Public Notice Pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.02

ARIZONA MUNICIPAL WATER USERS ASSOCIATION
MANAGEMENT BOARD

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

Wednesday, October 11, 2017 – 10:00 a.m.

Arizona Municipal Water Users Association
Board Conference Room
3003 North Central Avenue, Suite 1550
Phoenix, Arizona 85012

A. Call to Order

B. General Business—Items for Discussion and Possible Action
   1. Approval of the Minutes from the September 13, 2017 Meeting
   2. Schedule Next Meeting Date: Wednesday, November 8, 2017, 10:00 a.m.
   3. Governor’s Water Discussion
   4. CAWCD Excess Water Task Force
   5. CAWCD Rate Setting Policy
   6. Water Quality Standards Proposal for Non-Project Water under the System Use Agreement

C. Management Board Members’ Updates

D. Executive Director’s Report

E. Future Agenda Items

F. Adjournment

*The order of the agenda may be altered or changed by the AMWUA Management Board.

More information about AMWUA public meetings is available in the AMWUA office, online at www.amwua.org/what-we-do/public-meetings, or by request.
VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Craig Johnson, Glendale, Chairman
Mr. Kevin Artz, Avondale
Mr. Brian Biesemeyer, Scottsdale
Mr. John Knudson, Chandler
Ms. Jessica Marlow, Gilbert
Ms. Karen Peters, Phoenix
Mr. Javier Setovich, Goodyear
Mr. Mike Weber, Peoria
Mr. Jake West, Mesa

VOTING MEMBERS NOT PRESENT – EXCUSED

Ms. Marilyn DeRosa, Tempe

OTHERS PRESENT

Blaine Akine, Phoenix          Kathy Ferris, AMWUA          Kathy Rall, Scottsdale
Jessica Blazina, Avondale     Brett Fleck, AMWUA              Richard Siegel, SRP
Eric Braun, Gilbert           Sam Jaskolski, AMWUA           Cindy Smith, Phoenix
Cynthia Campbell, Phoenix     Pat Kossan, AMWUA                Tony Staffaroni, CAP
Greg Capps, Chandler          Frank Milam, Phoenix            Drew Swieczkowski, Glendale
Miranda DeWitt, Mesa          Colette Moore, SRP                Warren Tenney, AMWUA
Brian Draper, Mesa            Brian Payne, AMWUA                Carol Ward-Morris, AMWUA
Alan Dulaney, Peoria          Diana Piña, AMWUA                 Thalia Williams, AMWUA

A. Call to Order

Mr. Johnson called the meeting to order at 10:04 a.m.

B. General Business – Items for Discussion and Possible Action

1. Approval of the Minutes from the June 14, 2017 Meeting

Upon a motion by Ms. Peters and a second by Mr. Biesemeyer, the AMWUA Management Board unanimously approved the minutes of the August 9, 2017 meeting.
2. **Next meeting scheduled for Wednesday, October 11, 2017, at 10:00 a.m., in the AMWUA office**

3. **Governor’s Water Discussion**

   Mr. Tenney stated that the Plenary Group of the Governor’s Water Discussion met at the end of last month to discuss over a dozen issues that the Colorado River and Groundwater Work Groups have deliberated. He said some of the issues generated questions and a few expressions of opposition, the Plenary Group gave general support for the conceptual proposals presented and Mayor Lane was supportive of all of them. He also noted that at the meeting, Kirk Adams emphasized that the proposals were concepts and that the State would start to flesh out the details with stakeholders and develop the proposals into a package for legislation.

   Mr. Tenney reported that after reviewing and discussing the concepts of most interest to the AMWUA members, the AMWUA Board of Directors adopted the following motion at their August meeting:

   “The AMWUA Board of Directors recognizes that the Governor’s Water Discussion is an effort to improve Arizona’s overall management of Colorado River water and groundwater. The Governor’s Water Discussion’s conceptual proposals concentrate on those issues that Arizona needs to address at this time through legislation and rulemaking. AMWUA’s engagement is critical for this process to benefit municipal water users and the State as a whole. Therefore, the AMWUA Board supports the Governor’s Water Discussion process, and the need to address the concepts outlined by the State by working with the Governor and the Legislature as the concepts are fleshed out into a legislative package.”

