



---

302 North 1st Avenue, Suite 300 ▲ Phoenix, Arizona 85003  
Phone (602) 254-6300 ▲ FAX (602) 254-6490  
E-mail: mag@mag.maricopa.gov ▲ Web site: www.mag.maricopa.gov

December 6, 2007

TO: Members of the MAG Water Quality Advisory Committee

FROM: Roger Klingler, City of Scottsdale, Chair

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTICE AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Thursday, December 13, 2007 - 4:00 p.m.  
MAG Office, Suite 200 - Saguaro Room  
302 North 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, Phoenix

Please park in the garage underneath the building. Bring your ticket to the meeting; parking will be validated. For those using transit, the Regional Public Transportation Authority will provide transit tickets for your trip. For those using bicycles, please lock your bicycle in the bike rack in the garage.

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), MAG does not discriminate on the basis of disability in admissions to or participation in its public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting Jason Stephens at the MAG office. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

Members of the MAG Water Quality Advisory Committee may attend in person, by videoconference or by telephone conference call. Those attending by videoconference must notify the MAG site three business days prior to the meeting.

Please be advised that under procedures approved by the MAG Regional Council, all MAG committees need to have a quorum to conduct the meeting. A quorum is a simple majority of the membership. If you are unable to attend the meeting, please make arrangements for a proxy from your entity to represent you.

## TENTATIVE AGENDA

### COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED

1. Call to Order

2. Agenda Announcements

3. Call to the Audience

An opportunity will be provided to members of the public to address the Water Quality Advisory Committee on items not scheduled on the agenda that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG, or on items on the agenda for discussion but not for action. Members of the public will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. A total of 15 minutes will be provided for the Call to the Audience agenda item, unless the Water Quality Advisory Committee requests an exception to this limit. Please note that those wishing to comment on action agenda items will be given an opportunity at the time the item is heard.

4. Approval of the October 22, 2007 Meeting Minutes

5. Public Hearing - Draft MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Comprehensive Amendment for the Town of Buckeye

On October 22, 2007, the Committee authorized a public hearing on the Draft MAG 208 Plan Comprehensive Amendment for the Town of Buckeye. This hearing is being held, in accordance with State and Federal law, to discuss the Draft 208 Amendment and to accept public comments.

The Draft Comprehensive Amendment for the Town of Buckeye proposes 18 wastewater treatment facilities to serve the Town of Buckeye Municipal Planning Area including five of the six existing facilities, six

2. For information.

3. For information.

4. Review and approve the October 22, 2007 meeting minutes.

5. For information and public hearing.

planned facilities, and seven future facilities. One of the future facilities would ultimately replace the need for the existing Arizona State Prison Complex (ASPC)-Lewis Wastewater Treatment Plant. The ultimate proposed capacity for the Town of Buckeye Municipal Planning Area would be 241.2 million gallons per day. The Town plans to maximize opportunities for the reuse and recharge of treated effluent from the facilities. In addition, each of the facilities has or may obtain an Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AZPDES) Permit for discharges into Waters of the United States, except for the ASPC-Lewis Wastewater Treatment Plant.

The project is located within three miles of the Town of Gila Bend, City of Glendale, City of Goodyear, City of Surprise, Town of Wickenburg, and unincorporated Maricopa County. Five of the six entities have indicated no objections. On October 11, 2007, the City of Surprise provided a letter stating that it does not object to the general intent of the amendment; however, it has strong objection regarding the eastern boundary of the Buckeye Municipal Planning Area. At the October 22, 2007 MAG Water Quality Advisory Committee meeting, the City of Surprise indicated that Buckeye and Surprise would work to resolve the boundary issue over the following 60 days.

6. Draft MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Comprehensive Amendment for the Town of Buckeye

The Town of Buckeye is requesting that the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan be amended to incorporate the changes outlined in the Comprehensive Amendment for the Town of Buckeye. The amendment proposes 18 wastewater treatment facilities to serve the Town of Buckeye Municipal Planning Area including five of the six existing facilities, six planned facilities, and seven future facilities.

6. Recommend approval of the Draft MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Comprehensive Amendment for the Town of Buckeye.

7. Draft MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Amendment for the City of Goodyear Sonoran Valley Planning Area

On February 26, 2007, the City of Goodyear sent a letter to MAG requesting that the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan be amended to include four water reclamation facilities (WRFs) for the Sonoran Valley Planning Area. The State Land WRF would have an ultimate capacity of 4.75 million gallons per day (mgd) and serve the northern developable area. The Southern Region WRF (SRWRF) would be sized to serve the southern developable area and have an ultimate capacity of 24 mgd. In addition, there would be two satellite WRFs in the southern developable area that would serve as the initial facilities while flows are low. As flows increase, the Section 23 WRF (S23WRF) and Section 28 WRF (S28WRF) may transition into scalping plants once the SRWRF is constructed. The S23WRF and S28WRF would each have an ultimate capacity limited to 0.6 mgd with the excess flows being routed to the SRWRF for treatment. Reclaimed water from the four facilities would be disposed of through reuse, recharge, and AZPDES Permit discharge points to the Waterman Wash. The project is located within three miles of the City of Avondale, Town of Buckeye, City of Maricopa, the Gila River Indian Community, and unincorporated Maricopa and Pinal Counties. To date, five of the six entities have indicated no objections.

The Committee will be requested to authorize that a public hearing be conducted on the Draft 208 Plan Amendment. Please refer to the enclosed material.

8. Call for Future Agenda Items

The Chairman will invite the Committee members to suggest future agenda items.

7. For information, discussion, and possible authorization to conduct a public hearing on the Draft MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Amendment for the City of Goodyear Sonoran Valley Planning Area.

8. For information and discussion.

MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
WATER QUALITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Monday, October 22, 2007  
MAG Office Building  
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Roger Klingler, Scottsdale, Chair	# Stephen Bontrager, Peoria
* Marilyn DeRosa, Avondale	Robert Hollander, Phoenix
Lucky Roberts, Buckeye	Jim Swanson for Rich Williams Sr., Surprise
Jacqueline Strong, Chandler	David McNeil, Tempe
Dennis Teller, El Mirage	Kevin Chadwick, Maricopa County
Lonnie Frost, Gilbert	John Boyer, Pinnacle West Capital
Chris Ochs, Glendale	Jim Kudlinski for Ray Hedrick, Salt River Project
David Iwanski, Goodyear	Erin Taylor, U of A Cooperative Extension
# Bill Haney, Mesa	

\*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

#Attended by telephone conference call.

