

Upper San Pedro Water District Organizing Board
November 17, 2008
Cochise County Foothills Complex

I. CALL TO ORDER: Meeting was called to Order at 6:30 P.M. by Chairman Rutherford with Call of Roll.

II. CALL OF ROLL:

PRESENT:

Mike Rutherford
Rick Coffman
James Herrewig
Stephen Pauken
Holly Richter
Carl Robie
Susan Shuford

ABSENT:

MICAEL BOARDMAN
MARY ANN BLACK
JOHN LADD

OTHERS PRESENT:

Gene Fenstermacher
Britt Hanson
Tricia Gerrodette
Peggy Pauken
Cado Dailey
Tom Whitmer
Tom Carr

SPECIAL GUEST:

Eve B. Halper, U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation
Natural Resource Specialist, Tucson Federal Building
300 West Congress Street, Room 1L (FB-37)
Tucson, Arizona 85701-1371
520) 670-4809
ehalper@lc.usbr.gov

III. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

October 20, 2008, Meeting

Treasurer Coffman moved to accept the minutes of the Meeting of October 20, 2008.
Seconded by Mr. Herrewig. One point of clarification by Vice Chairman Richter to correct to

Vice Chairman (not Vice President). Minutes corrected and amended (attached hereto and made a part hereof).

VOTE: Unanimous in favor after correction. Minutes of October 20, 2008, were accepted unanimously. No objection heard.

November 10, 2008, Work Session

Mr. Herrewig moved to accept the Minutes of the work session of November 10, 2008. Seconded by Secretary Pauken. No corrections required.

VOTE: Unanimous in favor. No objections heard. Minutes of November 10, 2008, were accepted.

IV. Continued Discussion of ADWR Scope of Work with Focus on Development and Comprehensive Plan with Measureable Objectives.

Tom Whitmer reviewed the clarifications made in the draft Sections II and Section III as had been brought to light at the November 10, 2008, Work Session. The corrected document was sent to the Board via email and is attached hereto for review. The changes made specifically addressed the endangered species within the water umbrel.

Tom Carr requested that Rick Coffman address the water usage issues that he had spoken to Tom Whitmer and Tom Carr about just prior to the beginning of the meeting. Coffman stated that in reviewing the draft Sections II and III about water usage (excess of 400 gallons per household) and the PDS Water Company's numbers (approximately 200 – 250 gallons per meter). He states that in his opinion the difference may be based upon self induced conservation by individuals and induced by municipal standards and by smaller lot size properties demands by buyers (for economic and/or personal choice). Coffman stated there needed to be a sharing of information from sources so that numbers could be considered for putting together and creating the Plan. Whitmer stated that GCPD 2005 numbers were used and calculation of population growth and usage in the draft of the Plan thus far.

Carr welcomed feedback and input from Members. Carr reported that Sections I, II and III as a redraft will be provided to the Board for consideration for the December 15, 2008, Meeting. He stated that Section IV (contains Management Programs) is being written, but based upon the "delicate nature" of the contents, it has not been submitted to the Board for consideration yet as there needs to be discussion with the Board. Holly Richter requested that the Sections (and possibly questions and/or answers for Section IV) be provided in advance of the Meeting so that the Board Members can review the information for a more thorough discussion and input.

V. PUBLIC OUTREACH – Meeting Synopsis with Marie Hanson.

Holly Richter gave a synopsis of the meeting with Marie Hanson regarding Public Outreach and how to effectuate this part of the Plan. The meeting was attended by Chairman Rutherford, Vice Chairman Richter and Member Jim Herrewig.

A handout entitled NOTES – Upper San Pedro Water District (Ideas for communicating with the public re: upcoming ballot issue) was provided for the Board's review and consideration of steps

to take and what should be considered in the public outreach step. Ms. Hanson provided information in the form of samples and suggestions based on her experience in this area of expertise from her work with the City and the County. There are two basic first steps need a professional assistant to engage and assist with the public outreach and the necessity to engage the media in a proactive way.

