

DRAFT 4TH MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS

From William Collings, PAMA GUAC Vice Chairman

General Comments

The current draft of the 4th Management Plan unlike the previous version promulgated in 2017 appears to be intended as primer or planning guide prepared primarily for the benefit of the general public and ADWR Staff versus a document intended as a regulatory tool for the benefit of the Pinal AMA regulated water community that has had the experience of the preceding three management plans. This draft is overly wordy with numerous redundant sections repeated throughout the document as well as within each Chapter.

Chapter Two: Hydrology

2.3 Surface Water Resources

On Page 2-3 within the 3rd Paragraph: The McCellan Wash does not join with the Santa Cruz Wash at Picacho. It is on the north side of Picacho Peak and runs northwest, east of the City of Eloy where it dissipates and is dispersed in various channels through cultivated farm fields.

The Santa Cruz Wash runs on the South Side of Picacho Peak and northwesterly to the south of Eloy and the Casa Grande Mountains before trending north to join with the North Branch of the Santa Cruz Wash to the west of the City of Casa Grande.

The 4th paragraph on Page 2-4 needs to be updated to acknowledge that the flows in the Santa Cruz Wash have been intercepted by the Green Wash at Sasco Road west of Red Rock.

Chapter Three: Water Demand and Supply

3.2.7 Tribal Sector

The last paragraph on Page 3-15 does not acknowledge the use of treated CAP water by the Ak-Chin Community for domestic potable water consumption.

If the Ak-Chin Community used an average of 73,200 AF of CAP water per year for crop irrigation and the 2017 cumulative total of CAP water use by all tribal entities per Table 3-6 was 75,219 AF was there only 2,019 AF of CAP Water used by the Gila River Community in 2017?

Summaries of the 2017 estimates of Tribal agricultural volumes totaling 150,221 AF do not equate to the Table 3-6 2017 152,847 AF summarization of totals.

In Table 3-7 why is the offsets to Groundwater Pumping in 2106 only 8,107 AF when the year prior and the year following both 461,206 AF? And, why was it exactly the same in 2015 and 2017 when this situation did not occur in any other year?

Chapter 4: Agricultural

4.3.1. Base Program

In the last sentence of the first paragraph the reference to Section 4.8 should be revised to Section 4.7.

7.1.2 Calculation of Water Duties

Under the heading of 'Other Needs' the last sentence which states "For the fourth management period, no crops grown in the PAMA were identified as needing water for other needs". This sentence should be either deleted or revised. Melons have historically been grown in areas south of the Ak-Chin Reservation, and vegetable crops are currently being grown in the area north and south of the Maricopa City Hall which are identified in Appendix 4A as having "Other Needs" of 0.5 AF and 0.5 to 2.44 AF respectively.

Chapter Five: Municipal

5.1 Introduction

In the 1st sentence of the 1st paragraph change the word "possible" to feasible to be consistent with usage in Chapter One, Section 1.1 'Introduction', and for clarity – something maybe possible but not necessarily feasible (like putting a person on Mars).

5.1.2 Municipal Conservation Programs – History and Background

The Modified Non-Per Capita Conservation Program (MNPCCP) from the 3rd Management Plan becomes the new NPCCP for the 4th Management Plan. Why are all Designated Providers who were being regulated under the original NCPCCP program being automatically transitioned to the Total GPCD program if they can petition the Director for approval to be under the NPCCP Program? The cited A.R.S. § 45-567(A)(2) which states "May include in each plan, if feasible, additional conservation requirements for non-irrigation uses and intermediate conservation requirements, which shall apply subject to section 45-567.01." does not specifically create or require this change. This new requirement with respect to existing Designated Providers seems to be unnecessary and a waste of the Department's and Designated Providers' administrative time and energy.

5.2.3 Role of the Assured Water Supply Program in the Municipal Conservation Program

Amend the last paragraph of this section to identify the groundwater allowance volume as the result of the 2007 modification to the AWS Rules for the PAMA.