OTHERS PRESENT

Steve Borst, Town of Buckeye	Greg Leman, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation
Scott Lowe, Town of Buckeye	Mario Saldamando, City of Goodyear
Lori Brown, Town of Buckeye	Tanya Luedke, CMX
Garry Hays, Henderson Law Firm	Pam Steehler, CMX
Rocco Pontrelli, City of Glendale	Toni Bonar, CMX
Don Kile, Goldfield Preserve	Asha D'Souza, CMX
Lynsi Waggoner, Goldfield Preserve	Meredith Madsen, CMX
Carole Klopatek, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation	Sheila Logan, CMX
Vivian Saunders, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community	Bo Song, CMX
Kari Morehouse, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community	Kevin Kammerzell, CMX
Ray Jones, ARICOR Water Solutions	Lee Storey, Moyes Storey
Edwina Vogan, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality	Julie Hoffman, Maricopa Association of Governments
Larry Landry, Landry, Creedon & Associates	Harry Wolfe, Maricopa Association of Governments
Michelle Lehman, City of Surprise	Jason Howard, Maricopa Association of Governments
Wendy Riddell, Berry & Damore	Alana Chavez, Maricopa Association of Governments
John Rodriguez, C. Improvement District	Nathan Pryor, Maricopa Association of Governments

1. Call to Order

A meeting of the MAG Water Quality Advisory Committee was conducted on Monday, October 22, 2007. Roger Klingler, City of Scottsdale, Chair, called the meeting to order at approximately 10:00 a.m. Bill Haney, City of Mesa, and Stephen Bontrager, City of Peoria, attended the meeting via telephone conference call.

2. Agenda Announcements

Chair Klingler provided an opportunity for member agencies to report on activities of interest in their agencies.

3. Call to the Audience

Chair Klingler provided an opportunity for members of the public to address the Committee on items not scheduled on the agenda that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG or items on the agenda for discussion but not for action. No members of the public indicated that they wished to address the Committee.

4. Approval of the September 17, 2007 Meeting Minutes

The Committee reviewed the minutes from the September 17, 2007 meeting. Chris Ochs, City of Glendale, moved and David Iwanski, City of Goodyear, seconded, and the motion to approve the September 17, 2007 meeting minutes carried unanimously.

5. Draft Small Plant Review and Approval for the Preserve at Goldfield Ranch Water Reclamation Facility

Garry Hays, Henderson Law Firm, gave a briefing on the Draft Small Plant Review and Approval for the Preserve at Goldfield Ranch Water Reclamation Facility (WRF). He introduced those working on the project that were in attendance. Mr. Hays stated that the project covers 1,680 acres and is located off the Beeline Highway, surrounded by the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation and Tonto National Forest. He mentioned that the land was acquired by the Goldfield Preserve, LLC in March 2005 and there has been communication with all stakeholders involved. Mr. Hays indicated that the Town of Fountain Hills adopted a resolution in June 2007 and had a letter signed by the Town Manager that consented to the formation of a domestic water improvement district or county improvement district which will ultimately serve this area. He stated that there was a lot of discussion with the Town of Fountain Hills.

Mr. Hays stated that the application was filed with the Maricopa County Environmental Services Department for sponsorship. He mentioned that once the application reached MAG, MAG staff noticed that the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRPMIC) had not been contacted. Mr. Hays indicated that they had made their best efforts to get the information to the SRPMIC and have been available for discussion. He added that there has been significant discussion with the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation since August 2005 up to one and one-half weeks ago. He noted that they wanted to keep the Nation apprised of the situation since they are the closest neighbors. Mr. Hays stated that he was before the Committee one and one-half years ago and not happy with an

amendment. In that case, the Committee indicated that the amendment was technically sufficient and moved the amendment forward. He stated that the document before the Committee today is also technically sufficient and should move forward. Mr. Hays requested an opportunity at the end to respond to any issues or comments.

Sheila Logan, CMX, provided an overview of the Draft Small Plant Review and Approval for the Preserve at Goldfield Ranch WRF. She discussed that the facility is going through the Small Plant Review and Approval Process since the capacity is proposed at 0.4 million gallons per day (mgd). The requirements for the Small Plant Review and Approval Process is that the ultimate capacity of the facility be 2.0 mgd or less and have no Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AZPDES) Permit discharge. She discussed the project site, which is located in unincorporated Maricopa County, approximately six miles east of Fountain Hills. Ms. Logan indicated that the development includes four parcels of land; however, the water reclamation facility would only serve parcel A. The proposed facility would be located in the west half of Section 15 of Township 3 North, Range 7 West. She presented the proposed development land plan. Ms. Logan stated that parcels A through D encompass about 2,079 acres. She discussed the land use plan for parcel A. The number of dwelling units in parcel A would be 983 with a population of 3,146 at buildout. Ms. Logan stated that the ultimate capacity of the facility would be 0.4 mgd.

Ms. Logan discussed the complete-mix treatment process proposed for the facility, which was selected given its ease of operation and somewhat simple design. She indicated that the effluent produced would be Class A+ quality. Ms. Logan mentioned that effluent produced would be recharged, groundwater injection to the lower alluvial unit. She stated that the available hydrogeologic information shows that the site has three hydrogeologic units. The upper unit is an alluvium of unconsolidated silt, sand, and gravel. The middle layers consists of siltstone, claystone, and limestone. Ms. Logan noted that the middle unit forms a confining layer. She indicated that the lower fanglomerate unit is semi-consolidated and fractured and would be the target aquifer for the production of groundwater for the community and also to accept the groundwater recharge. Due to the confining layer, the Verde River to the east is not thought to be hydraulically connected to the lower alluvial unit.

Ms. Logan stated that the Preserve at Goldfield Ranch WRF would be operated under the Goldfield Preserve Improvement District, which was approved by the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors in August 2007. She indicated that operation and maintenance would be contracted to a Grade 3 licensed operator. Ms. Logan added that the Goldfield Preserve Development, LLC would be responsible for construction and initial operation of the facility. She also discussed the required permits for the project.

Chair Klingler inquired about the boundary for the Preserve at Goldfield Ranch and other developments in the area. Ms. Logan referred to the map that shows the limit of private ownership. She stated that there is an island between the Tonto National Forest and Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation. Ms. Logan indicated that the Rio Verde Utilities are located approximately seven miles north of the project. Chair Klingler asked if the dark area shown on the map is the boundary of private land, not land owned by this company. Ms. Logan replied that is correct. The remaining parcels of land within the boundary are part of the original Goldfield Ranch community, but not part of the Preserve at Goldfield Ranch community. The Preserve at Goldfield Ranch is represented as parcels A, B, C, and D shown on the map. Chair Klingler inquired about the location of State land

recently purchased in the area. Ms. Logan responded that the State land purchased by the developer is located approximately six miles east and is not part of this project.