   Mr. Tenney said since the AMWUA Board’s meeting, a meeting of the Colorado River Work Group was held where the Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR) reviewed the Drought Contingency Plan (DCP) that Arizona, California, Nevada, and the Bureau of Reclamation have negotiated. ADWR did not review DCP Plus again as a package with the review of DCP. He said Paul Orme, representing Pinal Agriculture, again raised Agriculture’s concern that under DCP, they would be immediately impacted if Lake Mead were to fall below 1,075 feet in elevation. Mr. Orme questioned if DCP Plus was enough protection and said Agriculture would like to see a mitigation plan in place for them. Mr. Tenney stated that AMWUA will be watching this matter closely since financing a mitigation plan would most likely impact its members. He noted that under the DCP, Agriculture would be the most impacted if Lake Mead falls below 1,075 feet; however, it would also impact municipalities receiving Non-Indian Agriculture Priority water allocations, which is why AMWUA has been supportive of the efforts to put DCP in place.
Mr. Tenney said AMWUA will keep itself and its lobbyists, Mr. Aarons and Ms. Ulmer, apprised on everything occurring with the Governor’s Water Discussion and how the Governor’s Office proceeds with developing these conceptual proposals into legislation. He noted that Mr. Aarons attended a meeting of lobbyists last Friday to discuss how the Governor’s Office plans to work with the Legislature.

Ms. Peters commented that she was glad to see the AMWUA Board of Directors’ resolution and that she thinks it strikes the right balance. She also said she was glad to hear that AMWUA is beginning to plan how to engage with Legislators and would encourage AMWUA member staffs to do the same with the Legislators representing their municipality because this is a complicated issue. Ms. Peters and Mr. Johnson thanked Mr. Tenney for his efforts and hard work.

Mr. Biesemeyer echoed Ms. Peters’ sentiments and emphasized the importance of having a true discussion on these issues because there are false narratives going around.

4. Water Quality Standards Proposal for Non-Project Water under the System Use Agreement

Mr. Tenney reported that the day before, Brian Biesemeyer, Troy Hayes of Phoenix, Sandy Elder of Tucson, Mike Ploughe of the Salt River Project (SRP), and himself presented the complete proposal for water quality standards developed through AMWUA’s Water Quality Group meetings to the Central Arizona Water Conservation District (CAWCD) Water Quality Task Force. He said the presentation went very well and the Task Force was pleased with the proposal and asked questions. He noted that the Task Force would like to see “not-to-exceed” numbers put in place, so AMWUA’s Water Quality Group will meet again to discuss. Mr. Tenney said the presenters also agreed to meet with CAWCD staff to further discuss the entire proposal.

Mr. Payne shared a condensed version of the PowerPoint presentation given to CAWCD with the AMWUA Management Board. The proposal presentation highlighted the entities who participated in the consensus; what the proposal accomplishes and its principle and standard; the equity of the proposal; the six constituents looked at in the proposal and operational maximums, including “not-to-exceed” parameters that are currently being evaluated; additional protection measures; and the proposal’s monitoring and oversight requirement.

Mr. Weber asked if there had been discussions on “what if” scenarios regarding canal quality being degraded by upstream discharges and the recourse. Mr. Payne said the model being proposed would cap it before it got to that point and if it were to get to that point, there would need to be operational constraints and that more discussion needs to be held on the issue and a fixed criterion will need to be developed. Mr. Tenney noted that by keeping within the historical range as it is today, there should not be a slow degradation over time. He also said the Central Arizona Project (CAP) would also have enforcement abilities in those situations.
Ms. Marlow asked if that applies to secondary effects in change of raw water quality and if there is a way to mitigate that. She also gave an example of having the same levels of Total Organic Carbon (TOC) in different water sources and experiencing different amounts of Total Trihalomethanes (TTHMs) forming. Mr. Tenney said the model proposed would address that issue, but it primarily focuses on the first six constituents to verify if the framework is acceptable, and then later discussions would address secondary regulated contaminants issues.

Mr. Biesemeyer noted that CAWCD would be encouraged to develop their own monitoring of the canal system to have preliminary sense of the water. Mr. Knudson added that individual dischargers should be held to monitoring the water qualities that they are discharging on a routine basis so that history is recorded; Mr. Biesemeyer agreed.

Mr. Tenney commented on the difference between Central Arizona’s, Southern Arizona’s, and CAWCD’s individual histories with water quality, treatment, and public perception. He reported that after the CAWCD Task Force meeting there were positive sidebar conversations about ways to tackle this situation that everyone would agree to. Mr. Tenney noted that while this process is still moving forward, significant progress has already been made.

