

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

Monday, May 12, 2003  
MAG Office Building  
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Roger Klingler, Scottsdale, Chairman	Phoenix: Robert Hollander
Avondale: Esmeralda Avila	Surprise: Rich Williams
#Chandler: Jacqueline Strong	Tempe: David McNeil
Gilbert: Lonnie Frost	Maricopa County: Dale Bodiya for John Power
Glendale: Chris Ochs	Pinnacle West Capital: John Boyer
#Goodyear: Joel Wade	*Salt River Project: Ray Hedrick
Mesa: Bill Haney	U of A Cooperative Extension: Patrick Clay
*Peoria: Kevin Kadlec	Citizen Representative: Eugene Jensen

\*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.  
#Attended by videoconference or by telephone conference call.

OTHERS PRESENT

PBS & J: Frank Turek	Maricopa Association of Governments: Heidi Pahl
GTA Engineering: Fred Goldman	Maricopa Association of Governments: Brenda Geisen
Maricopa Association of Governments: Lindy Bauer	

1. Call to Order

A meeting of the MAG Water Quality Advisory Committee was conducted on Monday, May 12, 2003 at 4:00 p.m. Roger Klingler, Chair, City of Scottsdale, called the meeting to order.

2. Approval of the July 31, 2002 Meeting Minutes

The Committee reviewed the draft minutes from the July 31, 2002 meeting. Robert Hollander, City of Phoenix, moved and Lonnie Frost, Town of Gilbert, seconded, and it was unanimously carried to approve the minutes from the July 31, 2002 meeting.

3. Draft MAG Small Plant Review and Approval for the Proposed Desert Oasis Wastewater Treatment Facility

Chairman Klingler indicated that agenda item number three was for information, discussion, and possible recommendation of approval of the proposed Desert Oasis Wastewater Treatment Facility

as part of the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan. He introduced Fred Goldman of GTA Engineering to provide an overview of the project.

Mr. Goldman indicated that the proposed Desert Oasis Wastewater Treatment Facility would be located at 163<sup>rd</sup> Avenue & Beardsley and would have an ultimate capacity of 350,000 gallons per day. He indicated that it would be a temporary plant which would be decommissioned when the City of Surprise extends its wastewater collection system to serve the area. He indicated that development of the plant would reduce the potential of groundwater contamination from septic tanks and that the proposed plant would not impact any existing plants.

He indicated that the CML Incorporated would build the plant, and ownership and operation would belong to the City of Surprise. He indicated that effluent from the plant would be denitrified and disinfected and used for irrigation on green areas. Operation and maintenance costs would be paid by residents of Desert Oasis and subsidized by CML Inc. through an agreement with the City of Surprise. He indicated that the City plans to subcontract the operations and management to an experienced management company.

Rich Williams, City of Surprise, indicated that the City supports the process and the idea that development should pay for itself. He indicated that the City is not ready to invest in infrastructure in the area, so the developer will finance this temporary plant and the City will own the plant.

Mr. Frost inquired about the anticipated timeline for development.

Mr. Goldman indicated that it is anticipated that 200 housing units per year would be constructed and that, within 3 to 5 years, City of Surprise infrastructure may be extended to the area.

Mr. Frost inquired whether the temporary plant would be decommissioned when the City's infrastructure is developed.

Mr. Williams indicated that the temporary plant would be decommissioned at that time.

Dale Bodiya, Maricopa County, indicated that another party had contacted him about hooking another development up to the Desert Oasis Plant and asked if the plant would need a higher capacity to accept such flow.

Mr. Williams indicated the proposed plant was designed to accept flows from the Desert Oasis Development, and the City is developing a Master Plan to evaluate future wastewater treatment needs for the City.

Mr. Hollander indicated that the feasibility report identifies BADCT as guidance and it should be noted that BADCT is now in rule which goes beyond just guidance. He inquired whether the homeowners would be informed that they will own the pipeline.

Mr. Goldman indicated that the homeowners would be informed that they will own the pipeline, and that the pipeline may be subsidized.

Mr. Hollander inquired whether the proposed plant would be added under the recently revised and adopted MAG 208 Plan.

Lindy Bauer, MAG, indicated that the plant would be added to the MAG 208 Plan which was adopted by the MAG Regional Council in October 2002. She indicated that the Small Plant Review and Approval Process of the 208 Plan was largely the same as the previous Plan with some minor improvements.

Bill Haney, City of Mesa, indicated that the numbers used for calculation of the plant flows appear to be conservative.

Mr. Goldman indicated that the Maricopa County Environmental Services Department requested that these conservative numbers be used due to the lack of history for this new development.

Mr. Haney indicated that the use of these conservative numbers may create higher costs for the cities.

Joel Wade, City of Goodyear, inquired who would hold the permits for the facility and whether there would be effluent storage.

Mr. Goldman indicated that the City of Surprise would hold the permits and a storage reservoir for winter storage had been included in the plant design.

