enables them to call it alternate water and build new subdivisions. He said that is a very specific type of credit. Mr. Zambrano said on the other hand if they simply mean they want ADWR to recognize the water is going into the ground and when they do a water budget they count that for meeting safe yield then he would not use the term credit for that. He said that is simple an engineering recognition that there is water going into the ground that was not going in before. He asked the Coalition if they use the term credit and they mean assured water supply credits then use the whole term so they know what the Board is talking about. Mr. Zambrano said because right now he is confused when they use the term credit by itself without the other adjectives in front of it.



Member Wilson said he used the term in the context of safe yield so the etymology is not specific and that he was talking about safe yield and how they get there.

Mr. Zambrano said there is no term for credit for safe yield rather ADWR simply does water budgets. He said they should be an engineering exercise, a mathematical exercise, and the Board wants them perhaps to count that water going into the ground when they do the water budget. He said he thinks sometimes when the Board uses the term credit people are thinking assured water supply credits, which means they can build new subdivisions. He said the terminology should be clear and right now to him it is not.

Vice Chairman Springer said she usually refers to that as unappropriated water because that in fact is what it is. She said it is rainfall that is not yet reached a water course to the point where it becomes appropriated.

Mr. Zambrano said he thinks that is an accurate characterization of the water but they are using the term credit and to him he does not know what they exactly mean when they simple say credit.

Vice Chairman Springer said she thinks the ultimate goal at least for her would be to get a credit for it. She said that is the whole purpose of measuring it so that they can account for how much goes into the ground. She said they are looking at recharge and so counting it toward recharge.

Mr. Zambrano said so all of this conversation was not dealing with assured water supply, it was dealing with recognition that water is going into the ground for the purposes of calculating safe yield.

Chairman Flannery said this is a pilot program right now and in terms of how it is credited they have not reached that point yet. He said if it is credit toward recharge then they will take that or water budget or whatever recognition as to how that water is to be used. He said Mr. Zambrano's point is well taken and they will try to clean up their use of terms.

Doug McMillan said rainwater harvesting is intentionally happening already in many sewer systems throughout the United States. He said when he was involved in doing infiltration inflow studies of rainfall entering sewer systems in Oakland they were finding some areas where 50% of the rainfall was entering the sewer system unintentionally. He said that had the undesired increase in the conveyance and treatment costs. He said in this case they want to emulate that but for a positive purpose.

ITEM NO 7. Discussion & Possible Action – Water Conservation Efforts Update

Mr. Muccillo said regarding the Well Owners' Workshop the Coalition sponsored that with refreshments and distributed water conservation materials. He said it



was another effort for public education and getting the water smart brand out there.

Member Wilson said he understands it was very well attended.

Mr. Muccillo said the agenda packet includes samples schedules of the radio spots. He said there has been discussion about mass mailing a better vehicle to get their message out there and are exploring utilizing Valpak in that effort. He said it is basically for the map on page 23 in the agenda packet, which is grouped by 10,000 households regions. He said that also raises the question of the target audience. Mr. Muccillo said they have had a few informal requests from folks outside of the AMA about access to the material that has been created. He said he thinks that is a good thing and it means they are getting some attention. He said he is asking for the Board's reaction and feedback to this type of thing.

Vice Chairman Springer said she still has not heard any of the radio adds and does not know what they say. She asked what the adds are focusing on.

Chairman Flannery confirmed that the radio spots are on the website.

Member Wilson said basically it is Shaun Rydell and she has redone the commercials that she was doing for the City of Prescott under the auspices of this organization. They have to do with water conservation, for instance landscaping and how to do a landscape plan.

Mr. Muccillo said on page 25 the one invoice from KDDL lists the titles and they give an indication of the content.

Member Bunker said they are a very brief focus and comments on specific things that people can do to save water.

Member Wilson said they are 30 second spots and they can only do so much in 30 seconds.

Vice Chairman Springer asked how much this is costing. Mr. Muccillo said the amounts are on the sample monthly invoices in the packet. He said KDDL is \$170 and KAHM is \$800 but they are getting a lot more coverage there.

