

Central Yavapai Highlands Water Resources Management Study
Technical Working Group
Thursday, August 6, 2009
Meeting Minutes

Attendees:

Abe Springer – NAU	Brent Bitz - Sedona
Charles Mosley – Sedona	Doug Von Gausig - Clarkdale
Greg Kornrumpf - SRP	Jane Moore - Jerome
Jeanmarie Haney - TNC	John Munderloh – Prescott Valley
John Rasmussen- YCWAC	Leslie Graser - ADWR
Rebecca Davidson – SRP	Robert Hardy – Cottonwood
Vivian Gonzales – Reclamation	Diane Joens - Cottonwood
Kaki Rowland – Verde NRCD	Candace McNulty
Lou Bellesi	

Introductions

Goal

As we work today, think about when you might think Phase I can be wrapped up (October?), and then how it should be presented to the WAC. We will try to close the meeting by wrapping back around to this topic.

FYI – Work in Progress

Prescott Valley AWS Analysis and Certificates – review of committed demand. This is being checked at ADWR by AAWS Section Manager. Results will be reviewed when complete and may determine if AAWS filing will be used as one of the data sources for Estimated Available Supply.

YC District 1 questions – Population % growth, cross-check on 0.33 AF/well to determine exempt well demands, and APS connections as a cross-check on 2006 population numbers (especially for CCDs).

Update of AG methods in Assumption document

Revised Study Map (WPA_Study_LTGREY_0809) – this was done to show COPs service area in Town of Chino Valley and to update Jerome. There was some discussion about the lands (Ctn-Verde Villages CDP) flanking Cottonwood. This was OK'ed by Bob Hardy. There was also a question about Clarkdale, the boundary was OK'ed by Doug Von Gausig. The Humboldt CCD was also questioned, but was OK'ed after the group discussed that part of the Humboldt CCD was cut away with the study boundary. Prescott WPA was questioned by John M. due to what looked to be a piece of Prescott CCD within PV WPA.

Action Item: Vivian will check PV WPA and if the portion of Prescott CCD near the “Y” is correct.

Jerome’s SW claim question from Jane M. as it relates to Estimated Available Supplies

Review Phase I – Demand Analysis Table and Assumptions *filename-Demand Analysis Summary Table (DES)07-17-09_DM-CI-AG*

- a. **2006 populations with YC parcel cover** – Vivian explained that she received YC parcel information from Kevin Blake at YC. She queried the DB for Usage = “Res” (residential) or “Res/IPR” (residential with no permanent structures such as mobile homes). She organized this data by WPA. Next the Total Residential Parcels were multiplied by 2.3 pph. The goal of working with this data is to get reasonable numbers in the demand analysis for populations in the CCDs. This is needed because this study is not using the entire CCD so a reduced number needs to be developed. This data set will also be used for comparison sake with the 2006 populations from the communities, DES and potentially the APS records. *SEE file: Copy_Yav_parcel_POP_WPA*

John M. also provided an example of how Prescott Valley numbers compared to the above work. *See file: Copy_Yav_parcel_POP_WPA_withPVcomments080509.* Vivian’s file showed that PV WPA has 16224 residential parcels and then multiplying that by 2.3 pph yields a population of 37,315. John’s comparison showed that with DOR information (that is within the YC parcel data set) you can query to a finer scale. PV’s residential parcel count is 15,854; however, if you look at the types of residences, the dwelling count becomes 19,211. If this dwelling count, 19,211 is multiplied by 2.4pph then the PV population is 46,106. Once again, showing how it can be fine tuned.

Discussions were held on why we needed to do this, if it needed to be done for all the WPAs (or just the CCDs), if the fine tuning was needed and if pph should vary in the study area since the data is available. It was determined that we did need to do some work on this to get the CCD populations supportable, but that it was not really necessary for the other WPAs. For the sake of a complete data set and due to ease of rerunning the data, all WPAs will be done, but this number does not need to be assumed to be the final number going into the table. Fine tuning was determined not to be necessary because the 2006 city and town population numbers are seen to be solid. Fine tuning was thought to be unnecessary due to CCDs generally not do not have multi-family (condos, apartments, duplexes). It was determined that the pph should be varied based on census pph information.

Action Item: Vivian will recalculate the populations with this data source using US Census Bureau pph by place (CCD, CDP, city/town). Leslie M. will compile the sources used for population so that a comparison can be done.

- b. **2006 population for ranches** – Leslie G. showed the group how we have 0 2006 population assigned to ranches identified as sub areas of CCDs. She asked

if the group thought we should determine 2006 populations for those ranches from YC parcel info and then subtract it from the current CCD population. After some discussion on how to approach this, it was determined that we should remove the rows associated with the ranches and footnote the CCD to show we are aware of those ranches and their potential future development.