Mr. Weber and Mr. Biesemeyer discussed items that would be excluded from being discharged into the canal, such as brine discharges.

5. **AMWUA Website**

Ms. Ward-Morris gave the AMWUA Management Board a tour of the new AMWUA website, which was premiered at the August AMWUA Board of Directors meeting. She noted that the new site is easy to use, approachable, well organized, streamlined, and full of information. She highlighted that the website has four subheadings that organize content and tell AMWUA’s story: “who we are,” “what we do,” “where we stand,” and “what you can do.”

Ms. Ward-Morris noted that a second phase of the website will update the online versions of AMWUA’s publications: *Landscape Plants for the Arizona Desert* and *Xeriscape: Landscaping with Style*. She said this phase will be funded out of the Regional Conservation Program budget and will fall below the threshold requiring the AMWUA Board of Director’s approval. Ms. Ward-Morris welcomed any comments, questions, and feedback from the AMWUA Management Board as they reviewed the site themselves.

C. **Board Members’ Updates**

AMWUA Management Board members were invited to report on water activities in their city/town.
Chandler: Mr. Knudson said Chandler’s Municipal Utilities Department is now part of Chandler’s Public Works and Utilities Department. Mr. Knudson’s new title is Public Works and Utilities Director.

Glendale: Mr. Johnson asked if any of the AMWUA members had been asked to help with the disasters in Texas and Florida. Mr. Biesemeyer said Scottsdale was asked and would be able to assist, but have not been taken up on their offer yet. Ms. Peters said Phoenix had a similar experience, and noted that Phoenix’s Search and Rescue team was deployed to both Texas and Florida. Mr. Johnson also stated that chemical procurement for treatment may be impacted due to the hurricanes, and suggested the AMWUA members look into ways to make truck shipments more efficient and possibly getting a pricing advantage.

Scottsdale: Mr. Biesemeyer noted that the Annual Water Reuse Symposium is in town and gave kudos to Mr. Tenney for his introductory speech. He also reported that Scottsdale’s Water Citizen Academy co-winning the Public Education Program of the Year Award at the Symposium.

D. Executive Director’s Report

Mr. Tenney stated that CAWCD has an Excess Water Task Force, which is looking at excess water that becomes available during the year after water orders have been placed. He said this intra-year water became a major issue earlier this year when the first iteration of DCP Plus was being discussed and still remains a point of discussion. He stated that the hope of this task force is that there will be a better understanding of this intra-year excess water, how much is involved, and how it is accounted. He said the Excess Water Task Force is seeking proposals about how to manage this intra-year excess water and AMWUA will be discussing this with its Water Resources Advisory Group (WRAG).

Mr. Tenney stated that Thalia Williams, AMWUA’s Sub-Regional Operating Group (SROG) Program Coordinator, is retiring at the end of October. He said Ms. Williams has been valuable in overseeing AMWUA’s administrative and financial accounting support provided to the five SROG cities that own and operate the 91st Avenue Wastewater Treatment Plant. Mr. Tenney stated that AMWUA has begun to advertise for this position.

E. Future Agenda Items

There were no requests for future agenda items.

F. Adjournment

Upon a motion by Mr. Biesemeyer and a second by Ms. Peters, Mr. Johnson unanimously adjourned the meeting at 11:16 a.m.
Governor’s Water Discussion

STRATEGIC PLAN REFERENCE

Objectives – Safeguard Water Supplies; Reinforce Groundwater Management; Prepare for Impacts of Drought & Shortage; Augment Supplies; Elevate the Benefit of Water Reuse; Minimize Financial Impacts
Collaboration – Legislature; Arizona Department of Water Resources; Salt River Project; Central Arizona Project; Water Community

SUMMARY

At the September AMWUA Board meeting, it was reported the Governor’s Water Discussion had been fairly quiet for the last part of the month.

On October 2nd, the Colorado River Work Group met and discussed two key issues. Pinal agricultural interests want to have a mitigation plan put in place if the Drought Contingency Plan (DCP) and DCP Plus are pursued. This is because CAP ag pool water would be cut first if Lake Mead falls below an elevation of 1,075 feet under DCP. A breakout group will tackle ag mitigation as well as other issues related to DCP Plus, such as excess water and tribal ICS.