Vice Chairman Springer said she would imagine that most people go through the Valpak mailings every month. She said there are a lot of things in there that people are not interested in but there is always something for everybody in there. She said, for example, True Value is consistently advertised in Valpak with some sort of discount or restaurants with two for one deals. She said she thinks those are good and it is a product that has been on the market long enough that households are accustomed to getting it, they open it and they go through it. She said if they had a program of cards like series designed with a purpose for each one, very similar to the Water Smart cards series. She thinks people might start



to look for the information and even begin to collect them for water conservation tips. She said she thinks it is a good marketing method.

Member Wilson said he wanted to offer a slightly different perspective. He said they have a series of 12 cards and they put them in their utility bills for the City of Prescott. He said he would think that municipalities should be looking at sending them to the utility customers. He said the exception to that of course is the county because they do not have a water service.

Member Bunker said in the Town of Chino Valley they are doing their sewer bills on the cards so that is good. He said he thinks if they send them out they ought to stay on this side of the mountain.

Chairman Flannery said when it comes to this argument he needs to stay somewhat neutral. He does think when it comes to expanding beyond their own entities that are involved in the Coalition they need to be cautious about that. He said he does not mind to some degree of subsidizing because of the interest of conservation, which serves us all. He said he is not exactly sure if he wants to totally subsidize. Chairman Flannery said when they entered into this they had those grandiose ideas of water conservation for Yavapai County and he thinks they should stick with that as much as possible. He said he is not sure if they can afford at this time to be subsidizing that kind of a program. He said he would be cautious about going forward with that.

Councilwoman Schumacher said she personally thinks it is better to do multi-media because one type of media is not enough. She said she would always recommend doing something in print, radio and whatever media they decide.

Charlie Hildebrant from Yavapai County Nursery Landscape Association said as one of the authors of the Water Smart Cards, keep in mind that at least eight of those are based on horticulture and they are written for this side of the mountain. He said it is a totally different set of plants if they drop down into the Verde Valley. He said it came up in the TAC meeting that Shaun Rydell was aspiring to distribute these to the entire county and they were not designed for that because it is a different climate.

Mr. Muccillo said he suggests they put together a series and a proposed distribution patten based on the feedback and then come back with a more detailed plan with associated costs.

Vice Chairman Springer and Member Jim Bunker said they think this is a good idea.

Member Wilson said he is willing to support it and that he is just saying they have it covered in the City of Prescott.



Vice Chairman Springer said it should be something different than what they are currently doing.

Member Bunker said if the City of Prescott is covered there is no reason to duplicate.

Chairman Flannery said he would like to be willing to do all things but they are governed by budget mostly. He suggested they put together something to get the maximum for the desired expenditure and he would be happy to look at it. He said quite frankly, he thinks that is the bottom line – what is it going to cost them.

Mr. Muccillo said they are also talking about a potential sponsorship of a Water Conservation Information Share event next year. He said ball park cost would be \$2000 - \$3000 and would be sometime in the spring. He said he wanting to make them aware that this is something the TAC is discussing and they are looking for feedback from the Board.

Vice Chairman Springer said she thinks it might be a good idea but not this year or next year. She said since they have this whole pilot thing going then they should talk about some results rather than some hopes.

Member Wilson said they have the same constraint on this one that they had on the last one: if they do not have the money they cannot do it but if they get the money then all of the sudden they can do something.

Chairman Flannery said the other issue is manpower.

Member Bunker said it looks like they would be preaching to the choir.

ITEM NO 8. Discussion & Possible Action – Next Meeting Time / Location / Agenda Items

The next Coalition Board Meeting will be on Wednesday, December 9th at 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Muccillo said as a reminder that tomorrow, November 5th, is the TAC and Safe Yield Workgroup meetings at 1:00 p.m. and 2:00 p.m. He said there may be an additional meeting after that and before the end of the year.

Chairman Flannery said to check on the previous minutes where the Board discussed the due date for the Safe Yield Workgroup Report and to let the Board know.

Vice Chairman Springer said more important is to let the Safe Yield Workgroup know.



Chairman Flannery said he wanted to acknowledge that this is the last meeting for Mayor Wilson and wanted to thank him for his participation. He said this is also Jim Holt's last meeting before retirement and he wished Jim and Mayor Wilson luck. He said Connie Tucker is also going to be leaving so three major players in the water world will be moving on and they will be missed.

Meeting adjourned at 3:37 p.m.

COUNCILMAN MIKE FLANNERY, Chairman

ATTEST:

LORRI CARLSON, Administrative Assistant