



2036 N Gentry
Mesa, AZ 85213
Telephone: (480) 890-1927
E-mail: teresa@makprosvc.com
Web: www.WestValleyWater.org

WEST VALLEY WATER ASSOCIATION (formerly WESTCAPS)
PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

Summary of the February 9th, 2017 Planning Committee Meeting held at Reclamation, 6150 W Thunderbird Road, Glendale. **Throughout this meeting summary, action items are in bold font.**

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Mark Holmes, Vice-Chair (Acting Chair)
Jake Lenderking, EPCOR
Ron Whitley, City of Buckeye
Christine Nunez, City of Surprise

Robert Romo, Arizona Water Company
Lacey James, City of Avondale
Douglas Frost, City of Phoenix
Gary Gin, City of Phoenix

INTERESTED PARTIES

John Rasmussen, Reclamation
Deborah Tosline, Reclamation
Jay Corum, Reclamation
Nathan Miller, Southwest Groundwater
Steve Noel, Southwest Groundwater
Sandra House, City of Glendale

Angie Lohse, CAP
Heide Kocsis, ASLD
Don Breeding, Maricopa Water District
Kaylee Colter, FCDMC
Stuart Peckham, SRP

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:32pm.

2. Approval of Minutes

Christine Nunez moved to approve the meeting notes from the January 12, 2017 Planning Committee meeting, and Ron Whitley seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Reports

Executive Director's Report

Teresa Makinen said that the Management Committee approved the name change to the West Valley Water Association, so she will make that transition for any documents and the website. Teresa then shared that the legal folks held a telephone conference where they reviewed the by-laws for the organizational structure change, which will need to go to the Management Committee for final review, and then Gust & Rosenfeld can begin the incorporation paperwork. It was noted that the Planning Committee has already approved the by-laws and incorporation, so it now up to the Management Committee to decide. Next, Teresa shared the WESTCAPS cost-share report, and **encouraged all members to send in hours to be included.**

Treasurer's Report

Mark Holmes said that he feels the Treasurer's Report can be changed to quarterly, rather than monthly and asked for thoughts from the members. Jake Lenderking agreed, saying it doesn't really change that significantly from month to month, other than payments to the Director, and there were no other comments. Christine Nunez moved to approve the change in the Treasurer's Report from monthly to quarterly. Jake Lenderking seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Jake shared the Treasurer's report, noting the account balance is \$35,000.

4. BOR Report

John Rasmussen provided a handout, and walked through the four key tasks of the Basin Study, noting that we are currently working on the first task of Supply and Demand. Information provided to Nathan Miller is already being input in the model, and we will receive a technical memo from them that will be attached to the final report. With the Groundwater Model, the purpose of the scenarios is to address areas of problems.

John said that we'll need to avoid incorporating adaptation and mitigation strategies into our initial scenarios. John said it is not well defined where we start and stop doing that. Our overall purpose is to compare what the future would look like if we did no mitigation, compared to a future with mitigation measures. John said we need an assessment of what data we input, and how the model results affect the way we actually input data for the next run, mentioning that we may not know what to do with effluent, that we may have too much volume for a recharge basin, causing us to want to expand our recharge basin, which is a mitigation measure. John asked how that should be handled. Task 2 evaluates results and John feels there is a need for discussion of how we are going to evaluate and prioritize the results. This will be needed to address Task 3, which is developing adaptation and mitigation strategies, the major part of the study. The final report due date is June 30, 2018. Task 4 is the trade-off analysis. Finally, John said he has been talking to Denver Reclamation office and we are on the priority list schedule for this year.