The other issue discussed on October 2nd was a proposal from several stakeholders to have the ADWR Director become a non-voting member of the CAWCD Board. CAWCD and SRP both voiced opposition. SRP said they would prefer to see the ADWR Director oversee a formal advisory group so Colorado River issues can be discussed. The Governor’s Office did not voice a position on this proposal at the workgroup meeting.

We are watching to see how the Governor’s Office will wrap up the various issues in these meetings as the Governor’s Office prepares to work with stakeholders and legislators to develop legislative language.

RECOMMENDATION

The AMWUA Management Board is encouraged to ask questions and talk about the Governor’s Water Discussion.
CAWCD Excess Water Task Force

STRATEGIC PLAN REFERENCE

Objectives – Prepare for Impacts of Drought & Shortage; Minimize Financial Impacts
Collaboration – Central Arizona Project; Arizona Department of Water Resources

SUMMARY

The Central Arizona Water Conservation District (CAWCD) has initiated an Excess Water Task Force. This Task Force is looking at how CAWCD manages excess water that becomes available during the year after water orders have already been placed. Excess water became a major issue earlier this year when the first iteration of DCP Plus was discussed. Furthermore, excess water is listed as a point of discussion in the Governor’s Water Discussion, although it has not specifically been discussed in workgroup meetings. The CAWCD Task Force is requesting stakeholder proposals about how to manage excess water. The Task Force’s work could include a recommendation to the CAWCD Board about a policy for managing excess water.

Based on the two meetings that the Task Force has held, AMWUA staff understands the following about excess water.

Excess water is any Project Water available for delivery after CAWCD satisfies long-term contract orders. By agreement with the United States, CAWCD has the right to sell or use excess water for any authorized purpose of the CAP. Excess water essentially falls within three categories: (1) Ag Pool water, which steps down to zero after 2030, (2) Scheduled “Other Excess,” and (3) Intra-year Excess.

In October of each year, CAWCD staff receives annual water orders and calculates an estimated volume of excess water for the upcoming year in developing CAWCD’s annual operating plan. After taking into account orders from long-term contracts and the Ag Pool, CAWCD staff allocates and schedules the delivery of excess water according to the Access-to-Excess policy. This policy essentially makes excess water available to CAGRD, AWBA, and Reclamation. The Access-to-Excess policy only applies to “Other Excess” that is scheduled before the year begins. It does not apply to excess water that becomes available during the year—“Intra-year excess.”
This summary focuses on intra-year excess water that becomes available during the year. This excess water is not subject to any current board policy, including the Access-to-Excess policy. Currently CAWCD staff oversees the disposition of this water; however, it is subject to some operational constraints. There are two subcategories of intra-year excess: (A) Unplanned on-River excess, and (B) Turnback water.

(A) Unplanned On-River Excess Water Generally Goes to Lake Pleasant. As a general principle, when an on-River Arizona user fails to use their full entitlement, that water becomes available to CAWCD as part of the excess pool. CAWCD staff explains this unplanned excess supply by referring to the adjacent chart.

The light bars represent the amount of water Reclamation tells CAWCD in December is available to divert for the upcoming year. The green line is CAWCD staff’s internal estimate at the beginning of the year of what will be actually available. This number is used in the development of CAWCD’s annual operating plan. The blue bars are the amount that actually was available to CAWCD and is reconciled after the fact by Reclamation in the following year. As explained by CAWCD staff, unplanned on-River excess water that increases the excess pool can be looked at as the difference between the green line (CAWCD’s beginning-of-year estimate) and the amount CAWCD actually diverts, which historically has been within one percent of the amount represented by the blue bar.

**Annual Delivery Supply:** During the development of CAWCD’s annual operating plan, CAWCD calculates an “Annual Delivery Supply” (see nearby chart). This is the amount of water that CAWCD commits to deliver to users during the upcoming year. *Once determined, CAWCD’s current practice is not to change this number for the year, subject to minor exceptions.*1 For 2017, this number is 1.44 million acre-feet (MAF).

Since the number does not generally change, staff stores any unplanned excess water beyond the Annual Delivery Supply (the 1.44 MAF) in Lake Pleasant. This essentially means that unplanned on-River water is either already built into CAWCD’s annual operating plan (based on CAWCD’s diversion estimate at the beginning of the year—the green line) or goes to Lake Pleasant.