Chair Klingler inquired about the area to be served by the facility. He asked if any homes in the original Goldfield community would be served. Ms. Logan discussed the topography of the area. She indicated that the existing homes are being served by septic systems. Ms. Logan stated that there may be limited opportunity for homes located next to parcel A to be served by the facility; however, it would be at the homeowners expense to connect to the system. She noted that the opportunity is limited economically and by topography. Chair Klingler asked about the maximum flows of the facility. Ms. Logan replied that the 0.4 mgd facility would serve parcel A, based on the County guidelines of 3.2 persons per dwelling unit and 100 gallons per capita.

John Boyer, Pinnacle West Capital, commented on the facility disposing of effluent through only recharge. He inquired about the plan for the effluent if the plant or the pumps break down. Ms. Logan responded that there will be a provision in the plant design to contain the contents of the plant. She referred to the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) requirements for plants with no discharge. Mr. Boyer asked if there would be a pond or lagoon. Ms. Logan replied that they have not progressed to that level of engineering design. She stated that it would be an emergency situation and does not believe it could be a pond. Ms. Logan mentioned working with ADEQ and Maricopa County to meet the requirements.

Chair Klingler asked if there would be a golf course associated with the development. Ms. Logan replied no. Chair Klingler asked if the distance to Fountain Hills is about six miles. Ms. Logan responded that is correct.

Robert Hollander, City of Phoenix, inquired about the location of the Verde River in relation to the project. Ms. Logan responded that the Verde River is approximately three to four miles west. Mr. Hollander asked if filtration will be incorporated into the design of the facility. Ms. Logan replied that filtration is required for Class A+ effluent. Mr. Hollander asked about a site map that shows where the treatment plant would be located and a site plan for the facility. He inquired about where the various treatment structures would be located on the site. Ms. Logan responded that she does not have the information available; however, they have been working on it. She referred to a map in the presentation that showed the proposed location of the facility within the development. Ms. Logan discussed the setbacks and indicated that the area for the facility would be approximately 400 feet by 600 feet, excluding the setbacks.

Lucky Roberts, Town of Buckeye, inquired about the plan during the wet season, when effluent may not be able to be recharged. Ms. Logan responded that groundwater injection is the proposed method of recharge. She indicated that the wet season would not be a factor when injecting into the lower alluvial unit.

Lonnie Frost, Town of Gilbert, referred to Section 2.2 of the document where it indicates that industrial users are not planned or anticipated. He asked if commercial users such as restaurants or grocery stores are anticipated. Ms. Logan replied that there is the potential for a resort to be included in the land plan. Mr. Frost inquired about any additional restaurants or stores planned other than at

the resort. Wendy Riddell, Berry & Damore, responded there would be no other traditional commercial or industrial uses associated with this project. She stated that there is the potential for a special use permit to have a resort/spa and it is reasonable to expect that there would be some restaurant facilities incorporated with it on a limited basis. Mr. Frost indicated that one of the issues for the Town of Gilbert in terms of pretreatment is not industrial users but commercial users discharging into the system. Ms. Riddell indicated that part of the reason for amending the Development Master Plan for this site is to eliminate commercial.

Mr. Frost commented on the proposed well injecting reclaimed wastewater directly into the same aquifer as the development will be pulling from for drinking water. Ms. Logan indicated that there is a minimum separation that is required and all of those standards will be met through coordination with the Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR) and ADEQ. She stated that the quality of the effluent is required to meet drinking water standards through the Aquifer Water Quality Standards. Ms. Logan mentioned that it is a practice that is done valley-wide. She stated that the groundwater that would accept the effluent would not be adjacent to the groundwater well that draws potable water.

Chair Klingler asked for clarification that filtration would be used to meet the Class A+ standard. Ms. Logan replied that is correct. Chair Klingler inquired about additional advanced treatment before injection. Ms. Logan responded that they are in the process of conducting the conceptual design for the facility and it would be an option if needed to meet the requirements.

Mr. Frost requested clarification on proposing that the water being recharged will meet drinking water standards. Ms. Logan replied that the effluent would meet the Aquifer Water Quality Standards which are in essence the same as the Safe Drinking Water Act Standards.

Jim Kudlinski, Salt River Project, commented on injection of the effluent as the only option being considered. He inquired about reuse. Ms. Logan responded that the intent is to recharge 100 percent of the effluent. She added that this is not to say they would not try to recover groundwater and use it for irrigation. Mr. Kudlinski inquired about any potential offers for reuse of the effluent. Ms. Logan replied that due to the remote location, any opportunity for reuse would be limited to this development. She indicated that they have opted to forgo the installation of purple pipe and install localized wells for irrigation where needed.

Jim Swanson, City of Surprise, inquired if treatment will include UV or chlorine. He asked how they will account for trihalomethane (THM) production and its impact on meeting the Drinking Water Quality Standards if chlorine would be used. Mr. Swanson asked if they have accounted for the cost of removing THM and any operational costs. Ms. Logan replied that they have not proceeded with the plant design to determine if UV or chlorine will be used. She indicated that it is her understanding in working with ADEQ that the point of compliance would likely be at the discharge of the plant. She stated that is where the monitoring for those components would take place. Ms. Logan indicated that they will have to work through the issue when they proceed with the permits and design of the plant.

David McNeil, City of Tempe, referred to language in the document and inquired about the level of site specific geotechnical work that has been done to determine if recharge is a workable alternative for discharge. Ms. Logan responded that the hydrogeologic study that has been conducted to date for this site is included in Appendix G of the document and was filed as part of the assured water supply application. She added that there has been pumping and testing on the site.

Lee Storey, Moyes Storey, stated that the hydrogeologic study was conducted by Southwest Ground-water Resources which looked at technical data from wells drilled in parcels A and C. Southwest Ground-water Resources also looked at hydrologic studies that have been conducted on site since 1985 along with other hydrologic studies in order to prepare for the application to ADWR. Ms. Storey added that as part of that study, a lot of the data that was done historically was confirmed and reconfirmed which deals with the confining layer. She indicated that the confining layer is about 400 feet thick between the upper and lower alluvial. Ms. Storey stated that from day one, due to the sensitivity to the neighbors and water rights issues in the state, there was a decision made to go to a groundwater source that was approved by ADWR to be the sufficiently and hydrologically available and physically and continuously available for 100 years. She mentioned that prior to that study, because of the sensitivity to neighbors and claims of the connection between aquifers, the decision was made to look to the lower aquifer. She indicated that when the studies are completed about the receipt of the recharged effluent at Class A+ quality, it may take four or five wells. Ms. Storey stated that it will be clearly defined when it gets to that technical level of study.

