



ROCKIN' RIVER RANCH MASTER PLAN TAC MEETING #5 NOTES - * DRAFT *

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--|----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Project Info: | Meeting Notes | Meeting No.: | 05 |
| Re: | Technical Advisory Committee Workshop #5 | Meeting Date: | November 16, 2017 |
| Attachment(s): | None | Meeting Time: | 9:00 am to 1:00 pm |
| Meeting Location: | 4513 S Salt Mine Rd, Camp Verde, AZ 86322 | Location: | Rockin' River Ranch State Park |

ATTENDEES:

| | | | |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Skip Varney | Arizona State Parks and Trails (ASPT) | Steve Ayers | Town of Camp Verde |
| Robert Jennings | Arizona State Parks and Trails (ASPT) | Elaine Theriault | Camp Verde Ranch LLC |
| Keith Ayotte | Arizona State Parks and Trails (ASPT) | Janelle Turner | Public Attendee |
| Anna Schrenk | Friends of the Verde River Greenway | Wayne Colebank | Logan Simpson |
| Laura Jones | Friends of the Verde River Greenway | Brad Remme | Logan Simpson |
| Dan Daley | Salt Mine Road Community | | |
| Geo. Christianson | Arizona State Parks and Trails (ASPT) | | |

PURPOSE OF MEETING

The purpose of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Workshop #5 is to review past meetings, key issues, and the Master Plan; and to review changes made to the Master Plan based on TAC Workshop #4.

MEETING NOTES

1. TAC Meeting No.5 was held in the billiards/pool room at the Main House (On-site)
2. Not all TAC members were able to attend (see Sign-in Sheet), and there was one (1) member of the general public in attendance (see Sign-in Sheet).
3. Individual introductions were provided, as there were some new people at this meeting.
4. Skip Varney provided a brief introduction to the project and the status of the NEPA process associated with the project. He indicated that the park is schedule to open in October of 2018.
5. Wayne Colebank discussed changes that were implemented to the Master Plan based on input received at TAC-4. Changes can be seen on the revised Master Plan graphic.
6. Skip indicated that the Master Plan (albeit conceptual) should depict a couple elements a bit differently. Those include moving the entrance road closer to the contact station, which will make interaction between visitors and park ranger more convenient, safe and expedite the process of checking-in visitors.

7. The crossing of the wash by the main road was discussed in length; regarding timing, ditch downtime, the most efficient type of culvert to install and the possibility of pumping ditch-water over or around active construction zones associated with this area (thus keeping ditch operational during construction).
8. Discussion was had over the existing Verde Ditch, and when it is closed for maintenance/cleaning. It was indicated that the 'Ditch Boss' would have that information.
9. Skip discussed the process and benefits of developing a partnership or entering an agreement with a contractor/management group that would finance, install and ultimately manage the future on-site sewer system, lift station and any associated facilities with said system. Additionally, by doing so, available funds could then be reallocated back into the project to provide for additional or expanded amenities or upgrades.
10. ASPT would develop a sort of "evaluation team" that would review any bid received regarding the development of the sanitary sewer system. The evaluation team would review the bids to be sure they are comparable in scope, then the individual companies and their associated experience would be evaluated prior to selecting a contractor or management team.
11. A Construction Zone Map was presented to the group which was prepared by ASPT. The zone map indicates two (2) primary zones within the park; zones 1 and 2 respectively. Zone One is essentially any area that would experience some level of impact associated with the development of primary park amenities essential for the park to function and operate as a state park. Primary park amenities would include the contact station, roadways, parking areas, cabin and camping sites, restrooms, fencing, infrastructure including sanitary sewer and associated leach fields. Zone Two would include trails, wildlife viewing areas, river access points, and general management of the riparian and Mesquite bosque areas (i.e. tree trimming, etc).
12. Discussions were had regarding the current status of the onsite concessionaire and that per State code, the onsite concessionaire contract will be going out for bid.
13. Currently, no information is available regarding improvements to the existing irrigation system however plans will be made that address the need for a functioning system. The existing irrigation system is in poor shape and water is likely being lost due to the current state of disrepair; a goal of the State is to be as eco-friendly as possible, and creating an efficient irrigation system is an important task.
14. The commitment to being eco-friendly, as mentioned by Skip, is that the state is looking at solar options for the restrooms and entertaining the idea of installing "mini-splits" in the future cabins. The Mini-split is a ductless air conditioner and heat-pump all in one unit and efficient.
15. The question of fencing and controlled access during construction was asked. The point being that horses cannot be "quickly" relocated from one area of the pasture to another without pre-planning; in the event construction activities require it. Temporary fencing and overall coordination between the selected contractor (or ASPT Construction Services) with the onsite concessionaire will be very important.
16. Question was asked as to the possibility of developing signs that state that RV's are not allowed within the Park; and where best to place this signage. The purpose of the signs would be to

inform possible RV owners/visitors that there are no accommodations for RV's at the park. ASPT responded that ASPT staff will be working with ADOT on proper placement of signs along publically accessible roadways. Additionally, it was stated that as part of the ASPT online reservation system, all park accommodations would be listed for those people that make reservations prior to their arrival at the facility. The intent would be that people making reservations for an RV slip at the park would then realize, there are no such accommodations available.