---

1 Deviations can occur if (1) a customer turns back water but the water cannot be remarkeeted, (2) a customer ordered water but did not take it, or (3) if there is unplanned forbearance or conservation within the year.
Pleasant for use in future years. It is important to note that as a general practice, CAWCD staff pumps water into Lake Pleasant for storage during times of the year when power is cheaper, and makes deliveries from the lake during times when power is more expensive to save on power costs.

**Lake Pleasant:** Unplanned water that CAWCD conserves in Lake Pleasant is available for delivery in later years. CAWCD staff uses the analogy of comparing Lake Pleasant to a warehouse for inventory. Instead of storing widgets at a warehouse, CAWCD stores water in Lake Pleasant.

When CAWCD delivers water from Lake Pleasant it stored in a previous year, CAWCD must deliver that water according to the existing pool priorities for Project Water. After CAWCD fulfills long-term contracts and Ag Pool obligations in a given year, CAWCD appears to have discretion in how it uses excess water, including water remaining in Lake Pleasant. For example, AMWUA staff is unaware of any limitations preventing CAWCD (in the short term and subject to operational and planning constraints) from using excess water in Lake Pleasant to backfill a declared shortage, thus freeing up water for lower priority users such as CAGRD and the AWBA. Whether CAWCD would actually do this from a policy perspective is another matter.²

Some stakeholders have wondered how much excess water CAWCD can store in Lake Pleasant that is relatively free from operational constraints. CAWCD staff has indicated that the answer is complicated and dependent on the circumstances. There is 812 thousand acre-feet (KAF) of dedicated storage space in Lake Pleasant. Although CAWCD controls the vast majority of this space, CAWCD shares the space with Maricopa Water District with a roughly 80-20 percent split. Of the 812 KAF, 200 KAF is kept as a 60 to 90-day backup delivery supply for outages and emergencies. Another 400 KAF or so of space is often used for annual fluctuations in the lake due to CAWCD’s practice of drawing down Lake Pleasant to make customer deliveries when pumping from Lake Havasu is more expensive. This leaves about 200 KAF of space, shared with Maricopa Water District, where AMWUA staff understands CAWCD can store any unplanned excess water during the year if sufficient space exists and water is available.

**(B) Turnback Water.** The second category of intra-year excess is turnback water. If a subcontractor cannot use water it has ordered, that subcontractor can ask CAWCD to remarket the water to another user. This water is called “turnback water.” There is no board-approved policy for non-Ag Pool turnback water. CAWCD staff manages it as follows:

² CAWCD staff has not actually suggested this approach. However, CAWCD staff hinted at the possibility of using water from Lake Pleasant to mitigate DCP shortage impacts to the Ag Pool during DCP Plus negotiations.
• **(1) Current CAWCD Staff Practice:** CAWCD staff stated that it first remarkets turnback water to a contractor that needs water *and* that has room in its entitlement, meaning the contractor did not order its full allocation. However, CAWCD staff also said that in practice CAWCD does not typically solicit the sale of turnback water.

• **(2) Ag Pool Exception:** By Board policy, if turnback water originates from the Ag Pool, CAWCD staff will first remarket the water to Ag Pool participants in the same AMA, then to all other Ag Pool participants.

• **(3) Successfully Remarketed Turnback Water Typically Goes to CAGRD & AWBA:** CAWCD staff remarks any remaining turnback water to CAGRD, AWBA, and Reclamation. CAWCD staff stated that this is what typically happens with turnback water that it successfully remarkets. Turnback water that is not delivered or remarketed remains in Lake Pleasant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recent History of Turnback Water</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Successful Remarket</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>(Delivered)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWCD Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total Deliveries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to turning back water, CAWCD staff told the Task Force that subcontractors can do “hand-in-hand remarkets.” For example, if City A has ordered water it will not use, it can arrange to sell this water to another M&I subcontractor, City B. CAWCD staff said that this type of arrangement has not occurred in the last five years. This transaction is allowed by section 4.3(e) of the M&I subcontracts.