Mr. Frost commented that Section 2.3 of the document states that UV radiation will be used to disinfect the water. He referred to the correspondence from Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation which indicates that a couple parcels of land have been acquired between parcels A and B. He asked if bringing the two parcels together to be served by the facility is being considered. Mr. Hays replied that only parcel A would be served by the facility and remaining parcels would be on septic systems.

Chair Klingler asked how deep the recharge well would need to be to get to the lower alluvial unit. He inquired about the depth to groundwater. Ms. Logan responded that the depth to groundwater is approximately 300 feet. The lower alluvial unit is about 700 feet to 750 feet.

Mr. Frost commented that there are some anomalies in the number of units to be served when comparing the work of the hydrologist to other work presented. He also commended the Preserve for their water use plan. Mr. Hays stated that the Development Master Plan currently in place with Maricopa County calls for about 2,000 units, a golf course, and commercial. He indicated that there is an amendment in place that will cut almost half of the residential units, remove the golf course and reduce the water budget by 65 percent. Ms. Storey stated that the water budget demand reduction is from 2,600 acre feet per year to 732 acre feet per year at buildout with the conservation requirements, but not taking into account the offsets from recharge. Chair Klingler asked if the project is within the Phoenix Active Management Area and if the acre feet per year is referring to groundwater. Ms. Storey responded that is correct.

Chair Klingler recognized public comment from Dr. Carole Coe Klopatek, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation. Dr. Klopatek indicated that the document includes the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation's October 2, 2007 letter that was submitted to Maricopa County in regard to this plant. The letter

referred to wastewater recharge and financial matters and substantial concerns that fall within the purview of MAG and the Committee. She indicated that the opinion of the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation is that the developer's proposal is not in compliance with the process outlined by MAG. Dr. Klopatek added that they believe the developer has not adequately addressed their concerns either directly or indirectly through the County. She stated that the County has not directly responded to the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation letter. Dr. Klopatek indicated that the developer has stated that it is unnecessary to confer with the Nation; however, the MAG 208 Plan states that the review and comments of those whose Small Plant Planning Area is within three miles of the proposed plant location or service area must be accomplished. She stated that the Nation is an adjacent community with its own Municipal Planning Area and operates and provides community service akin to any municipality; therefore, respect, consideration, and consultation, with the Nation must be given at each phase of this development. Dr. Klopatek indicated that thus far there has not been any communication in regard to the small plant operation. She mentioned that the developer did provide the Nation with a copy, but it was done so in courtesy.

Dr. Klopatek stated that there are some quotes that they did put forth that she would like to discuss including the lack of information on the operational feasibility and permitting capability of the plant. She indicated that there were no hydrological/geologic considerations or feasibility studies to determine if materials will enter Waters of the U.S. Dr. Klopatek referred to the earlier presentation and stated that the Nation disagrees with the findings that there are two confining layers and that there are three aquifer units. She mentioned that the drilling logs in the analysis of assured water supply submitted by the developer do not confirm their previous statements. Dr. Klopatek commented on ADWR not using that data when providing a letter on the analysis of assured water. She indicated that ADWR approved the analysis, but did not give the developer an assured water supply. Dr. Klopatek referred to the diagram presented in terms of the different parcels included in the Preserve at Goldfield Ranch. She stated that parcel E was considered in the wastewater master plan and is referred to in several other versions of the document. Dr. Klopatek stated that the developer does have two other parcels that have been purchased. She discussed the MAG 208 Plan being a planning tool. Dr. Klopatek indicated that those two parcels purchased would connect parcels A and B so there would no longer be a disjunct. She stated that part of the process is to look at this and determine the best use of the land. Dr. Klopatek mentioned the use of septic systems and stated that having a disconnect in terms of topography is no longer a valid assumption. Chair Klingler thanked Dr. Klopatek for her comments.

Chair Klingler recognized public comment from Vivian Saunders, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community. She thanked the Committee for the opportunity to provide comments on behalf of President Diane Enos. Ms. Saunders stated that the document includes a letter that CMX sent to SRPMIC dated October 9, 2007. She noted that the SRPMIC was given less than eight working days to conduct their own research and provide an adequate response regarding this project for today's meeting. Ms. Saunders indicated that the State Board of Geographic Names gave them 90 days to provide comment on whether to change the name of Piestewa Peak. She stated that this project requires much dedication to analysis and providing a response. Ms. Saunders mentioned that the SRPMIC has not had an opportunity to sit down with the developer. She indicated that they are concerned about effluent discharge into the Verde River. Ms. Saunders stated that the SRPMIC estimates that the project is 1.7 miles to the Verde River and one mile to Sycamore Creek, tributary

to the Verde River. She mentioned that the location of the Goldfield Ranch project and the Verde River is a concern. Ms. Saunders stated that the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community respectfully requests postponement of this matter until they have had time to research and sit down with the developer. Chair Klingler thanked Ms. Saunders for her comments.

Chair Klingler recognized public comment from Larry Landry, Landry, Creedon & Associates. Mr. Landry stated that he has represented the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community since 1995. He indicated that nothing in this alluvial fan and water area is simple. Mr. Landry mentioned that he would like to echo comments made by Ms. Saunders and Dr. Klopatek. He asked if anyone would want to comment on something this complex given the hydrology and flow of the area in less than 10 working days. Mr. Landry stated that is not real consultation. He commented on the applicant not knowing where the Verde River and Sycamore Creek, tributary to the Verde River, are located and stated that is not good consultation with the neighbors either. Mr. Landry indicated that he would echo that the Committee postpone this item. He stated that there are a lot of questions.

Mr. Landry mentioned that the SRPMIC has dealt with issues of discharge with the Town of Fountain Hills and have found through dialogue that the issues can be worked out. He indicated that nothing in this area is as easy as it seems. Mr. Landry stated that the City of Scottsdale, Salt River Project, and the SRPMIC are all part of the coalition to try and protect the Verde River. He mentioned that the Verde River is a major water source and a riparian habitat for bald eagle nesting. He stressed that the Verde River is very important for water supply. Mr. Landry asked that the Committee not recommend approval at this time. He requested a process of really looking at these issues. Mr. Landry mentioned that a mistake in this area is major. He stated that the rush of judgement should not be upon the Committee and there is significant evidence from the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation that there are concerns. Mr. Landry indicated that there is a government within three miles that has not had the opportunity to comment. He mentioned that the application may be okay, but at this time it would be a rush to judgement. Mr. Landry asked for postponement and stated that the SRPMIC would like time to meet with the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation and look at their research as well as meet with the applicant. Chair Klingler thanked Mr. Landry for his comments.

Chair Klingler stated that public comment cards have also been received from Ms. Riddell, Ms. Storey, and Don Kile, Goldfield Preserve. They requested to speak after discussion.