Decision was reached to add to Agenda to set up a committee to do an RFP for hiring a professional to assist with public outreach. Richter stated that a website could be started now to begin to get the identity of the Board out to the public. Carr stated that the Plan from their perspective is a technical guideline for the Board and that identification of the problem for the public is a different issue for the Board's consideration. Richter stated that the Board will have to agree on what the problem is and how to provide this information to the public.

VI. SYNOPSIS AND OVERVIEW OF TUCSON CITY AND PIMA COUNTY WATER AND WASTEWATER STUDY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE.

Carl Robie provided a synopsis of the meeting attended by Chairman Rutherford and himself in Tucson regarding the Tucson City and Pima County Water and Wastewater Study and Oversight Committee. The meeting was the initial public engagement. He stated that it was a one and a half year study and committee and that there were over 400 definitions of sustainability. Robie explained the triple bottom line effect (the international nickname) wherein there is management of a resource, in consideration of the economy and society and the environment.

Eve Halper of the Bureau of Reclamation attended and presented the Appraisal Report (specifically titled Augmentation Alternatives for the Sierra Vista Sub-watershed, Arizona) which was completed at the request of the Upper San Pedro Partnership in June 2007. BOR uses longer periods of time (2050 was used in this report) and project usage, deficits, growth and alternatives and possible solutions to meet the identified issues. Coffman asked how the number is first calculated and what number is started at (either on a deficit or a surplus). Halper stated that this report is an appraisal level report. She stated that BOR is awaiting congressional approval (Lands Bill in the Congress) and funds to complete the next step which is a feasibility report.

VII. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Gene Fenstermacher stated that he had items to be addressed in the draft Sections of the Plan thus far. He will email those items to the Board for consideration.

Caddo Daily requested a change to the Minutes of October 20, 2008, Meeting. The Minutes of the October 6, 2008, Work Session were approved (not October 20, 2008). Correction made by Shuford.

VII. AGENDA ITEMS TO BE ADDRESSED

Confirmation of next meeting dates and time to be added to the Agenda.

Approval of Minutes for the December 15, 2008, Meeting as follows:
November 17, 2008

Committee consideration for discussion and possible action for an RFP

VIII. FUTURE MEETING DATE AND LOCATION:

Chairman Rutherford confirmed the next meetings would be as follows:

Meeting: December 15, 2008, at 6:30 P.M. at the Cochise County Foothills Complex, Sierra Vista.

IX. ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business Chairman Rutherford adjourned the work session meeting at 7:30 P.M.

Upper San Pedro Water Districting Organizing Board
November 17, 2008 - 6:30 P.M.
Meeting
Cochise County Foothills Complex – Sierra Vista, Arizona

Narrative of Meeting

Time Start: 6:30 P.M.

Rutherford: Call of Board to Order with Call of Roll

Rick Coffman	Present
James Herrewig	Present
Stephen Pauken	Present
Holly Richter	Present
Carl Robie	Present
Mike Rutherford	Present
Susan Shuford	Present

ABSENT: Mike Boardman, Mary Ann Black and John Ladd

Pauken: Request for individuals to speak loudly and distinctly to produce Minutes.

Rutherford: To Shuford: So you have the three folks who are absent.

So I will entertain a motion if everyone has had a chance to review them. If not, quickly peruse them.

Richter: One comment, Vice President Richter?

Shuford: Corrected to Vice Chairman

VOICE: There has been an election?

Shuford: I will fix that.

Rutherford: Outside of the promotion that Holly got, anyone care to make a Motion.

Coffman: I move that we approve the Minutes as submitted.

Herrewig: I second.

Rutherford: Coffman made the motion and Herrewig seconded.

This with the correction of Vice President to Vice Chair. All in favor?

Ayes heard. No opposition heard.

Rutherford: Let's move to the November 10, 2008, Minutes. Corrected date to November 10, 2008.

Shuford: Made correction.

Herrewig: Motion made.

Pauken: Seconded.

Rutherford: Herrewig made the motion and Pauken seconded. All in favor, Aye.