17. In the event an RV visits the park, there are adequately dimensioned turn-arounds that would allow the RV visitor to navigate their way out of the park without making 3-point turns or entering a parking area to turn-around.
18. The question was asked as to if a "living quarter trailer" is considered an RV. It was discussed that, yes, a living quarter trailer would be classified as an RV. Several horses are brought in and out of the park by those people who utilize living quarter trailers, and do spend nights at the project site. If these trailers are not allowed to overnight, then they would leave and park elsewhere and the park would not capture associated revenue. The decision on accommodating these trailers was not definitively answered or agreed upon, other than the team understands this item will need to be addressed as part of the final design process and that park operations would need to address the issue accordingly.
19. Regarding the potential of RV day-use visitors; they would not be permitted to utilize the park facility; however that may be open for discussion at some point after the park is open, established and successfully operating.
20. Question was asked as to if a fulltime park ranger would live or be stationed at the park 24-hours/fulltime. ASPT has not made this determination yet. Although, it was discussed that the existing two-story building could be renovated into living quarters for a fulltime onsite ranger or the cycling of park rangers to ensure 24-hour supervision.
21. It was stated that if the ranch is to remain an equestrian-based facility; that there will need to be someone onsite at all times; and that the horses cannot be left unattended.
22. An open call to the public was made, and one member of the public accepted the opportunity to speak (see Sign-in sheet). She mentioned that there are concerns over the development of the park, but understands change happens. She, and others, do feel a tie to the ranch and the area, and hope it is developed in a manner that respects those feelings. Skip added that ASPT has called adjacent neighbors to be sure their questions or concerns have been heard and addressed to an acceptable level.
23. Elaine asked if the plan will include property-line fences, of which ASPT indicated that, yes, the fences are still part of the Master Plan.
24. Robert (ASPT) indicated that as much as possible, ASPT forces will return construction areas to their natural state; which may include re-vegetation, re-grading or other means of restoration. He indicated that they (ASPT) approach construction projects with a low-impact goal.
25. The question was asked about possibly salvaging existing trees and reintroducing those trees onsite. The response was that ASPT has salvaged trees on other projects and that, yes, tree

salvaging will be considered. However, some trees may prove un-salvageable due to overall size, age or access to a specific tree.

26. ASPT stated that on some project where trees had to be destroyed, new trees were planted at a 3:1 ratio to ensure a well vegetated project site.
27. Native plant seeds have been collected or are being collected by “Friends” groups associated with the Verde River and the Verde Valley.
28. It was indicated that many residents have relocated to the area/community for what it is and what it stands for; and that change can be difficult. That was understood by the group, and ASPT stated that there will be some level of impact associated with the project, but that ASPT will put it back “as-is” as much as is possible.
29. There was discussion as to what impacts there will be to the river as more river access is provided or made available. Such impacts may be trash, noise, etc. Additionally, it was stated that Beasley Flat will see increased usage/impact as well. It was mentioned that many, responsible hikers or river users will actually collect garbage as part of their excursion. Beyond visitors cleaning-up or collecting trash as they go, there is a thought that more people utilizing these amenities will discourage others from littering.
30. It was asked if the new put-in or take-out will be included on river/trail maps or guides. These locations will be added to those publications. Additionally it was noted that Verde River Maps are the most downloaded feature off the Friends of the Verde River Greenway website.
31. Both Wayne and Skip discussed the fact that the access road and the park development are in-fact a connected action, regarding the NEPA process for US Fish and Wildlife. USFW is allowed up to 135 days to review any NEPA submittal.
32. ASPT may involve their in-house Construction Services for some of the park construction; this will save both money and time.
33. ASPT indicated that funding for the park has been approved, and that the park design will move forward once NEPA issues are determined and addressed; this will eliminate the possibility of losing time due to re-design (should NEPA issues impact design/layout).
34. ASPT thanked the TAC for their time; and the meeting was closed.