Mr. Hays referred to comments made by Mr. Landry and Ms. Saunders. He indicated that the application was submitted to the Maricopa County Environmental Services Department and then forwarded to MAG. Once the application reached MAG, MAG staff noticed that the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRPMIC) had not been contacted. Mr. Hays stated that he then contacted the office of Mr. Landry 10 to 15 times. He indicated that since they spoke with MAG staff about the SRPMIC being within three miles, they have been trying to contact the SRPMIC to set up a meeting. Mr. Hays mentioned that he was not successful in getting a response. He added that the Goldfield Preserve has asked for several meetings and are available to meet at any time. Mr. Hays suggested that the item move forward to the MAG Management Committee in November. He added that he will set up an appointment with the SRPMIC right away.

Ms. Riddell discussed the contact that Goldfield has had with the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation. She indicated that she has been involved in the process since 2005 when escrow was first opened on the property. Ms. Riddell stated that one of the first things Goldfield did was sit down with the Nation and discuss the plans. She indicated that the Nation has been a valuable stakeholder throughout the process. Ms. Riddell mentioned that she has material that outlines the different dates when Goldfield has met with the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation. She stated that the 208 document was delivered to the Nation in May 2007 and there was no response for over four and one-half months. Ms. Riddell indicated that a letter was not received from President Bear until Goldfield called him to move the process along. She mentioned that the letter stated that the Nation received the 208 document, it was under review, and they reserve the right for comments at a later time. Ms. Riddell stated that within a 48 hour period the comments and concerns were received. She indicated that Maricopa County immediately forwarded the comments to Goldfield and responses were provided within days. Ms. Riddell mentioned that Goldfield continues to be very responsive to the Nation and trying to address its concerns. She reiterated that Goldfield has been meeting with the Nation on this process for over two years.

Ms. Storey stated that they do know where the Verde River, Sycamore Creek, and Salt River are located. She indicated that it has been part of the consciousness of the community from the beginning. Ms. Storey mentioned that Goldfield has been in negotiations with the Salt River Project since it had concerns earlier in the process when the project originally called for 2,600 acre feet of water supply. She stated that the Salt River Project and the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation were told in discussions that in going forward with this application, Goldfield would not exceed the water budget that was approved by ADWR in 1985. Ms. Storey stated that the amount of acre feet has been decreased to less than 732 acre feet of water for the entire development project. She added that there will be no discharge into the Verde River, which requires a different process. Ms. Storey indicated that the goal is to recharge and utilize all of the Class A+ quality effluent. She mentioned that communication with the local communities has to and will continue. Ms. Storey stated that she is proud to be part of the project since Goldfield has been sensitive to these issues since the beginning.

Chair Klingler referred to a map in the presentation and inquired about the distances to the Verde River and Sycamore Creek. Ms. Storey replied that it is approximately two miles to the Verde River from the project, but that is the upper aquifer. She indicated that Goldfield is talking about the lower aquifer and there is a confining layer for about 400 feet. Ms. Logan stated that Figure 1 in Appendix A of the 208 document shows the Verde River to the west of the site. She mentioned that the distance to the Verde River for the proposed treatment plant location it is approximately two and one-half miles. Ms. Logan added that the Sycamore Creek is upgradient of the project. The Salt River is also depicted on Figure 1 and ranges from one and one-half to two miles south of the southern property boundary.

Chair Klingler asked Mr. Kile if he would like to speak at this time. Mr. Kile indicated that he did not wish to speak.

Mr. Swanson asked if Maricopa County received comments from the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation and Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community prior to the issuance of its letter. Mr. Hays

replied that Maricopa County did receive comments from the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, but not SRPMIC. He indicated that SRPMIC were not notified until after the Small Plant Review and Approval was submitted to MAG. Kevin Chadwick, Maricopa County, stated that verbal comments were received from the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation prior to sending out the letter of sponsorship; however, written comments were not received until afterwards. He added that Maricopa County did not receive any comments or provide a letter to the SRPMIC.

Mr. Hays stated that Maricopa County is sponsoring the Small Plant Review and Approval for the Preserve at Goldfield Ranch WRF. He indicated that Maricopa County is not rescinding its letter. Mr. Hays mentioned that the Small Plant Review and Approval is a planning document and a way to amend the MAG 208 Plan. He discussed the various permits and procedures still in the future for the project. Mr. Hays stated that this is the first step in a long process and it is important to move forward. He mentioned that Goldfield will continue to work with the Indian Communities. Mr. Hays stated that one and one-half years ago he stood before the Committee on a different matter and said that he did not want the project to move forward and the Committee indicated that the project met the requirements and moved it forward. He asked the Committee to do the same today.

Mr. Hollander stated that he is accustomed to seeing more detail on the design plans, treatment, and disposal. He acknowledged that it is a sensitive area where the small facility is being proposed. Mr. Hollander indicated that he is inclined to recommend that the Committee look at the project further before approval.

Mr. Boyer echoed the comments made by Mr. Hollander. He stated that he was looking for at least a layout of the design and some indication that Goldfield had taken into account what would happen if there was down time and how the water would get to the recharge site. Mr. Boyer commented on making sure the plant is designed properly to move forward. He added that it would take much time to prepare a plant layout and choose a methodology.

Ms. Roberts stated that since there are issues raised by the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation in an October 2, 2007 letter regarding wastewater recharge and financial matters related to the Preserve at Goldfield Ranch WRF she moved that the Committee table this item for 60 days to allow the applicant to work cooperatively with the Nation, a neighboring MPA, to address the concerns raised by the Nation in the October 2, 2007 letter. Mr. Hollander seconded the motion.

Mr. Chadwick stated that Maricopa County appreciates the issues that have been brought up, although the project meets the strict interpretation of the checklist in Table 4.52 of the MAG 208 Plan. He added that Maricopa County does appreciate the comments.

Chair Klingler asked for clarification on the motion just referring to the concerns of the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation. He indicated that the Committee has also heard from SRPMIC. Chair Klingler asked if part of the motion would also encourage discussion with the SRPMIC. Ms. Roberts responded that the motion would encourage discussion with everyone.

Chair Klingler stated that there appears to be some work to do on the technical details with the location of the plant and some of the contingencies. He acknowledged that this is an early phase;

however, there are some things the Committee typically sees. Chair Klingler mentioned further discussions. He indicated that there is the understanding that the applicant has been working with the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation since 2005; however, for this process, for only a small amount of time.

