5th Management Plans
Municipal Subgroup Meeting
September 14, 2020
• Opportunity to provide input and feedback on items discussed in the meeting
• Questions are optional so you can choose what you’d like to provide input on
• Responses will be posted anonymously on our 5MP Concepts Webpage
• Please respond by 9/21/2020

Link to Google Form Questionnaire: https://forms.gle/g9Y6wj5pky4Pu8dFA
I. Welcome

II. Municipal Non-Per Capita Conservation Program (NPCCP) Revisions
   A. Provider Tiers
      i. Tier Structure
      ii. Number of Best Management Practice (BMP) Points Required per Tier
   B. BMP Accounting
   C. Category Requirements
   D. Planning Category

III. Guest Presentation: Integrated Water and Land Use – Benefits and BMP Potential – Erin Rugland, Research Fellow, Babbitt Center for Land and Water Policy

IV. Initial Discussion of the Gallons Per Capita Per Day (GPCD) Program
   A. Overview of GPCD Program
   B. Initial Discussion of Potential 5th Management Plans GPCD Program Updates

V. Closing Remarks
Municipal Subgroup

NPCCP Summary
* Provider Tiers
  * Proposed tier structure
  * Proposed BMP points requirements per tier
* BMP Points
  * Proposed to continue with BMPs being worth multiple points
* BMP Categories
  * Proposed requirement to earn points from a minimum number of categories per tier
* Planning Category
  * Discussed draft Planning Category and Planning BMPs

Next Steps for Future Meetings:
* GPCD
  * Data update – Non-Residential Components
  * Alternative Program(s)?

GPCD Summary
* Introducing GPCD Program Discussions
* Requesting any ideas or proposals

Next Meeting:
November 4, 2020 – 10am
Municipal Non-Per Capita Conservation Program Revisions
Do you think it would be useful to have different implementation requirements by tier for some BMPs?

**Category 1: Education and Public Awareness**

BMPs in this category are designed to raise awareness of the need for water conservation or to educate and/or train a specific audience on water conservation practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point(s) Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Implementation and Reporting Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.1 Local or Regional Conservation Campaign | The water provider actively participates in an advertising or social marketing campaign to raise awareness of the need for water conservation and to encourage the efficient use of water. The campaign must reach local or regional customers using methods such as traditional media (television, radio or print), websites, social media, and promotional materials (e.g., brochures, vehicle wraps, bookmarks, magnets, etc.). | To receive credit for this measure:  
• a tier 1 provider must reach local customers and utilize at least one method of advertising media  
• a tier 2 provider must reach local customers and utilize at least two methods of advertising media  
• a tier 3 provider must reach regional customers and utilize at least three methods of advertising media  
• a tier 4 provider must reach regional customers and utilize at least four methods of advertising media  
The provider must submit documentation with its CER that describes the campaign, the methods of advertising media utilized, how many customers it reached, and the results. |
Options for the 5MP NPCCP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>Prescott &amp; Tucson 4MPs</th>
<th>Phoenix, Pinal, &amp; Santa Cruz 4MPs</th>
<th>Options for 5MPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tiers</strong></td>
<td>Tier 1: 1 BMP Tier 2: 5 BMPs Tier 3: 10 BMPs</td>
<td>Tier 1: 3 points Tier 2: 8 points Tier 3: 15 points</td>
<td>• Decide how many tiers and how many service connections per tier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BMP Points</strong></td>
<td>Each BMP is treated as equal</td>
<td>Certain BMPs may be worth multiple points</td>
<td>• Each BMP treated as equal • Certain BMPs worth multiple points • Decide point requirements per tier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Requirements</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>• Points must come from a minimum number of categories • Assign minimum/maximum point requirements per category • Other/None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which option is your preferred tier proposal?

- Proposal 3A
- Other

20% 80%
## Options for the 5MP NPCCP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>Prescott &amp; Tucson 4MPs</th>
<th>Phoenix, Pinal, &amp; Santa Cruz 4MPs</th>
<th>Options for 5MPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tiers</strong></td>
<td>Tier 1: 1 BMP</td>
<td>Tier 1: 3 points</td>
<td>• Decide how many tiers and how many service connections per tier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tier 2: 5 BMPs</td>
<td>Tier 2: 8 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tier 3: 10 BMPs</td>
<td>Tier 3: 15 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BMP Points</strong></td>
<td>Each BMP is treated as equal</td>
<td>Certain BMPs may be worth multiple points</td>
<td>• Each BMP treated as equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Certain BMPs worth multiple points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Decide point requirements per tier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Requirements</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>• Points must come from a minimum number of categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Assign minimum/maximum point requirements per category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Other/None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Each BMP treated as equal
- Certain BMPs worth multiple points
- Decide point requirements per tier
- Points must come from a minimum number of categories
- Assign minimum/maximum point requirements per category
- Other/None
• Responses were split

• ADWR proposes to keep the BMP point structure

• Reevaluate point structure effectiveness in Post-2025 groundwater management

Are you in favor of each BMP being treated as equal (in terms of points)? Or would you prefer that certain BMPs be worth multiple points?