Ayes heard.

Rutherford: Any opposed.

No opposition heard.

Rutherford: Continued Discussion of ADWR Scope of Work with Focus on Development and Comprehensive Plan with Measureable Objectives and we all have copies of Identification of Problems, the draft.

Pauken: Tom, there were a few items that we discussed at last week's workshop that needed to be clarified or corrected. Were those done on the draft that were sent to Susan electronically.

Whitmer: Yes.

Pauken: Perhaps it would be a good idea maybe, if we went over those real quick.

Whitmer: The main point had to do with the endangered species issues and specification that the critical habitat is only designated as the water umbrel. That has been put in here in some context in both A 2 and II C Section.

Rutherford: Has everyone had the opportunity to review the draft document.

Carr: Just prior to the meeting, (referring to Coffman), had some points maybe you would like to bring up.

Coffman: I was looking through today as I was finishing up reviewing this that some of PDS Water Company is seeing from the standpoint of usage on a per capita basis and the number was 400 and some gallons, no 164 gallons per person per day which in a 2.8 person household worked out to be about 410 gallons per day which isn't anywhere close to what we are seeing at PDS in terms of usage. Now there may be a number of explanations for that. But, I offered to let them take a look at our books and kind of see what we are seeing which is closer in the low 200s if I averaged it over a year on gallons per meter per day for lack of a better term. Now I have to double check and make sure that these are apples to apples and obviously I do not know the number of people per household in all of our units, but we do have a good grasp of what different neighborhoods are using in terms of water usage and how it goes over the course of a year.

In summary, what I think we are seeing is the effect of two things, one is an increased water conservation ethos on the part of individuals and the other is a combination of municipal restrictions on certain things like low flow toilets and so on. And the other fact is simply smaller lots. People and most of the growth that is taking place is and I believe will continue to be in smaller lot subdivisions. Our typical lot subdivision 15 or 20 years ago were one acre lots or larger with lots of grass and there was a lot more irrigated area. I think and I am sure that Jim that is what you are seeing today coming through for rezoning and so on are 7,000, 8,000 or 9,000 square foot lots.

Herrewig: That's rare.

Coffman: That's a big one. So, I think what we are seeing is a combination of conservation of water ethos and also the conservation ethos backed up by municipal restrictions and then, just smaller lot sizes that are a product of both consumer desire and consumer financial capability. Things have gotten more expensive so they want smaller lots to keep the prices the same.

The upshot of all of this is that I believe strongly in looking toward the future that we are going to continue to see a drop of per capita usage and that our planning ought to reflect on the ground, real world experience. Now, I am not certain of what all of the components of the 164 gallons per person per day are, but from what I am seeing it really is significantly below that. We are seeing household usage in the 200s, 250. As low as 160. In places like Winter Haven which is an active adult community, even though the lots are bigger, we are seeing a usage that is much less. Probably because those people don't have a bunch of kids running around, and taking showers and the households are smaller. I also suspect that they are also more concerned about managing their resources for reasons of conservation and also economy.

Anyway, that summarizes our conversation. I am happy to share some of the information I have got about what the actual usage has been so that going forward we are not over planning or overstating what the future usage might be. Because I think there are trends that are taking place that offset that significantly. So looking at the past, we have got probably 30 or 40% large lot, but in 15 years from now, that number will be half because most of the new stuff is going to be small lots.

Richter: I just wonder how the GCPD was calculated he was referring to in here. Was that from the AMA estimates? Because another way to calculate that would be to look at the 321, their estimates which actually used ACC records most recently.

Carr: We also use reports coming into us annually. We used the 2005 reports to make some of the estimates. So, our information for the current usage is based upon what we think is pretty close to the reality, but I think what you are seeing is this average is older homes, newer homes, commercial, parks, schools and things like that lumped in to today's estimate.

And, so, we will go back because what we are talking about here is that if we continue on a trend of more conservation oriented development which seems to be what is happening today, then we want to have our projections more in line with what that sort of development will look like.