5.3.4 Conservation Requirements for New Large Municipal Providers

The date in the first sentence needs to be changed from January 1, 2000 to January 1, 2023 to be consistent with the 5-601. Definitions - Item 30. definition of a "New Large Municipal Provider" and Item 5-605.C.1.

5-601. Definitions

The Item 27. definition of a "Municipal Provider" needs to be expanded to include Co-ops, Domestic Water Improvement Districts, and mobile home parks to be consistent with the discussion in the 1st paragraph of Section 5.1.1.

5-605 Non-Per Capita Conservation Program

Under Subsection B. Provider Profile – Contents; Review; Approval or Disapproval, Item 1.a., there needs to be a definition of "water use patterns". Additionally the 'and' between "service area characteristics" and "water use patterns" needs to be changed to an 'or' to be consistent

with Item B.1.e, Subsection B.2., Subsection D.1.b., Subsections D.4.b. and D.6.b., and Subsection E.4.

5-606 Consolidation of Municipal Provider Service Areas

If two DWIDs that are currently regulated as small municipal providers merge in to one political entity but the two service area remain physically and geographically separate will the new DWID continue to be treated as a small provider with respect to the two separate service areas?

Chapter Six: Industrial

6.2.1 PAMA Industrial Sector Description

On Page 6-4 in the first paragraph it states that peaking power plants and mining were lumped into the “other” category because “historical volumes have been much lower than the other sectors.” Yet in Figure 6-1 and Table 6-2 the “Other” category after the year 2000 tends to be more significant than the Feed Lot and the Sand and Gravel categories especially post 2007. This disparity should be addressed.

On Page 6-4 in the 3rd Paragraph it states that in 2017 25 dairies reported using 9,116 AF of water which conflicts with Sub-section 6.2.2.5 “Dairies” which states that in 2017 24 dairies used 9,116 AF. Which number is correct?

This paragraph goes on to state that “most (dairies) being located south of Casa Grande and west of Eloy” which is inconsistent with figure 6-3 shows that the dairies are fairly equally distributed east and west of the City of Casa Grande, trending to the northwest toward the City of Maricopa and to the northeast toward Coolidge and Florence with only one on the south side of the City of Eloy.

6.2.2 Industrial Water Use Profile

This section should quantify what the amount or percentage of reduction is in the conversion of an IGFR to a Type 1 GFR.

6.2.2.1 Turf Related Facilities

The first paragraph states that there are 51 turf related facilities, but the sum of turf facilities referenced in the 2nd paragraph is 48. Which number is correct?

The 3rd paragraph states that there are no golf courses irrigated with CAP water. This statement does not appear to be correct. The Arizona Water Company provides 1000 AF per year of CAP water to the Francisco Grande Golf Resort.

6.2.2.4 Large Scale Power Plants

This section states that there are two electrical power plants located in the PAMA which are considered municipal users along with one peaking plant. However, Figure 6-3 only shows one power plant, (SRP’s Desert Basin Plant) in Casa Grande and a peaking power plant south and east of Coolidge. This discrepancy needs to be corrected.

6.3.5.1 Steam Electric and Combined-Cycle Power Plants

In the first paragraph there is a typographical error. In the last sentence it should state ...cooling process so long as this stream (not steam) does not have a negative impact....

Chapter Seven: Water Quality

7.1 Introduction

The statement “most of the groundwater supplies in the PAMA meet Federal and State Drinking Water Standards, though a small number of wells have exceeded the EPA National Primary Drinking Water Regulation Limits for Nitrates and Fluoride” is significantly out of date. Since the EPA lowered the Maximum Contaminant Level for Arsenic in 1997 from 50 parts per billion (ppb) to 10 ppb numerous systems have had to install arsenic removal systems. Nitrates levels have been rising through out the central portion of the AMA with more systems having to install nitrate removal equipment or being on the verge of having to do so.

7.5.1 Assessment Goals and Objectives

The comprehensive water quality assessment included in the 3rd Management Plan was prepared from data collected in the 2nd Management Plans is outdated and should not be relied upon for the 4th Management Plan. It should be redone prior to performing a qualitative assessment for the 4th Management Plan.