- Certain BMPs worth multiple points 40%
- All BMPs treated as equal in terms of point values 50%
- Some kind of hybrid of the two where a utility can have a diverse set of BMP some of which are weighted differently based on effort, time, and complexity. 10%
## Options for the 5MP NPCCP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>Prescott &amp; Tucson 4MPs</th>
<th>Phoenix, Pinal, &amp; Santa Cruz 4MPs</th>
<th>Options for 5MPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tiers</strong></td>
<td>Tier 1: 1 BMP Tier 2: 5 BMPs Tier 3: 10 BMPs</td>
<td>Tier 1: 3 points Tier 2: 8 points Tier 3: 15 points</td>
<td>• Decide how many tiers and how many service connections per tier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BMP Points</strong></td>
<td>Each BMP is treated as equal</td>
<td>Certain BMPs may be worth multiple points</td>
<td>• Each BMP treated as equal • Certain BMPs worth multiple points • <strong>Decide point requirements per tier</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Requirements</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>• Points must come from a minimum number of categories • Assign minimum/maximum point requirements per category • Other/None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BMP Points Requirements per Tier

**Fourth Management Plans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Connections</th>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Required Number of BMP Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 5,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 – 30,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001 +</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fifth Management Plans Proposal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Connections</th>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Required Number of BMP Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001 – 5,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 – 30,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001 +</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4th Management Plans**

| Total Available BMP Points | 65 points |

**DRAFT 5MP Appendix 5C**

| Total Available BMP Points | 71 points |
## Options for the 5MP NPCCP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>Prescott &amp; Tucson 4MPs</th>
<th>Phoenix, Pinal, &amp; Santa Cruz 4MPs</th>
<th>Options for 5MPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tiers</td>
<td>Tier 1: 1 BMP</td>
<td>Tier 1: 3 points</td>
<td>• Decide how many tiers and how many service connections per tier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tier 2: 5 BMPs</td>
<td>Tier 2: 8 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tier 3: 10 BMPs</td>
<td>Tier 3: 15 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP Points</td>
<td>Each BMP is treated as equal</td>
<td>Certain BMPs may be worth multiple points</td>
<td>• Each BMP treated as equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Certain BMPs worth multiple points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Decide point requirements per tier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category Requirements</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>• Points must come from a minimum number of categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Assign minimum/maximum point requirements per category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Other/None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the responses received, ADWR is proposing that BMP points be earned from a minimum number of categories determined by the provider’s tier.
## BMP Points Requirements per Tier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Connections</th>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>2018 average number of categories BMPs were earned from</th>
<th>Fourth Management Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 5,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 – 30,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001 +</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Connections</th>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Number of categories that BMP points must be earned from</th>
<th>Fifth Management Plans Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 or more categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001 – 5,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 or more categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 – 30,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 or more categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001 +</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 or more categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Received support for the inclusion of a planning category

• ADWR is proposing to move forward with brainstorming and developing this BMP category
Guest Presentation: *Integrated Water and Land Use – Benefits and BMP Potential*
Integrated Water and Land Use

Benefits and BMP Potential

Erin Rugland
Research Fellow
Babbitt Center for Land and Water Policy
Babbitt Center & Our Work

• Research
  o Establish and evaluate best practices for linking land and water management

• Technology Innovation
  o Advance development and adoption of adaptive management approaches to address connected land and water management challenges

• Partnerships
  o Develop and improve technical assistance efforts

• Education & Training
  o Improve mechanisms for identification and dissemination of best practices
Water and Land Use: The Missing Link

• Historical disconnect between water and land use
  o Water: regulated at state and federal level
  o Land: regulated by local government
  o Siloed departments

  75% of planners indicated that they were not involved enough in water planning and decisions. (APA Water Working Group, Water Survey 2016).

• Separation at many levels
  o Separate commodities and property rights
  o Impacts of local development may not impact that community’s water source
Why Is Land Important When Looking At Water Scarcity?

• Land use decisions are made every day that shape our water future
  o Development influences water demand
  o Need to plan for development with water constraints in mind

• Coordination of land and water use decisions is critical if we are to meet the current and future water needs of our people, economy, and environment
Why Integrate Water and Land Use Planning?

1. Land use planning and development approval influence water use initially
   a) Build water smart from the start

2. Long-range planning and development approval processes are two important points of collaboration
   a) Meaningful input from water providers at these stages make all the difference

3. All providers can collaborate with land use authorities
   a) Size or capacity are not automatically inhibiting factors to collaboration

4. Value of technical assistance & tools
   a) The more resources providers have to work with, the better
Planning Category - Background

- Requested by 5th Management Plan stakeholders
  - In a follow-up survey, 78% of respondents supported the inclusion of a Planning BMP

- Desire to have the Planning Category better defined
  - Making plans, implementing plans, zoning requirements, building permits?
    - The proposed category will have a range of actions for aspects of land use planning, development, and building
  - Associated water savings
    - The direct link of water savings gained from land use integration is not definitively studied except for a few cases
    - Another perspective is to consider the saved time, cost, and efficiencies of making a water-efficient development from the outset, rather than having to pay for additional conservation measures later on
Planning Category – Proposed Framework