It plays also into, and I will talk about that more in a minute, about management programs in the conservation area that might be put into the plan. If it is already occurring, that type of conservation, then it is very reasonable to assume a program that would encourage that would continue or even ratchet down a little bit if it is possible. So, this is very good information and we appreciate it.

Whitmer: I believe that this number he came from the 2005 numbers that we have. Basically, if everything was to remain constant based on 2005 numbers that we have, which calculated into that 164, and then we carried that out to 2030, this is what the estimated demand will be.

Rutherford: But I am sure that those numbers must have contained construction water and everything else that doesn't show up on somebody's household meter.

Coffman: That is right. The meter is not the whole story.

Carr: No actually that is something we will have to go back and look at. Feedback is very valuable and to go back and relook at any of these assumptions. We encourage anyone that while you are reading this and that has any sort of idea that comes up to them as they read this information to give us an email or give us a call so that we can wrap it into the considerations.

What I would like to report tonight is that although we didn't bring it with us, we have the Introduction finished in our preliminary draft form. You are looking at Sections II and III, that describe the problems and in Section III we also talk about the future risks. So, those sections are done in what we call preliminary draft. We are at this time, beginning a rewrite on that to make it more factual, and also just to go back through and make it read smoother and more direct.

One of the things we were talking about was bringing some of the technical information down a step so that it is easier for folks to refer to it.

The next piece, and this is where Section IV and it talks about our Management Programs that will need to be in the Comprehensive Plan. Those Management Programs include conservation, reuse, recharge, augmentation and describe how those all fit into consistency with the management goal, setting the Measurable Objective and meeting the Measurable Objective and how does that affect then the Water Supply Adequacy Rules of the Department that we adopted in order to implement consistency with the goal, with the measurable objectives.

We are just now talking about that and our lead writer, Herb Dischlich that is working with us is starting to put some concepts down on paper. At the December meeting, we would like to go through and try to explain how all of these pieces work together to create a Comprehensive Plan. We are on the right track or we need to change direction, then we can do that so that we can have it all prepared for January. I would kind of like to give you a flavor for it.

The Conservation Programs, now as we heard tonight, conservation is happening. It's happening because we have a pretty strict conservation requirements in Sierra Vista. We have some overlays that encourage conservation at the County level. The new housing developments are different character because of the influence of these conservation programs. Any new developments that come into the District Comprehensive Plan should probably lay out what would be the desired level of conservation for new development.

6:51 P.M. – Eve Halper from Bureau of Reclamation arrived.

And although the District cannot create a mandatory conservation requirement, certainly if we have laid out that all new development should meet a certain base level of conservation, base level of usage per household based on landscaping, conservation that should be adopted, plumbing and those types of things. Then, we can incorporate that into our consideration when we are doing our

adequacy rules. So a subdivision in order to get their adequacy would have to demonstrate to the Department of Water Resources that it was being consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Reuse and Recharge – they are a little bit different, but we would be looking for mechanisms whereby we might be able to encourage the implementation of Reuse programs. Possibly that can be done through IPAs or IGAs with the City or with the Water Company. This is the type of thing we are trying to explore and put together and put in front of you. We would talk about here is the concrete answer in the Plan and the District to manage its water supply and water resources to meet its measurable objectives that we talked about previously. Then, we need to talk about how to implement it.

I think what I want to do is have a discussion with you all so that we can have a better idea of where the Board Members are, with regards to how we approach this Section. I believe that this Section will be where the rubber meets the road. Where we get a good dialogue going and people are going to start saying we want to do this, but we don't want to do this other thing over here as much. So, I wanted to leave that with you and tell you that is the direction that we are going and that is the progress we are making right now.

If everything holds together right now, we will also be bringing with us the next time, or maybe we can get it to you a little sooner, but just of the rewrite of this first part of Sections I through III.

I wanted to hold off on Section IV because of the delicate nature, yes, delicate is a good word, delicate nature of everyone's desire of what they want that section to look like. So we will have it drafted for our purposes, but what we want to do is just start the discussion and probably come up with a Power Point and handouts and get everything down to how it's going to be put together, what is it you want on the menu, what it is you don't want. So, what I guess I am kind of asking that you be prepared to do that in terms of just being able to spend time.