David Iwanski, City of Goodyear, asked how tabling the item for 60 days would affect the applicant. Mr. Chadwick stated that if the item is going to be tabled, it is important to clarify the possible changes. He indicated that the treatment plant layout has been mentioned and the comments from the Indian Communities. Mr. Chadwick discussed addressing the specific issues. Mr. Hays indicated that he is surprised by the motion to table for 60 days in dealing with the Nation. He stated that he heard that there are some technical details that need to be worked out and he feels that is appropriate. Mr. Hays mentioned that there is sufficient evidence to say that Goldfield has attempted to work with the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation for over two years. He indicated that he will set up an appointment with Mr. Landry after the meeting to brief the SRPMIC on the project. Mr. Hays suggested giving Goldfield two weeks to work on the technical issues and meet with the SRPMIC and bring the item back in two weeks. He added that two weeks would be the optimal amount of time for the applicant.

Ms. Riddell stated that there is a small amount of detail to provide and two weeks would be sufficient. She noted that both Indian Communities are in the room and the Committee has the commitment of Goldfield to meet with them and work through the issues.

Jacqueline Strong, City of Chandler, asked for clarification on the motion. She inquired about detailing the information to be brought back to the Committee. Ms. Strong noted that would be a change to the original motion. Chair Klingler stated that the motion is to delay the item for 60 days to have discussions with the Indian Communities and any other affected parties. He mentioned that the Committee could amend the motion to add that additional detail is needed. Chair Klingler stated that the applicant has heard the discussion of the Committee and has indicated that they can provide the additional detail. He mentioned that the Committee would need to determine if an amendment is necessary. Chair Klingler noted that no amendment was made. Chair Klingler called for a roll call vote on the motion, which passed with Mr. Chadwick, Mr. Ochs, and Mr. Iwanski voting no.

6. Draft MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Comprehensive Amendment for the Town of Buckeye

Ms. Logan provided an overview of the Draft MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Comprehensive Amendment for the Town of Buckeye. She indicated that the Town embarked on a process to plan for the future of its wastewater services within the Town's planning area over one year ago. Ms. Logan stated that the Town desired a consolidated regional plan that optimizes the collection systems, treatment facilities, and recharge and reuse opportunities. She mentioned that Buckeye also wants to maintain the opportunity for the Town to offer wastewater services to its residents. Ms. Logan discussed the population projections for the Town of Buckeye. She indicated that buildout for the Town may be about two million people. Ms. Logan discussed the Town of Buckeye Municipal Planning Area (MPA). She indicated that the area is approximately 590 square

miles with 426 square miles being developable. She added that about 331 square miles have been annexed by the Town. Ms. Logan stated that the current population is 49,000.

Ms. Logan indicated that the wastewater treatment facilities are broken into three categories within the amendment. She mentioned that the first category is existing facilities. These facilities have been constructed and include: Arizona State Prison Complex (ASPC)-Lewis Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP), which will ultimately be decommissioned; Central Buckeye WWTP; Festival Ranch WRF; Sundance WWTP; Tartesso West WRF; and Verrado WRF. Ms. Logan stated that the second category is planned facilities which are in some level of planning from being proposed to the Town to having an approved 208 Plan amendment. These facilities include: Anthem Sun Valley South WRF; Douglas Ranch WRF; Palo Verde Road WWTP; Tartesso East WRF; Town of Buckeye WRF at Cipriani; and Trillium WWTF. She mentioned that the third category is future facilities. This category includes facilities for areas that have not previously had an identified wastewater solution. These facilities are: Gila 85 WRF; Gila Hassayampa WRF; Gila Rainbow WRF; Gila Southwest WRF; Hassayampa North WRF; Sun Valley WRF; and Waterman Wash WRF. Ms. Logan indicated that the five existing, six planned, and seven future facilities would ultimately serve the Buckeye MPA. Combined, the facilities would have a capacity of 241.2 mgd at buildout.

Ms. Logan reviewed the considerations and assumptions in the amendment. She indicated that the land uses and populations were based on previous 208 amendments, where applicable, and the Town's General Plan that is under development. Ms. Logan discussed the water logged area in Buckeye, the municipal planning area boundaries, mechanisms for development and financing of the facilities, and optimizing groundwater recharge and reuse. Chair Klingler inquired about the size of the water logged area. Ms. Logan responded that the area is from approximately the Buckeye Canal to the Gila River.

Tanya Luedke, CMX, provided an overview of the facilities for the Buckeye MPA from north to south. She stated that the Festival Ranch WRF is an existing facility that has been approved for a capacity of 4.0 mgd. Ms. Luedke noted that a pending application to increase the capacity to 11.0 mgd has been submitted to the Town for sponsorship, but not to MAG. The Comprehensive Amendment for the Town of Buckeye proposes the ultimate capacity for this facility to be 17.3 mgd. She discussed the constructed capacity, current flows, and treatment system for the facility. The A+ quality effluent is disposed of through reuse, recharge, and an emergency AZPDES Permit discharge to the Wagner Wash.

Ms. Luedke discussed the Hassayampa North WRF. She indicated that it is a future facility that would have an ultimate capacity of 9.4 mgd and the A+ quality effluent would be disposed of through reuse, recharge, and potential AZPDES Permit discharges to the Hassayampa River and/or an unnamed wash tributary to the Hassayampa River.

Ms. Luedke presented the planned Douglas Ranch WRF. She discussed the Douglas Ranch WRF 208 amendment that has been submitted to the Town of Buckeye for sponsorship, but has not been submitted to MAG. She indicated that the Comprehensive Amendment for the Town of Buckeye being presented today proposes an ultimate capacity for the Douglas Ranch WRF of 31.9 mgd with the A+ quality effluent being disposed of through reuse, recharge, and an emergency AZPDES

Permit discharge to the Jackrabbit Wash. Ms. Luedke also provided the anticipated initial capacity and treatment process for the facility.

Ms. Luedke discussed the existing Tartesso West WRF that is located in north central Buckeye. The facility has been approved for a capacity of 18.0 mgd and this amendment is proposing to increase the ultimate capacity to 24.2 mgd. Ms. Luedke mentioned the constructed capacity, current flows, and treatment process for the facility. The A+ quality effluent is disposed of through reuse, recharge, and an emergency AZPDES Permit discharge to the Hassayampa River.

Ms. Luedke stated that the Anthem Sun Valley WRF is a planned facility that has been approved for a capacity of 4.5 mgd. She noted that this amendment is proposing that the capacity remain 4.5 mgd. Ms. Luedke discussed the anticipated initial capacity and treatment process for the facility. The A+ quality effluent would be disposed of through reuse, recharge, and an emergency AZPDES Permit discharge to the White Tanks Wash.

Ms. Luedke indicated that the Tartesso East WRF is also a planned facility that has been approved for a capacity of 9.6 mgd. She stated that this amendment is proposing that the ultimate capacity for the facility increase to 10.7 mgd. She mentioned the anticipated initial capacity and treatment process for the facility. The A+ quality effluent would be disposed of through reuse, recharge, and an emergency AZPDES Permit discharge to an unnamed wash upstream of the Flood Retardant Structure (FRS) #1.