• **Land Use Planning and Water Utility Coordination and Communication**
  - Originally “Industry and/or Regional Partnerships”
  - Land use authority and water provider meet regularly, document these meetings with CER annual reports

• **Staff Education or Training**
  - New addition
  - Staff from either the water provider or associated land use authority attend an educational program related to integrated water and land use planning/management

• **Non-Residential Water-Use Plan**
  - Originally “Non-Residential Water-Use Plan Requirement”
  - Same as original with an addition about consideration of land use planning within these Water-Use Plans
Planning Category – Proposed Framework

• Integrated Long-Range Planning
  o New addition
  o Menu of options: General Plan, Capital Improvement Plans, Sustainability/Resilience/Climate Plans, Hazard Mitigation Plans, One Water/IWRMPs
    ▪ General Plan: existing AZ requirement for water in the General Plan, calculate water use by land use type in zoning maps and proposed zoning changes, water-efficient land use forms, use of zoning for water, water-efficient development
  o Water is included in at least 3 of these plans for credit

• Conservation Oriented Development
  o New addition
  o Menu of options related to implementing and/or incentivizing water-efficient buildings
    ▪ LEED, WaterSense, model homes, low impact development, green infrastructure, developer incentives, water budgets, landscape/irrigation requirements
Land Use BMP – Proposed Framework

- **Water Demand Adaptive Management and Shortage Response**
  - New addition
  - Menu of options for Drought Mitigation Planning, programs for reducing water demand more easily if needed in the face of drought, shortage, etc.

- **Water Supply Diversity**
  - New addition
  - Menu of options for diversifying water supply portfolios: recharge and recovery, groundwater modelling, regional collaboration

- **Formalization of Water Efficiency Requirements**
  - New addition but pulls from existing BMPs
  - Adopting water-efficient ordinances, codes, or regulations;
  - Removing conflicting regulations; or
  - Adding water efficiency into development planning and approval processes
Next Steps

- Continue discussions with stakeholders about the proposed Planning Category and BMPs through:
  - Municipal Subgroup Meetings
  - Municipal Subgroup Questionnaires
  - Written and/or emailed comments

- Utilize stakeholder input to continue drafting and refining the proposed category and BMPs
Q&A
Erin Rugland
erugland@lincolninst.edu
602.393.4300
Overview of the Gallons Per Capita Per Day (GPCD) Program
A.R.S. § 45-563 (A)

“The director shall develop a management plan for each initial active management area for each of five management periods... and shall adopt the plans only after public hearings... The plans shall include a continuing mandatory conservation program... designed to achieve reductions in withdrawals of groundwater.”
Limited to large designated providers

Uses a formula to set a GPCD target for each provider.

- Amount of water withdrawn, diverted or received by the provider for non-irrigation use is compared to GPCD target to determine compliance.

Program has been relatively static over time, with some adjustments to reduction strategy between Management Plans.

Statutory language is relatively vague

- “Reasonable reductions in per capita use”
- “Additional conservation requirements for non-irrigation uses”
What is counted?

- “…water from any source, except direct use reclaimed water and reclaimed water recovered within the area of impact, for non-irrigation use…”

  (Draft Phoenix AMA Fourth Management Plan, Section 5-603(A))

- Excludes some effluent
- Includes spill (Note: this is a change from 3MP)

* Flexibility provision

* Annual notice of targets and compliance
Calculation –
4th Management Plan GPCD Targets
4MP GPCD Targets

GPCD Requirement will be the default unless:

Default < Minimum $\rightarrow$ Minimum
Default > Maximum $\rightarrow$ Maximum

* Default = Median of total GPCD from 2000-2009
* Minimum = 132 gal/HU + 40 gal/person + 3MP Non-Residential component
* Maximum = 3MP Final GPCD requirement

See Appendix 5A for all details and values
Discussion and Request for Feedback: 5MP GPCD Program Updates

Bare Minimum

* Updates to Non-Residential Component used in calculating targets
  * Would be pulled from existing data/reports

What else?

* Establishing target
* Establishing minimums
* Establishing maximums
* Other components or considerations?
Closing Remarks
Municipal Subgroup

NPCCP Summary

* Provider Tiers
  * Proposed tier structure
  * Proposed BMP points requirements per tier
* BMP Points
  * Proposed to continue with BMPs being worth multiple points
* BMP Categories
  * Proposed requirement to earn points from a minimum number of categories per tier
* Planning Category
  * Discussed draft Planning Category and Planning BMPs

Next Steps for Future Meetings:

* GPCD
  * Data update – Non-Residential Components
  * Alternative Program(s)?

GPCD Summary

* Introducing GPCD Program Discussions
* Requesting any ideas or proposals

Next Meeting:

November 4, 2020 – 10am: GPCD
MPWG Subgroups

{All meeting info is available at new.azwater.gov/5MP/meetings}
Questions?

managementplans@azwater.gov

Management Plans Work Group:
new.azwater.gov/5MP

Full Text of Management Plans:
new.azwater.gov/ama/management-plans

Natalie Mast
nlmast@azwater.gov (602)771-4646