Rutherford: And this would be in the December Meeting?

Carr: Yes. That was all I really wanted to get out in the status report.

Richter: So, one question, Tom at the December meeting, it sounds like this is going to be kind of a discussion about where the rubber really meets the road. So, are we going to be able to have some things to contemplate before the meeting or are we going to have to just show up and on the spot tell you we want that or we don't want that.

Whitmer: Yes.

Carr: Let me see what we can do.....

Richter: Even if there are some questions to kind of get us thinking about things that would be helpful.

Carr: We will work on that and try and get out the packet.

Richter: Even if it's just questions not answers to give us something to think about.

Robie: I would recommend that we be careful to conservatively capture what has already been done and quantify that and I think that will be of particular importance when taking this Plan to the public. The second point is that don't forget the Fort is both in the District and the City of Sierra Vista so they need to be included.

And before we move on, does everybody know Eve Halper.

Halper: I am Eve Halper and I am with the Bureau of Reclamation.

In case anyone didn't get a copy, I have a copy of our Augmentation Report. See Appraisal Report: Augmentation Alternatives for the Sierra Vista Sub-Watershed, Arizona, Lower Colorado Region.

Rutherford: Any other discussion of Tom's agenda.

If not, Holly I would like . . . Jim.

Herrewig: In looking through this, I see reference to a lot of documents. Some of the members have talked about a website.

Pauken: Jim, I have a vague recollection of when we were first started up this Organizing Board that we were kicking around some ideas for putting stuff up on a website. My memory is really vague, but it seems like we were going to maybe try and borrow a page of the Cochise County website.

Robie: I don't recall reaching a conclusion.

Pauken: I mean it was all just a discussion at the time, because we went through our marathon of hiring an assistant phase.

Robie: My immediate reaction to that is it would probably be better if this group got it's own (website).

Richter: That will be part of the Marie Hanson discussion.

Pauken: OK then we will stop there if you are going to discuss that.

Richter: Good point.

Rutherford: I would like to ask Holly to give us a synopsis of our meeting with Marie and kind of walk everybody through the optimistic meeting that we had.

Richter: Marie is a very skilled professional at understanding how to engage the public in public issues projects. She has done it many different ways and times.

I want to make it very clear that we, Jim and I asked Marie for her advice about how the Board might go about really reaching out as we need to on this planning process and we kind of cornered Marie and asked for her expert opinion on this. So, she gave us some pointers. She had some reference materials that she had from other projects and she shared that with us at our request.

Herrewig handed out Handout 1 titled NOTES – Upper San Pedro Water District (Ideas for communicating with the public re: upcoming ballot issue)

I think those are very informative and helpful in thinking about what we need to do as far as outreach and public engagement regarding our Comprehensive Plan. I don't know what order those things are presented in actually Ideas for Communicating with the Public. That is really good. There were two suggestions for first steps there that are really the ones we need to hone in on about how there is a difference in providing information to the public and really soliciting their input and feedback and incorporating their suggestions. Those are two very different things. I think as a Board we have discussed that what we really do need is their input if we want for this to actually pass an election process. That we don't just want to give information and that we want their feedback and we are willing to incorporate that feedback. That is a more complicated process than just making public presentations.

Marie gave some examples of how that kind of input has been incorporated into other projects like Tompkins Park which is actually probably a much simpler, more specific project than what we have. And, even this process was fairly extensive and required different steps. Partway through your handout is the Tompkins Park where they kind of had an identity for the project. They created a logo, they created newsletters and outreach tools to support this process. They provided the public with a calendar and how they can stick with the process through the different months and activities.