Ms. Luedke discussed the planned Trillium West WWTF that has been approved with a capacity of 11.0 mgd. She noted that this amendment proposes an ultimate capacity for the facility of 3.2 mgd with A+ quality effluent being disposed of through reuse, recharge, and emergency AZPDES Permit discharges to the Hassayampa River and Wagner Wash. Ms. Luedke also provided the anticipated initial capacity and treatment process for the facility.

Chair Klingler inquired about why the ultimate capacity for the Trillium West WWTF was decreasing from 11.0 mgd to 3.2 mgd. Ms. Luedke replied that the natural boundaries of the developments and the topography lead to a smaller service area than what was proposed in the approved 208 amendment for the facility. Chair Klingler asked if the part of the service area being removed would then be served by another facility being described in this amendment. Ms. Luedke responded that is correct.

Ms. Luedke discussed the Sun Valley WRF. She indicated that it is a future facility that would have an ultimate capacity of 13.2 mgd and the A+ quality effluent would be disposed of through reuse, recharge, and potential AZPDES Permit discharges to the Hassayampa River and/or the White Tanks Wash.

Ms. Luedke stated that the Sundance WWTP is an existing facility in eastern Buckeye. The facility has been approved with a capacity of 8.9 mgd. She indicated that the Comprehensive Amendment for the Town of Buckeye proposes an ultimate capacity of 13.9 mgd and the disposal methods for the A+ quality effluent include reuse, potential future recharge, and AZPDES Permit discharges to

the Roosevelt Canal and/or Buckeye Canal. Ms. Luedke also mentioned the constructed capacity, current flows, and treatment process for the facility.

Ms. Luedke discussed the Verrado WRF which is an existing facility that has been approved for a capacity of 3.35 mgd. She noted that the facility is privately owned by Arizona American Water Company. Ms. Luedke indicated that this amendment would increase the capacity of the Verrado WRF to 3.6 mgd to include a neighboring development in the service area. She mentioned the constructed capacity, current flows, and treatment process for the facility. Ms. Luedke stated that the A+ quality effluent is going to be disposed of through reuse, recharge, and potential AZPDES Permit discharges to the White Tanks FRS #4 and Roosevelt Canal.

Ms. Luedke stated that the Town's main WWTP is the Central Buckeye WWTP. This existing facility has been approved for a capacity of 16.6 mgd. She indicated that the Comprehensive Amendment for the Town of Buckeye proposes an ultimate capacity of 45.8 mgd and the disposal methods for the A+ quality effluent include an AZPDES Permit discharge to the Arlington Canal and potential additional reuse opportunities. Ms. Luedke also mentioned the constructed capacity, current flows, and treatment process for the facility.

Ms. Luedke indicated that the Palo Verde Road WRF is a planned facility for western central Buckeye. She indicated that the facility has been approved for a capacity of 10.2 mgd and the ultimate capacity proposed in this amendment is 11.7 mgd with A+ quality effluent being disposed of through reuse, recharge, and emergency AZPDES Permit discharges to the Buckeye Canal, Roosevelt Canal, and Hassayampa River. Ms. Luedke also provided the anticipated initial capacity and treatment process for the facility.

Ms. Luedke presented the planned Town of Buckeye WRF at Cipriani. She discussed the Town of Buckeye WRF at Cipriani 208 amendment that has been submitted to the Town of Buckeye for sponsorship, which has not been submitted to MAG. She indicated that the Comprehensive Amendment for the Town of Buckeye being presented today proposes an ultimate capacity for the facility of 12.0 mgd with the A+ quality effluent being disposed of through reuse, recharge, and planned and emergency AZPDES Permit discharges to the Stone House Wash. Ms. Luedke also provided the anticipated initial capacity and treatment process for the facility.

Ms. Luedke discussed the Gila 85 WRF. She indicated that it is a future facility that would have an ultimate capacity of 9.1 mgd and the A+ quality effluent would be disposed of through reuse, recharge, and potential AZPDES Permit discharges to the Arlington Canal, Gila River, and/or the Hassayampa River.

Ms. Luedke stated that the Gila Hassayampa WRF is also a future facility that would have an ultimate capacity of 7.8 mgd and the A+ quality effluent would be disposed of through reuse, recharge, and potential AZPDES Permit discharges to the Arlington Canal, Gila River, and/or the Hassayampa River.

Ms. Luedke indicated that the ASPC-Lewis WWTP is an existing facility in western south Buckeye that is currently operated and maintained by the Arizona Department of Corrections. The facility

has been approved for a capacity of .75 mgd. Ms. Luedke stated that in initial conversations, the Department of Corrections has expressed preliminary interest in decommissioning the facility when public sewer service becomes proximal to the facility. She noted that this amendment discusses the facility ultimately being decommissioned. Ms. Luedke discussed the treatment process and current capacity of the facility. She indicated that the B+ quality effluent is currently being reused on site.

Ms. Luedke stated that the future Gila Rainbow WRF would most likely be the recipient of the flows from the ASPC-Lewis WWTP once it is constructed and sewer reaches to the area. She indicated that the Gila Rainbow WRF would have an ultimate capacity of 13.2 mgd and the A+ quality effluent would be disposed of through reuse, recharge, and potential AZPDES Permit discharges to the Gila Bend Canal, Rainbow Wash, and/or Gila River.

Ms. Luedke discussed the Gila Southwest WRF. She mentioned that it is a future facility that would have an ultimate capacity of 7.5 mgd and A+ quality effluent would be disposed of through reuse, recharge, and potential AZPDES Permit discharges to the Gila Bend Canal or Gila River.

Ms. Luedke stated that the Waterman Wash WRF is a future facility that would be located in eastern south Buckeye. The facility would have an ultimate capacity of 2.2 mgd and the A+ quality effluent would be disposed of through reuse, recharge, and a potential AZPDES Permit discharge to the Waterman Wash.

Ms. Logan discussed the plans for effluent disposal at the wastewater treatment facilities. She indicated that there are currently three underground storage facility permits that have been issued by ADWR within the Buckeye MPA. Ms. Logan presented the location of additional recharge opportunities that may be explored in the future. She mentioned that future facilities may incorporate recharge through basins, wells with a preference for aquifer storage and recovery wells, and potentially linear recharge facilities.

Ms. Logan mentioned that there are existing AZPDES Permit discharge points at the Festival Ranch WRF, Tartesso West WRF, Sundance WWTP, and Central Buckeye WWTP. She also presented the location of future AZPDES Permit discharge points which would be used for emergency conditions.

