

July 31, 2019

Einav Henenson
Area Director, Statewide Active Management Area
Arizona Department of Water Resources
1110W Washington St
Phoenix, AZ 85007

ehenenson@azwater.gov

Re: Comments on Draft Phoenix Active Management Area
Fourth Management Plan

Dear Area Director Henenson:

As you requested, I have reviewed the Draft of the Phoenix Active Management Area Fourth Management Plan dated July 11, 2019. These are my comments on the Draft.

I also have a few very minor questions and suggestions on the draft for your consideration that do not merit lengthy discussion. I would like to discuss these very briefly with you either over the phone or by visiting you in your office. Alternatively, I would be happy to talk with the staff person responsible for the draft, if you believe that is preferable.

Let me start by saying that I believe the Draft is excellent. It is surprisingly readable and clear for a document which must be technical and regulatory. It is well organized and communicates with good supporting data. For a draft, it is remarkably free of typos, incorrect references and other errors.

These are my comments:

1. I understand the events that bring us to the Fourth Management Plan (4MP) at this date and I support the approach of promptly improving and updating the Third Management Plan while focusing significant change and redirection to the Fifth Management Plan (5MP). In preparing for the Fifth Management Plan, you may also want to use the Fourth Management Plan to gather data and encourage water community discussion of potential 5MP strategies. I was pleased to note that you have done this in several places in this Draft and I support this approach.
2. Table 3 – 8 on pages 3 – 18/19 is very significant. The overdraft demands attention. To deal with it, it is important to understand its source. In reviewing the text and charts regarding the Agricultural, Municipal and Industrial sectors, it was not clear how each sector was involved in the overdraft. Some charts seemed to even depict net recharges

to the aquifer. I do not believe that the Plan should vilify, but it is important to take fair and appropriate action in the specific area(s) where an overdraft is occurring. I hope I have misunderstood the Draft identified the Draft or somehow missed this discussion.

3. Early in the draft, maps are shown in a third of a page or half of a page format. They are unreadable. While this is a simple presentation issue, if the maps are important enough to include, they should be legible. Map(s) 6 – 3 on pages 6 – 9 and 6 – 10 are easily readable and contribute significantly to the presentation. These useful maps are shown in full page format. Why not use full page format for all maps or, if they don't merit the space to be understandable, delete them.
4. It would be valuable for the Fifth Management Plan to evaluate whether the Non Per Capita Conservation Program (NPCCP) works. Maybe it would be better to evaluate what is working in the NPCCP. It has been in place for enough time that it can be evaluated. It may be a huge success. If it has shortcomings, the Fifth Management Plan may be the place to make improvements. At this stage of the Fourth Management Plan, it probably does not make sense to try to include an evaluation in the 4MP.
5. With some exceptions, the Municipal sector is discussed as a conglomerate. Separate regulations are identified only for large and small municipalities. In reality, there are many different situations and conditions. ADWR has historically done well in considering general differences in regulatory processes. As we move to the 5MP it may make sense to consider separate groups of municipalities which share similar supply, demand and growth issues. Different situations may call for differing regulatory, conservation and assistance approaches. This probably needs to wait for the 5MP.
6. The unnumbered table on page 5 – 29 lists the number of required Best Management Practices (BMP) for Municipal providers. Large providers are required to implement many more BMP's than smaller providers. This is rational and I am not proposing a change. However, shouldn't we also consider the situation the provider is in? Regardless of size, shouldn't a provider who is heavily dependent on groundwater, who is in a declining aquifer and/or a cone of depression or in a heavy growth situation without apparent new water sources, be required to take more aggressive action than a provider who has multiple water sources and reliable access to renewable sources? As with other comments I have made, I am not sure that such a change could be considered in time for the 4MP.
7. Section 9.5.1 has an excellent list of water conservation and evaluation needs for the Phoenix AMA. The section goes on to suggest identifying WMAP priorities upon adoption of the 4MP. This is an excellent idea that has so much merit that it should be considered, perhaps in a simplified way, for WMAP funds even prior to 2023.
8. The section on recharge is excellent. Among its strengths is that it identifies the limited availability and capacity of percolation recharge sites. It also discusses the need for further progress in injection recharge. Some current recharge sites are located in drainage ways that result in underground water flows through existing river systems. This water ends up in water-logged areas or areas that already have sufficient access to water. Further, work is necessary to locate future recharge sites in areas with declining groundwater levels or cones of depression.

Again, I believe the Draft 4MP is excellent. I hope my feedback is useful. I hope to have the opportunity to discuss some other minor points over the phone or in person. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Frank Fairbanks

Frank Fairbanks
2708 N 21st Ave
Phoenix, AZ 85009

frankonline@cox.net