It is very clear that we need a professional assistance here and so the first thing that Marie suggested in her timeline here on the first page for things we might consider is really to begin sooner than later on our RFP for getting public participation services. These services have to start soon. It's not going to be a one or two month effort of hold meetings, get input, and then hold a second set of meetings. That is how we have perceptualize this, but we really need within the Organizing Board to get a subgroup of us or somebody on point for creating an RFP to get professional services on line sooner than later. And to start with a bunch of tools, it's not going to be just one or two meetings. It is probably going to be a mixture of collateral materials, maybe a website, she thought that is a really important actually to get the website up and going. This will get an identity in the community, because we can't just expect to pop up at the last moment and say, Hey we are on the ballot. Vote for us. We need an identity. We need to create some information going out and coming back to us in an ongoing way. So, that RFP is an essential first step. So, I think that we need to organize internally as to how do we start to define the scope of services.

Secondly, getting with the local media, the Herald, maybe the Arizona Daily Star. Maybe holding an editorial board so that they know us and we know them and we are communicating our messages proactively with the media and not just expecting for that to miraculously occur or not.

Those are two upfront actions that I think were very powerful that came out of her (Marie Hanson's) summary of her experience. There are a lot of other handouts in here that we can talk about as far as conceptually how you do this stuff. What are your target audiences? Starting off with opinion makers, which in a way is us, internally, if we don't have some things that we agree on, messages that we are all comfortable with and that we are all committed to sending consistently, then, we can't start this outreach process. We need to do some homework internally, so that we are all singing the same tune and singing it consistently and we know how to work with an outreach consultant.

Then, we need to go in these concentric circles working outward and getting the folks that are most attentive to these issues engaged first, working outward to those who are less attentive eventually, but will in fact be voters.

This is a big process guys and it's one that we need to get all over really soon, or we are going to be way behind the curve. It takes somebody like Marie, who is a professional, to really make you aware of the long sequence of steps and that you don't just get there overnight.

Herrewig: She had a good laugh over the Plan and thinking that we are going to complete the Plan in January and start the outreach in February. Her main thing was that we should get somebody who knows how to do this, and start immediately. Get the information out. She gave us an RFP that she had used in the past and she has used on a City project. Giving us her thoughts from a lot of years of doing this.

Robie: She helped made it a lot easier.

Richter: Yes, she really has and we owe her a big thanks for sharing all of her knowledge with us. That being said, we really need to take it and go somewhere.

Rutherford: It was time well spent. It was eye opening.

Richter: It is a whole bunch of tools. I think that the website in particular, there is no reason that we couldn't get some kind of a website up and going where we are proactively putting out information about our minutes, our activities, forecast what is to come kind of like the Tompkins Park. Maybe we don't want to commit to a whole lot of specific things, but just to give folks a where we are intending to go and to also to be able to start receiving questions that people might have right now of us.

Rutherford: How do you feel about putting it on the next meeting Agenda to go ahead and appoint a committee and start working on that or get volunteers for the committee.

Robie: I think it is not too soon.

Carr: Mr. Chairman, one thing caught my eye here and that is the public process. You want to focus on identifying the problem with your public. I think that we have been talking in terms here of the Plan here because that is what the legislation says. Maybe though you might just to rename it and reconsider that the paper we are doing is more of a technical paper and background information for the Board. That gives you more flexibility to develop aspects of solutions to the problem that you are identifying for the public. That would take away that idea that you have already planned every thing out and not just trying to corroborate everything. I don't think that that is what you are trying to do anyway.

Robie: This whole public process is a major part of the election plan.

Rutherford: And we don't want to spend all of the time that we have spent and all of the time that we are going to spend and then fail. So, we have got to put a package together that is the right package to get the voters to embrace.

Robie: The key message that is going to be necessary is to flush out the RFP as well. We are going to have to tell them what it is that we are trying to get.

Richter: It is going to take some internal work for us to come up with what we can all consistently agree on saying.

Herrewig: She mentioned with regard to the Tompkins Park, that we don't lock in the Plan and then want public input when actually it's already adopted.

Richter: That is the worst think you can do.

Rutherford: Any other thoughts on this?

If not, Carl would you like to give us an opinion of the meeting that you and I attended in Tucson.

