

JANICE K. BREWER
Governor



**SANDRA A. FABRITZ-
WHITNEY**
Acting Director

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

Water Resources Development Commission (HB 2661) Environmental Conditions Subcommittee – Notes: January 31, 2011 Meeting

IN ATTENDANCE:

Brenda Burman (TNC, Workgroup Co-chair)
Christine Dawe (USFS)
Val Danos (AMWUA)
Rebecca Davidson (SRP, Subcommittee lead)
Santiago Garcia (USBR)
Dena Gambrel (ADWR)
Amelia Homewytewa (GRIC)
Doug Kupel (City of Phoenix)
Jim Renthall (BLM)
Linda Stitzer (ADWR)
Dave Weedman (AZGFD)
Jean Calhoun (USFWS)
Rob Marshall (TNC)
Summer Waters (Coop. Ext.)

DISCUSSION OF REVISED FORMAT AND CONTENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS COMPENDIUM:

- Based on comments received at the previous meeting, revisions have been made to the table. Reservoirs are now delineated as to whether there is volumetric or surface area data available. Springs were consolidated into a single water feature.
- Wet-dry mapping has been done for the San Pedro, Agua Fria and Cienega Creek and Arivaca Creek in Pima County. Rob can provide wet/dry mapping data for the lower and upper San Pedro basins. This information could be included in the headnotes or in the table with a footnote.
- There was a comment that the NEMO effluent dominated streams dataset may represent less than actually occurs and that ADEQ/ADWR data should be used for the mapping effort along with the associated extent.
- Where a TNC study stream extends across more than one basin, the baseflow data should appear in the basin table with the gage.
- The maps will show the location of all streamgages but those used for the baseflow calculation will be identified differently.
- It was suggested that the final report could include notes on the location of additional environmental flow data e.g. USGS streamgage and hydrograph info.
- It may be necessary to provide the tables and maps to the water supply and demand workgroup as early as the 18th of February. There was discussion about whether at that point we would identify hot spots or whether the maps themselves would clearly identify problem areas.
- There was also discussion of how the environmental information would interface with the water supply subcommittee work. For example, if groundwater is available to pump, how would the potential impact on surface water and environmental resources be represented?

- The USGS has provided ET rates to Rob so that the riparian demand calculation can be completed.
- Regarding the generation of riparian acreage data, Rebecca reviewed the riparian mapping discussion from the previous meeting, which included suggested modifications to both the 1993 AZGF data (removing agricultural land class) and SW ReGap data (buffering by stream order, including overlaying a digital elevation model). ReGap has limitations but it is the only data available statewide.
- The group discussed the use of AZGFD modeled riparian habitat, which combines the 1993 Riparian Inventory and the SWReGap riparian categories. In addition, known areas of development, agriculture or dewatering were erased from the model. The group concurred that this modeled habitat data may be the best we have
- Rob mentioned that the USGS estimated riparian acres by assuming it included all vegetation extending 50m on both sides of the stream but includes only areas below the Mogollon Rim. For mapping purposes it might be preferable to use the NAU data in combination with the 1993 AZGF layer.
- Dave, Nicole and Rebecca have worked on the headnotes format and asked the group to review and provide comments. Information sources include websites, "watchable wildlife", etc.
- Discussion of who might be able to help draft the headnotes ensued. Rebecca will provide the groundwater basin map and headnote format to USFWS, USFS, BLM and Cooperative Extension (Master Watershed Steward Program) for volunteers on specific basins.
- It was noted that the species counts are from the SWAP model that is based on suitable habitat for species. It was suggested that the headnotes mention societal values as well as economic values. Areas excluded from hunting and fishing should be indicated.

DISCUSSION OF FINAL REPORT OUTLINE:

- Since time was limited and the draft report outline had only recently been distributed, it was suggested that comments be sent directly to Christine Dawes or Jim Renthal.
- Doug Kupel provided comments at the meeting and was asked to submit them in writing.
- It was agreed that the outline would be revised based on comments (due by Friday, February 4th) and distributed to the entire workgroup for discussion at the February 8th Environmental Workgroup meeting.

NEXT MEETING:

- An Environmental Conditions subcommittee meeting was not scheduled.