Action Item: Update the Demand Analysis Table has mentioned above.

- c. **2050 population for ranches** – Same concern as in b. but for 2050. Since it was determined that the rows with ranches would be removed and footnoted on the CCD, then Las Vegas Ranch without a 2050 population leaves the Prescott CCD 2050 pop at 35,000. For the CVCF and Yavapai Ranches, the group felt the Ashfork CCD 2050 population should be $3,000 + 20,000 + 45,005 = 68,005$.

Action items: Update the Demand Analysis Table as mentioned above.

- d. **Population change** – The next column in the table was looked at, and the goal was to assess how comfortable the technical members were with the potential population changes from 2006 to 2050. The District 1 representative had asked for a percent change column in the table. See file: *Demand Analysis Summary Table Plus Sup Springer Info (DES)06-30-09_DM-CI-AG(2)*. The group looked at Avg Growth Rate (%) column where the values ranged from 0.3 to 25.4. Both Clarkdale and Chino Valley were discussed, 10.5 and 9.1 respectively. Since Doug Von Gausig was at the meeting, he discussed the number with the group. He mentioned that Clarkdale should be near 4%. He recalculated the number and said that is what you get with 2006 pop = 4,000 (approx.) and 2050 pop = 22,500 (approx). The excel table formula was checked. It looked like we may need to consider a compounding formula vs. a straight line formula. This item was tabled until the spreadsheet is checked. A discussion followed about comparing the 2050 H3J populations to the 2050 DES. We see some communities growing much more than DES projects. Several TWG members stated the reason is that the DES numbers were wrong. It was mentioned that they have been wrong for years and that there were reports that showed this. Leslie G. asked for copies of those reports or other items that could be used to defend the statement that DES projections are wrong (or consistently low for the region). Doug stated he had sent Leslie G. information in the past about how DES is calculated. Leslie G. stated she has read the method and noted that DES looks at many sources (school counts, driver's licenses, etc) to get the best figure. Leslie stated she would look at the information from Doug again and if she does not have it then she will contact Doug to resend it. Leslie stated it is important to document why the numbers may fall short for this region and why the study group chose to use something other than DES.

Action item: Time will need to be made to pull historical projections (1990-2009?) and see how they compare to estimate (non census years 1991-1999 and 2001-2009) and census years (1990 and 2000). A brief discussion will need to be written to support this studies potential choice from 2050 population.

- e. **2006 AG Demands for ranches** – once again since it was decided to remove the row for the ranches, and footnote the CCD it will not be necessary to determine a AG demand subset from the CCD AG demand.
- f. **2006 GPPD** – due to the remaining available meeting time (15mins), Leslie G. decided this topic would be too large and would need to be tabled until next time.
- g. **2050 Com/Ind and AG Demand** – Leslie G. reminded the group that the table still needed data from the WPA representatives for these two columns. She was under the impression that those who knew what their 2050 AG and commercial/industrial demand may look like, have provided the data. Those cells in the table that have not been filled in may be at a stand still. So, an idea was offered that maybe the group could make a decision on how to handle these empty cells. Greg stated that AG is a large component in this table. Greg suggested that Ag lands, that stay in production and those that convert to another use could possibly be determined based on using the Holocene Alluvium delineation. Current Ag GIS could be looked at with an alluvium cover? It was considered a possibly but a member wondered about the time necessary to do the work. Verde Valley representatives were asked for their opinion. Kaki engaged in a conversation with Greg about if future Ag could be guaranteed with that method. Jeanmarie offered her property as an example. She also stated that the ditch companies should have input on this topic. Leslie G. tried to state how important AG was to the Verde and the other side of the mountain, but the choice of words didn't convey the intended message. Once again, due to the meeting ending at noon this issue was not going to have the time it deserved. John M. recommended a working group similar to the one convened for 2006 AG. Leslie G. reminded the group that the reason we have this topic on the table was based the group requesting that the 2006 and 2005 demand be broken down by dom/muni, com/ind, and Ag.

Action item: Organize a conference call for those interested in this topic. Work up some ideas that can be developed and reviewed by the study stakeholders.

Action item: Jane mentioned that the footnote for Jerome on the demand analysis table was not correct. Update is needed.

Estimated Available Water Supply – this discussion item needed to be tabled until next time.

Next Meeting

Thursday, September 3, 2009

10:30 am

Yavapai County Board Room

10 South 6th St Cottonwood, AZ