Robie: It was a very interesting meeting. I was really amused. We went to the Pima County Tucson City Committee on Water and Wastewater policy. It has been in session now for a year and a half. The meeting that we went to was their initial engagement with the public on what sustainability means.

Coming from several organizations that have bantered the word around and using it and defined as we define it and it seemed odd that somebody that is far ahead of us as an active management area and so forth and so on and the City Manager, and the County Supervisors are being so sort of proactive when it comes to water that they were still wrestling with the idea of sustainability.

A good set of presentations. I think the Sonora Institute was there. The Center for Biological Diversity, the Builder Development sort was represented by an attorney who spoke for all of them. The environmentally oriented organizations spoke individually for five minutes. The City of Tucson and the County both made presentations. The potential is there for all 400 definitions for sustainability to show up in their documents. But interestingly enough, Tucson and the County both have their definitions of sustainability. The thing that most amused me was the definition that we use when we talk about preserving the resource, or taking care of a resource with unacceptable environmental, societal or economical consequences, they call that the triple bottom line approach. It actually has a nickname internationally. The triple bottom line is that you manage the resource and in our case is water, in consideration of the economy and society and the environment.

That was pretty much my impression of what went on. It was a long meeting. Everyone was given an opportunity to talk and no one was cut short.

Rutherford: Thank you.

Carr: Are we moving too fast?

Rutherford: We are down to a call to the public.

Richter: We might have skipped one – augmentation.

Rutherford: I thought that we had touched on it, but we can go back certainly. Is there any discussion needed on it.

Richter: It seemed that the last time it was on the Agenda, we discussed the need to send BOR an invitation to participate in our meetings. I guess I just wanted to hear from Eve had she received that.

EVE HALPER (BUREAU OF RECLAMATION): We are drafting a letter back, but since we knew that the meeting was tonight, and Eric asked me to come. So here I am. If you have any questions about the augmentation study, I can answer those. Do you want me to talk a little bit about it.

Rutherford: Yes, you can.

Halper: We were initially brought in to supplement the study that the Upper San Pedro Partnership had commissioned from a consulting firm. This firm used the date of 02/20/2011. In Reclamation, we use a little more long term. We are trying to project out about fifty years. We started in 2003, so we used 2050 as our end date that we were looking at.

We tried to project water demands through 2050. We assume that per capita consumption would remain the same. We came up with 30,000 acre feet a year of augmentation. Basically that would be by the time we get to 2050 with the same population growth and the same per capita consumption usage staying the same which is conservative and we understand that, we estimate that we will need about an additional and this is where the Sierra Vista Subwatershed which I think is approximately and there is a deficit of about 4,000 acre feet a year.

We weren't looking at deficits, we were just looking to offset the total consumption by people. When we do that and it allows recharge to start accreting this deficit. Using more every year we go a little more into debt in the aquifer. We were thinking about augmentation and we need to start filling up the aquifer and we need to account for the people who are going to move here and so we put all of this together and we come up with about 30,000 acre feet.

Coffman: How far back did you go on this sort of accumulating or is it just starting from today. Is it just that we have been doing a deficit? Or has it been a deficit for 30 years and therefore, we have created or built in this deficit to start with or starting behind the curve. Is this building in the deficits or how is this figured in?

Halper: We did it a little simplistic. We said, we have got a deficit, but we aren't sure just how big it is. But we need to start putting that back in besides just offsetting exactly what people are using right now. That certainly helps, but that doesn't fill it up. We can't rule out climate change and I think Gretchen Cantu said, that what we need to do is that we need to offset human use. We cannot control the climate, if there is a drought. What we do have is the ability to mitigate the human effect on the environment so let's estimate what that is and how do we offset it.

We know by doing that the more that we bring our water deficit back to zero, but it may take a long time. We started with that numerical target. BOR is an engineering organization. If you are going to engage engineers you have to tell them how much of something you want so that they know how they are going to build whatever it is there are going to build. They then say, now we know how big this problem is. Assuming that population growth is going to go about the same and using conservatively the same amount as we have determined as estimated, assuming that nothing else changes, this is the situation that we should be in by 2050. And that we leave water for the environment not just for human needs.