In considering CAWCD Task Force’s request for proposals, the Water Resources Advisory Group (WRAG) agreed that additional information and a better understanding about excess water was needed before a proposal could be developed. CAWCD staff did attend a WRAG meeting and answered many questions; however, additional questions remain. The WRAG believes it would be beneficial if CAWCD provided an accounting breakdown of all types of excess water and present that information regularly to the CAWCD Board.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The AMWUA Management Board is encouraged to ask questions and discuss a possible proposal to provide to the CAWCD Excess Water Task Force.
CAWCD Rate Setting Policy

STRATEGIC PLAN REFERENCE

Objectives – Advocate for Solutions; Minimize Financial Impacts
Collaboration – Central Arizona Project

SUMMARY

At the September 26th Finance, Audit, & Power (FAP) committee meeting, CAWCD Board members began an effort to update its “CAP Rate Setting Policy,” last revised in 2010. This effort stems from the desire of some Board members to ensure the Rate Setting Policy reflects contemporary water policy and to give more guidance in setting rates annually, particularly with respect to the capital charge and incentives for agricultural users. These issues are of particular importance as revenues from the sale of excess power at the Navajo Generating Station will no longer be available when the station shuts down at the end of 2019.

Prior to proposing any guidance in setting the capital charge, staff sought to determine if there are any limitations on how the capital charge can be set. The M&I subcontracts state that the capital charge cannot be set higher than the amount owed on the debt, attributed to M&I use, amortized annually. In a presentation to the FAP committee, staff documented a methodology that separates the total federal debt across three use categories: power, irrigation, and M&I. Using this methodology, staff then associated repayments made thus far to each use category by funding source e.g., property taxes, capital charges, or Basin Development Fund (BDF) revenues. The result of this analysis being that staff has determined the entire remaining debt balance is attributed to M&I users. This means that the capital charge can legally be set to cover the entire annual makeup payment (annual debt bill less any Basin Development Fund revenues).

With no limit on how much capital charges can contribute to the annual repayment, Committee Chairman and Board Vice President Jim Holway expressed his personal desire to see some kind of formula or basis for setting the capital charges incorporated into the Rate Setting Policy. Vice President Holway welcomed staff and stakeholders to submit comments and proposals on the topic.
AMWUA staff has consistently advocated for CAWCD property taxes to continue to be used to support CAWCD’s federal debt repayment as directed by the AMWUA Board on April 27, 2017. This message is important to counter suggestions by some Board members that capital charges alone should be used to make the federal debt repayment.

AMWUA staff is reluctant to see a formula or basis for setting the capital charge memorialized in the Rate Setting Policy. This approach could potentially restrict CAWCD’s ability to make the best use of all revenue sources and address future uncertainty. A more flexible approach would be to add language to the Rate Setting Policy requiring that property taxes be considered in fulfilling the annual debt repayment. Additional language clarifying the distinction between the cost-of-service Water Delivery rate and the capital charge would also be beneficial. Separating capital charges from the cost-of-service Water Delivery rate would provide distinction recognizing that the capital charge is used solely for repayment of the debt of the Central Arizona Project for which all citizens of its three-county service area benefit regardless of whether they physically receive water from the canal. Such language would provide more balanced direction or policy in helping future Boards better consider how to use a combination of taxes, capital charges, and the Basin Development Fund to make that repayment.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The AMWUA Management Board is encouraged to ask questions and provide feedback regarding the discussion of the CAWCD Rate Setting Policy.
Water Quality Standards Proposal for Non-Project Water under the System Use Agreement

STRATEGIC PLAN REFERENCE

Objectives – Prepare for Impacts of Drought & Shortage; Minimize Financial Impacts
Collaboration – Central Arizona Project; Bureau of Reclamation; Southern Arizona; Salt River Project; Gila River Indian Community

SUMMARY

The Central Arizona Water Conservation District (CAWCD) had requested proposals for a water quality standard for non-project water put in the Central Arizona Project (CAP) canal. In an effort to develop a consensus proposal among stakeholders, AMWUA facilitated meetings among the AMWUA cities, Southern Arizona utilities, Apache Junction, the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), and the Salt River Project (SRP). On September 12, 2017, the proposal was presented to the CAWCD Task Force.

At last month’s meeting, the AMWUA Management Board was shown a condensed version of the presentation given to the CAWCD Task Force. The AMWUA Board of Directors was given the same presentation at their September 28, 2017 meeting.

The Water Quality Group met again on September 20, 2017 to determine how we could best address questions raised by the CAWCD Task Force. Specifically, what can be done to address the difference between Central and Southern Arizona on the issue of not-to-exceed parameters for discharge. The Group considered a concept that establishes maximum discharge levels based on rationale scientific reason. The Group is doing some calculations with the concepts to determine if the concept would be acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION

The AMWUA Management Board is encouraged to ask questions and provide feedback regarding the Work Group’s water quality standard for non-project water in the CAP canal.