Ms. Logan indicated that the existing and planned facilities have a sequencing batch reactor (SBR) treatment process. She noted that the Town's practice has been to have a SBR process at the facilities which are then converted to a Modified Ludzack-Ettinger (MLE) process once the flow reaches approximately 3 mgd to 5 mgd. Ms. Logan stated that due to the high strength wastewater and more concentrated flow since focusing on lower water uses, the Town embarked on a process to study if the MLE treatment process is the most optimal to address the higher strength wastewater. Through a contract with Dr. David Stencil, University of Washington, the recommendation was made to convert SBRs to Bardenpho process when the facility capacity approaches 3 mgd to 5 mgd.

Ms. Logan discussed the Bardenpho process. She noted that there are several alternatives, but in general, the process alternates sequencing of anoxic and aerobic reaction zones. Ms. Logan

mentioned the anticipated effluent quality from the Bardenpho process and indicated that it treats high strength wastewater. She stated that there are several alternative configurations that exist and may be considered for facility conversion.

Ms. Logan presented the anticipated implementation for the existing, planned, and future facilities. She discussed the constructed capacity for the existing facilities and the anticipated first phase capacity for planned and future facilities including the year it was or will be constructed. She also presented the anticipated total facility capacity following the next planned expansion the year it will take place and the ultimate capacity for all facilities.

Ms. Logan discussed financing for the facilities. She indicated that generally, developers fund construction through Community Facilities District financing or other mechanisms. Ms. Logan stated that facility ownership would be transferred to the Town following construction and testing and acceptance by Buckeye. She mentioned that the Town would ultimately be responsible for the operation and maintenance of the facilities; however, the Town may contract operations in the initial period.

Chair Klingler mentioned that there have been a number of amendments for the Town of Buckeye to add new facilities. He asked if this amendment is combining everything that has been presented in the past with some modifications and additional facilities into a comprehensive plan. Ms. Logan replied that is correct. Chair Klingler inquired about the future facilities. Ms. Logan responded that through the development of the amendment, they have met with Maricopa County, ADEQ, and MAG. She indicated that the comprehensive amendment is the plan for Buckeye. Ms. Logan stated that another amendment could be necessary in the future if there are significant changes that would make a facility inconsistent with this amendment; however, this amendment addresses all of the facilities planned for the Buckeye MPA.

Chair Klingler asked if this amendment supersedes previously approved amendments for the Town of Buckeye. Julie Hoffman, Maricopa Association of Governments, replied that this amendment would supersede prior amendments approved for existing and planned facilities within the Buckeye MPA.

Mr. Iwanski inquired if an amendment would be necessary if a facility changes the class of the effluent being produced. Ms. Hoffman replied that an amendment may be necessary if there is a change that would make the facility inconsistent with the MAG 208 Plan. She noted that once Buckeye goes to construct some of the future facilities, information such as AZPDES Permit discharge points could change that may require amendments. Mr. Iwanski indicated that his question was not specific to the Buckeye Comprehensive Amendment. He stated that he feels a change in the class of effluent produced is significant enough to require an amendment. Ms. Hoffman responded that she is not aware of an amendment for changing the class of effluent produced; however, it is a change that could make a facility inconsistent with the MAG 208 Plan and would need to be considered.

Mr. McNeil commented on the level of specificity in 208 amendments. He mentioned a situation of moving an outfall 200 feet. Mr. McNeil stated that the City of Tempe has had discussions with

MAG about adding an outfall to a WWTP. He inquired about the level of specificity for the MAG 208 Plan. Mr. McNeil commented on the Town of Buckeye having to amend the MAG 208 Plan in the future to add more specificity. He asked if changing or adding an outfall for a facility requires a 208 amendment. Chair Klingler responded that a comprehensive update to the MAG 208 Plan has been completed where all the municipalities were contacted for input. He indicated that a lot of those adjustments were made at that time. Chair Klingler commented on another update to the MAG 208 Plan.

Ms. Hoffman stated that the last update of the MAG 208 Plan was completed in 2002 which took approximately two years. She discussed the number of amendments that have been approved in the last few years. Ms. Hoffman indicated that the Committee has approved amendments to add new AZPDES Permit discharge points to facilities that has been previously approved. She noted that ADEQ has indicated that AZPDES Permit discharge points need to be specific.

Bill Haney, City of Mesa, indicated that the older 208s focused more on flows, population, watershed, and the point of discharge. Chair Klingler commented on a change in the class of effluent produced possibly affecting more than just the treatment plant process.

Chair Klingler asked if the Verrado WRF will continue to be private or turned over to the Town. Ms. Logan replied that the Verrado WRF will continue to be owned and operated by the Arizona Amendment Water Company.

Mr. Hollander referred to the letter provided to the Committee regarding a jurisdictional issue between the City of Surprise and the Town of Buckeye. He inquired about continuing the amendment when there is a jurisdictional issue. Mr. Swanson provided the Committee with a map of the area discussed in the letter dated October 22, 2007. He indicated that Surprise and Buckeye have met and the letter indicates that Surprise would probably object to the application, but it is only to the boundary dispute and not the intent of the application. Mr. Swanson stated that based on discussions with Buckeye, the municipalities will work to resolve the boundary issue in the next 60 days.

Mr. Swanson discussed the map provided to the Committee. He indicated that the Surprise General Plan has the western boundary about 1.5 miles west of the Surprise MPA boundary. Mr. Swanson stated that following the Growing Smarter Act, Buckeye completed its general plan before Surprise and each plan showed a different boundary. He indicated that the difference in the boundary is represented on the map. Mr. Swanson noted that there are three entities in the area. He stated that from Cloud Road on the south, about Honda Bow Road on the north, the Wickenburg MPA on the west, and the Surprise MPA is approximately 10 square miles in limbo. The hope is to also work out this issue with Buckeye.

Chair Klingler commented that the service area for the Hassayampa North WRF would be impacted by the area described. He stated that it sounds like Surprise and Buckeye are working on the issue. Mr. Swanson indicated that the hope is to have the issue resolved by the time the amendment reaches the MAG Management Committee. Chair Klingler asked if Surprise is okay with the amendment

moving forward with the understanding that the issue be resolved before the amendment reaches the MAG Management Committee. Mr. Swanson replied that is correct.

Ms. Roberts made a motion to authorize that a public hearing be conducted on the Draft MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Comprehensive Amendment for the Town of Buckeye. Chair Klingler commented that he appreciates Buckeye preparing a comprehensive amendment. Mr. Iwanski seconded and the motion passed unanimously through a roll call vote by the Committee.

7. Call for Future Agenda Items

Chair Klingler asked for any suggestions for future agenda items. With no further comments, Chair Klingler thanked the Committee for participating and called for adjournment of the meeting.