That was the long and painful process.

We looked at alternatives. The first we looked at was taking water from the Tombstone mine which would have to be treated, delivered through some sort of way. We looked at Benson and piping it down to Sierra Vista. We looked at taking the water from the Copper Queen Mine where it is accumulating and from all of these that you can see on Pages 15 – 17, you can see all of these alternatives that we looked at. The long and the short of the story is that it is not easy to come up with. You can see the projects and they each have their own problems.

Richter: Challenges.

Halper: The Upper San Pedro Partnership went through and rated these. We have their ratings in the report at the back. Essentially three were selected for further study. Those are capturing and reusing storm water. We have the alternative to use the water at the Bisbee mine. Extend the cap to Sierra Vista. And all of these, even if you combine several of them, the CAP only meets the criteria. That would be a very challenging alternative, but it is possible.

Once we completed this report which is called an appraisal level report which uses existing information, then the next step in Reclamation is to do Feasibility Report, but for that we need authority. There is a bill submitted right now and it part of the Land bill and we need congressional approval. If that passes, we will be funded and do a Feasibility Study. One of our major points in this paper is that there . . . the Reclamation there is no entity. The CAWCD which is the state counterpart which repays the Bureau of Reclamation. So part of the CAP is used for federal purposes and part is used for state purposes. And CAWCD's mission is that for privacy because it is used for the state, it pays back the federal government at a very discounted interest rate over a long period of time. But it does pay the money back to the government. There is no other fiscally responsible entity like that in the Upper San Pedro Water District that would have the legal authority to do this. If you are interested in extending the CAP or any other type of Reclamation projects, there has to be a fiscally responsible entity that we can participate with.

Richter: Like the District.

Halper: So, here we are and we are very happy that you took this step. It would have to be a permanent District with some sort of revenue generating authority. If there some interest in building a fiscal augmentation project that is what would need to happen.

Richter: So one of the questions I guess is how your planning process does or does not align with what we are doing right now with ADWR and our Comprehensive Plan.

Halper: Yes.

Richter: It's kind of a timing issue and I guess in a way and at least I think it is great that you are both in the room with us so that we are aware of where these different efforts are.

Halper: I hope that you can take advantage of the work that we have done. To make use of all of those hours. . . . We looked at all of these factors.

Carr: The augmentation report will be part of and will be used as one of the references for that section.

I have a note on that Lands bill. We thought that the Lands Bill which has 140 bills attached to it was going to come up for a vote under the lame duck session. It is not. But we have also been told that the Chairman is going to bring up the Lands Bill up in January under some rule that they have at the Senate. We aren't sure that this particular bill that has a whole lot of things attached to it that we are interested in our Department in addition to the Feasibility Study. There are actually two feasibility studies that we are interested in.

Rutherford. Any other questions? Thank you (to Eve).

Call to the Public.

Gene Fenstermacher: Has some input on the Plan that I would be glad to share with you. Shall I email it to you or discuss it now.

Rutherford: Email would be fine.

Fenstermacher: He will send it through Susan.

Caddo Daily: Has a correction to the October 20, 2008 Minutes of the Meeting. Comment that the Minutes that were discussed in October 20, 2008,

Shuford: Clarify that for me.

Daily: In October 20, 2008, Minutes. It should be October 6, 2008, Minutes were accepted not October 20, 2008.

Shuford: Confirmed and corrected.

Rutherford: Anyone else.

Our next meeting is December 15, 2008, and that will be a regular meeting and it will be at Sierra Vista. There will be no work session in December.

Rutherford: Being no other business. . .

Pauken: I don't know if there is anything else on the Agenda for the 15th but will you work with Susan.

Rutherford: Yes. Further discussion and possible action on a committee for the public outreach.

Shuford: Then, the December 15 Agenda is ready.

Rutherford: There being no other business, then we are adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 7:30 P.M.