Discussions regarding how to record future information to avoid putting mitigation measures into our scenarios came up, and Gary Gin shared that one issue was that a city was looking at projections, saying that their effluent water was being underreported and wanted to properly represent that data. Nathan shared that the CAP:SAM model numbers are not intended to cover all of the effluent data. The amount projected by the model is to be used to meet part of the supply and demand. For all entities, there is more effluent than what is showing. They are inputting data based on emails from each entity, then they calculated what effluent should be generated each year and allocations of that are all based on the entity's answer. They assign those volumes to different USF recharge facilities up to their capacity, or their known physical capacity. Nathan asked, what do we want to do with that with this model; do we leave it as unassigned? The results of the model may identify the need for recharge basins to handle that volume and do we input that now or not. Jake Lenderking shared that in the West Valley is it difficult to assume what volumes should be at, and that the results of the study indicating we need more recharge basins would be a valuable part of the study and so should not be included at first. Christine Nunez feels it should be identified as an amount unassigned, and that would support our recharge site analysis. Mark Holmes said that the Groundwater Model and the CAP:SAM model have differences; the CAP:SAM model takes a certain portion of effluent water as part of the water supply portfolio and directly delivers it as a portion of their reclaimed water. It doesn't account for recharged water, bank credits, etc., and the model has to put the water somewhere. You can put the water into a primitive volume, and there is little space left for recharging in the West Valley. What are we going to do with the new reclaimed water, and no recharge facilities. This is the crux of what we are trying to fix right now, and how will people read this report since the CAP:SAM is different. The model has other accounting that is different than the CAP:SAM.

Deborah Tosline asked if the Agua Fria might be a potential location for recharge; there was a study on it for Title 16 as a linear recharge study, and she said she could forward the link for the group. Additional discussion included quantifying numbers and addressing direct uses would need to be inputted into the model.

Teresa asked if this was the first of the CAP:SAM results, this isn't either of the two scenarios reflecting central growth vs. spread-out growth. Nathan said that we would do it for every scenario, they have a draft spreadsheet where every entity calculated total demand, like 40%, where each of that goes into the model and it goes to the capacity of the recharge facility. Gary Gin said going back to individual cities, there is a flat line after the 20 years and to keep it at capacity, and then as growth occurs, you are going to generate more reclaimed water which will need to have a bucket account to account for that growing volume of effluent. Gary asked, so shouldn't the cities be looking at the supply and demand numbers to figure out what the effluent numbers would be in the future in each of the scenarios? Nathan said he can provide the total numbers/spreadsheet and how it is divided out to Teresa so she can send on and everyone can take a look.

Discussions included how demand fluctuations affect volume of effluent, climate control, drought management measures, supply and demand changes, growth scenario changes, the demands would change with a hotter drier climate, and housing unit assumptions. Teresa asked if the baseline was run, and if the climate information from Denver was integrated yet. Nathan said not yet, he needs more information from Ken first and then it will be ready to run. Nathan shared that there will be striking differences with the scenarios, for instance the Buckeye demand doubles in the outward growth scenario. They have generated effluent numbers for the baseline run, and will do that with the other scenarios and send them out to the group. Gary asked for instructions along with the spreadsheet showing that all the rules are all the same so all know what they are doing, with highlighted cells to make it easy to focus on for revisions. Nathan may just make a short list of assumptions, because there is more than one data set, for each scenario and each category. Teresa clarified that each city and each private water provider will have to look at this data, make their changes in a timely manner and return them. Gary said yes, there is really no other way to do it. Nathan will boil it down so that it is just a handful of cells. Discussions included what the model already considers, how helpful the spreadsheet will be for future planning, and making sure we annotate how we got here. Nathan will check with Ken to go over his questions and minor loose-ends to tie up along with a couple of errors that need to be addressed. **Teresa asked Nathan if the spreadsheet could be sent out by mid-next week, and Teresa asked all if they could turn it back around within one week. All were in agreement.** Mark pointed out that the CAP:SAM and the Groundwater Model are different.

5. Strategic Planning Update

Team 1 – Lacey James shared that the Management Committee approved the organization's name change to West Valley Water Association and asked when will the name change officially take effect. Teresa said that she will start sending out all documents reflecting the change and that West Valley Water Association is already on the by-laws and articles of incorporation.

Team 2 – Mark Holmes shared that the team is going to meet soon, and Mark will provide updates during the March meeting.

6. Legislative/Regulatory Update

None shared.

7. New Business
Having already notified the Management Committee via email, Teresa said that she was invited to a meeting with the West Valley Mayors and Managers on February 14th to do a ten-minute presentation on why the West Valley Water Association, formerly known as WESTCAPS, is considering moving to a 501(c)(4) organization. Mark Holmes will join her.
8. Call to the Public
None
9. Member Updates
Members wishing to provide information to the committee did so.
10. Next Meeting and Adjourn
There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:52 pm. The next Planning Committee meeting will be held on March 9th, 2017 and will be scheduled a little longer for a review of the model results.