Chapter 9 Water Management Assistance (WMA)

9.2 Description:

Who determines when “preserving existing agricultural economies in the PAMA” is no longer feasible – the farming community or the Department – and how will this determination be made?

9.2.2 Augmentation

What augmentation studies have been initiated or conducted by ADWR or others, what cost sharing grants for augmentation projects has ADWR issued and what planning and technical support has ADWR provided for water management strategies within the PAMA since 1984? Summarize in a table.

9.2.3 Monitoring and Assessing Water Availability

Provide specific examples of how the sited information and data has been used in support of bullet points.

9.2.4 Pinal County Water Augmentation Authority (PCWAA)

This Section needs to be expanded to identify that funding is at the discretion of the director and cannot, per Statute, exceed \$200,000.

9.3.1 Ground Water Withdrawal Fees

Need to include a Table 9-2 that summarizes annual WMA fees collected from annual surcharge from permits for interim ground water used in bodies of water, application fees for underground storage facility permits, groundwater savings facilities permits, water storage permits and recovery well permits. If none so state.

9.4.1 Second Management Period

Provide a list with descriptions of all funded WMAP projects during 2nd Management Plan that were included in the of 3rd Management Plan.

9.3 Funding

This section needs to be updated to reflect current fund allocations post DCP versus the \$0.50 shown in table 9-1.

9.4.2 Third Management Period

Why is the AMWUA water awareness month interactive website listed as being funded by Pinal AMA WMAP monies? The use of PAMA pump tax funds is not permitted by Statute for projects outside of the Pinal AMA.

9.6.1 Identifying Priority Projects

How are “Members of the water using community” selected and by whom?

9.6.2.C. Grant

Same question as for Section 9.6.1.

9.6.2.D. Direct Use by ADWR

How is this use of AMA funds publicly noticed to the PAMA water community?

9.6.5 GUAC Role in the WMAP

This whole section is dis-ingenuine. To my knowledge of the six bullet points listed the Pinal GUAC has not been given the opportunity to participate on four of them since I joined the GUAC in 1994. These include the following:

- Provide input and recommendations about the goals and priority focus areas for the PAMA
- Assist ADWR in selecting general project ideas for funding prior to the solicitation of applications or proposals
- Identify sets of criteria for evaluating proposals and contracts
- In coordination with ADWR, participate in selecting evaluators for grants

9.6.6 Criteria Used to Evaluate Projects

To my knowledge ADWR has never solicited input from PAMA GUAC on criteria for RFGA's or RFPs.

Chapter 10 Implementation

10.2 Notice of Conservation Requirements and Compliance Dates

In numerous places within precious chapters, it is stated the certain submittals must be made to ADWR by July 1, 2022 and be in compliance with 4th Management Plan requirements by January 1, 2023. But not once are these dates sited in this sub-section (or any other sub-section of this chapter.) Why is that? And why aren't they?

10.7.1 Education and Assistance

Second paragraph of this section appears to be the only place within the Draft Management Plan where use of AG Flex credits is discussed.

Appendix 10A

No where in this Section are Analyses of Assured Water Supply discussed or mentioned

1. Groundwater Pumpage

- a) Committed Demand

How do Analyses of Assured Water Supply factor into committed demand and the overall water balance circulation?

- b) Groundwater allowance through 2025 – same issue with respect to AAWs

On Page 10-11 In the water balance calculations, how is “Preserving Future Water supplies for Non – Irrigation uses” computed and quantified when the AMA is already in an overdraft condition? How far in the “Future” is the future considered to be “so as to preserve sufficient future water supplies for non-irrigation uses”? 100 years? 200 years? 500 years?

Chapter Eleven: Water Management Strategy

11.2 Water Management Challenges

Is this a Department administrative end run to force “Safe Yield” in what the 3rd Management Plan defined as a “Planned Depletion” AMA?

Who determines the extent and method to “preserve a sufficient future water supply for non-irrigation uses”? Based on the discussion in this sub-section it appears that the Pinal regulated water Community and stakeholders will not have any significant input into the process with all major planning decisions being made by the Department.