

Producer Sub-Committee Priorities

- Viable sustained economy based on farming, ranching, small businesses (including ecotourism) and continued mining operations. Communicating the importance of mining and agriculture to the area's economy.
- No further fragmentation of rural lands (i.e. with large solar fields, wind generating fields). No large commercial housing development with associated businesses (e.g., Walmart, Walgreens). No new large infrastructure development, e.g., freeways, power lines, pipelines.
- Protection of water quality and sufficient supply. No movement of water out of the watershed. Protection of water rights. Any "improvements" to the watershed as a whole would be those focused on District priorities.
- Stable soils. Active management of vegetative communities (brush control is important). Vegetatively stable uplands.
- Reasonable Threatened and Endangered Species actions based on rigorous proven science.
- An incentive program for producers which encourages research and management for wildlife vs. the current and necessary self-preservation mindset of "no entry, no way, no how, never gonna find it, count it, study it, etc."
- Accurate history of the area--ecological, economical, and social.
- Closure of wildcat roads. Better law enforcement of illegal OHV use, illegal wildlife harvest, etc. More active presence of Game and Fish Law enforcement -given the hunting pressure and access issues in the valley.
- Better informed and committed citizens on natural resource issues. A constant flow of education and information to local communities about multiple use and natural resource management.
- Program to manage benchmark data across all ranches.

Scott Cole
6:34 AM

From: **Scott Cole** (C-Spear_Ranch@cox.net)

Sent: Tue 10/15/13 6:34 AM

To: '[Francie Meyer](mailto:franciekmeyer@msn.com)' (franciekmeyer@msn.com); '[Stephanie Small house](mailto:carlink@hughes.net)' (carlink@hughes.net); '[Hattie Hedrick](mailto:hcoyote@msn.com)' (hcoyote@msn.com); '[Steve Turcotte](mailto:stephen.turcotte@gmail.com)' (stephen.turcotte@gmail.com)

Below is my input.

Add

1) State land within the planning area should remain in grazing use for perpetuity

2) Isolated ranch parcels surrounded by State land should be provided legal access along existing ranch roads by the state.

I would also recommend that the following comment be withdraw or modified. "No large commercial housing development with associated businesses (eg. Walmart, Walgreens)" In keeping with our past work on the committee I believe we should express a vision for what we want, not a prohibition on specific uses of private property, which may run afoul of private property rights. The CRM planning book also lists a similar concept in its guidelines "Express Needs Not Positions" "Positions" create confrontation and "needs" generate compassion and understanding. Groups are more likely to take care of legitimate needs. The group must discipline itself and help each other to speak in terms of "needs" and avoid position statements, grandstanding, or accusations typical of adversarial relations"

If we must comment in this area, perhaps We could espouse a vision for low density housing development (not that we want to encourage development) or commercial development that only serves the needs of the local community. San Manuel could use a real grocery store.

Scott

Conservation Objectives for The San Pedro (Nature Conservancy)

A commitment to the continued flow of the San Pedro river.

A long-term conservation ethic throughout the San Pedro Watershed.

Community/cultural support for conservation commitments.

Incentive based conservation that rewards conservation successes while supporting sustainable agriculture practices.

Protection for landowners.

Clear conservation objectives.

Clear expectations from State/Federal agencies for species objectives.

October 2, 2013

Teleconference of the so-called "small landowner" sub-group of the NRCD refuge alternative committee.

Present for the 6 pm meeting were committee members Charles Ffolliott, David Omick, Bob Evans, and Peter Else. We had a short discussion at the beginning of the conference about whether to think big and long term, or to think smaller. We decided that since the lower San Pedro watershed is the last of its kind in southern Arizona and since extraordinary measures would probably be required to save the San Pedro, we would think big and long term.

List of items that the participants want to include in the committee's planning process:

- 1) Provisions for the protection of habitat on lands that are formally designated for conservation or mitigation purposes.
- 2) Provisions to promote conservation and improvement of habitat not under formal designation in the watershed.
- 3) Develop an effective partnership with federal agencies, including the FWS, to help accomplish items one and two above, and to promote recognition of the important relationship between habitat and BMP ranching with the water resources that support both. It is our observation from what has taken place in other Arizona watersheds and what is currently taking place in the upper San Pedro that Arizona water law grants no special status to habitat conservation or BMP ranching in critical conservation areas, and does not recognize the link between groundwater overdraft and surface/subsurface flow. These partnerships with federal agencies could also help provide a disincentive for industrial scale infrastructure proposals that provide no benefit to the watershed.
- 4) The ability for landowners to grant a conservation easement to the group or agency of their choice, including the FWS.

This teleconference concluded at 7:25 pm.