Central Yavapai Highlands
Water Resources Management Study

Technical Working Group
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, March 1, 2012
10:30a.m.-12:30 p.m.
Cottonwood, Az.

In Attendance:
Tom Whitmer-Cottonwood, Stanley Bullard-Camp Verde Water, Lou Bellesi-Citizen, Ken Janecek-CWAG, Jane Moore-Jerome, John Munderloh-Prescott Valley, Vivian Gonzales-Reclamation, Leslie Meyers-Reclamation, Greg Kornrumph-SRP, Rebecca Davidson-SRP, Jeanmarie Haney-TNC, John Rasmussen-Yavapai WAC, Doug McMillan–Civil Tech, Justin Bullard-Camp Verde Water, Stacy Barnes-Camp Verde Water, Chris Courtney-AMEC, Mario Lanza-BLM, Charles Mosley-Sedona

Alternatives Update
Sharon Masek Lopez from NAU is working on the watershed management alternative. She will be using GIS data to determine ponderosa pine and calculating water yield by forest thinning.

Doug McMillan has data for the macro-rain water harvesting alternative he will share with Reclamation.

Reclamation engineers Doreen Song and Danny Falcon are finalizing alternatives 5, 11, 12 & 13.

Alternative Descriptions & Environment Considerations
Rebecca and Vivian went through each alternative for comments/changes on the descriptions and the environmental analysis. Rebecca will document comments/changes to the environmental analysis.

Below are comments/changes to the alternative descriptions. They will be correct in the Water Supply Alternatives Report and the Environmental Considerations.

Alternative 1 – Local GW Development
The Prescott AMA exempt wells will be included in the alternative. The alternative description will need to be redone to include a better description of future exempt wells that are allowed within the AMA.

Alternative 2 – Big Chino Sub-basin GW Development
Historically irrigated agriculture water was not included. The demand analysis looked at only what was irrigated in 2006.

The water planning areas need to be expanded to include the Verde Valley in this alternative in order to be consistent with the other alternatives.

Alternative 3 & 4 – Conversion of Existing Septic Urban & Rural
Will need to make sure that write-up for both alternatives are consistent.

For Alternative 4, John Munderloh explained that although a portion of the Prescott Valley WWTF is shown not to be running to full capacity it is actually dedicated to future sub-divisions and will not be available for converting existing septic tanks to sewer for this alternative. It belongs to future development.

Alternative 6 – Storm Water – Rainwater Harvesting
This alternative needed to be divided into two categories:
6.1 Urban Rainwater Harvesting from Large Hard Surfaces
6.2 Macro Rainwater Harvesting from Large Catchments in Undeveloped Areas

For 6.2, it was suggested that the supply captured be recharged into dry wells.

Alternative 7 – Existing Unused Effluent and/or Capacity
Sedona wanted it noted that they are not permitted to discharge effluent into a wash. (APP permit)

Alternative 9 – New Effluent from New Population
In this alternative there is a high-low range of new effluent entering into a sewer system from 100% to 45% (Prescott 100% & Cottonwood 60%). In 2002, the Northern Arizona Council of Governments (NACOG) Section 208 Plan estimated that 45% of the population in Yavapai County was served by WWTFs. That percentage (45%) is utilized in this study for the conservative estimate. The two exceptions are Cottonwood at 60% and Prescott Valley at 100%.

The group had some concerns about the conservative assumption of 45% of future population that would be served by a WWTF. Please let Vivian know if you have another estimate for the conservative range.

Alternative 13 – Regional GW Development Outside the Study Area (Big Sandy & Bill Williams Sub-basins)
It was decided not to have a separate environmental issues table for the areas outside the study area, specifically for the areas for groundwater extraction. Instead, Rebecca will put in a blanket statement that pumping may cause groundwater mining.

There was a question about which water demand number was used for determining how much water was needed. The number used 42,379 AFY is the water supply deficit as calculated in Phase I Demand Analysis; Status Quo Method.

It was suggested that the alternatives be grouped into categories such as groundwater, effluent, etc.

There was discussion that there are some alternatives that are so conceptual that they maybe be deemed unviable.

Next Meeting
April 5, 2012
10:30am-12:00pm
Prescott, AZ