Mr. Wade inquired who would hold the permit for the effluent storage.

Mr. Goldman indicated that there would be no reuse permit, and that the reuse would be included in the Aquifer Protection Permit which would be held by the City.

Mr. Frost inquired if the irrigation would continue when the temporary plant is decommissioned.

Mr. Goldman indicated that the purpose of irrigation of green areas is to provide a means to use the treated effluent, and eventually irrigation would discontinue and homes would be constructed on the green areas.

Chair Klingler inquired whether any golf courses or other areas would be using the effluent for irrigation.

Mr. Goldman indicated that there would not be any golf courses and only the green areas would be irrigated.

David McNeil, City of Tempe, inquired why denitrification was included in the plant design.

Mr. Goldman indicated that denitrification was included because it allows the plant to perform better, requires no extra cost, provides flexibility in effluent use, meets BADCT, and it is company policy.

Mr. McNeil indicated that if denitrification is provided, meeting the water balance is not required. Mr. Frost inquired why recharge for water storage credits was not included in the plant design.

Mr. Goldman indicated that this type of recharge requires a more complicated and costly process than desired for a temporary plant and that it would require dechlorination.

Mr Frost moved to recommend approval of the proposed Desert Oasis Wastewater Treatment Facility as part of the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan. Mr. McNeil seconded, and it was unanimously passed by the Committee.

4. Agua Fria Reclaimed Water Groundwater Recharge Project

Chairman Klingler indicated that agenda item number four was for information and discussion and introduced Frank Turek of PBS &J to provide an overview of the Agua Fria Reclaimed Water Recharge Project. Mr. Turek indicated that the project was sponsored by the Multi Cities Subregional Operating Group (SROG) and the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR). He indicated that the project objective was to use 40,000 to 60,000 acre-feet of reclaimed wastewater per year from the 91<sup>st</sup> Avenue WWTP each winter for recharge, recreation, habitat enhancement, and direct reuse.

Mr. Turek indicated that the project study area would mainly be located north of Interstate 10 and west of the 101 Loop, along the Agua Fria River. He indicated that the project concept would include laterals at one mile intervals along the Agua Fria River recharge area, and the flow at each lateral could be adjusted as needed. He indicated that a two year study was being conducted to obtain public input, develop options, address public comments, and develop a consensus plan.

Mr. Turek indicated the project had four phases. Phase One would include stakeholder coordination and public information. Phase Two would include technical investigations, conceptual design, and economic analyses. Phase Three would consist of preliminary designs, and the final designs and implementation would occur in Phase Four. Over fifty stakeholder groups were interviewed including federal, state and county agencies, cities, homeowner's associations, and private sector interests.

Mr. Turek indicated that research findings showed that the project was frequently confused with other Agua Fria projects, and main stakeholder concerns included coordination with other projects, potential vector control problems, protection of groundwater, best use of the reclaimed water, impact on sand and gravel operations, and who would benefit from the project.

Mr. Turek indicated that several committees worked to evaluate different components of the project and public input was an important part of the evaluation. He indicated that a consensus plan has been developed and is under final editing review. He indicated that the purpose of the consensus plan was to assemble all the data, integrate information and process it into a unified document, present a complete picture, resolve issues where possible, frame issues for later resolution, and build a foundation for Phase Two of the project. The next steps include completion of Phase One and initiation of Phase Two.

Chair Klingler indicated that the project name was long and inquired whether it had ever been called the "SROG Linear Recharge Project."

Mr. Turek indicated that the name has been shortened to the “Agua Fria Recharge Project.”

Mr. McNeil inquired why the Arizona Water Quality Warm Water Fisheries Standard would apply on an ephemeral reach which would be subject to the Federal Water Quality Standards.

Mr. Turek indicated that the water quality standards for the Agua Fria River reach near Lake Pleasant are different than those for the Gila and Salt Rivers, and the Warm Water Fisheries is a non-attainable use.

Mr. Hollander inquired whether the project was on schedule for completion of Phase One.

Mr. Turek indicated that the consensus plan has been drafted and final revisions are underway, with final printing expected in June 2003.

Mr. Wade inquired what physical structures would be used to obtain recharge credits for the project and who would obtain these credits.

Mr. Turek indicated that detailed structure planning is still underway, and such decisions will be made in Phase Two. He indicated that the concept includes constructed recharge facility rather just a managed facility, to obtain recharge credits of a higher percent. He indicated that SROG would get the recharge credits. He indicated that, as west valley SROG cities, Phoenix and Glendale could recover water and east valley SROG cities could recover credits using remote recovery. He indicated that the project is open to involvement by other entities.

Chair Klingler inquired whether any financial estimate had been proposed for the project.

Mr. Turek indicated that a 1996 evaluation showed an estimated \$80 million estimate, with \$20 million being provided through federal funding.

Mr. Williams indicated that the City of Surprise plans to recharge very close to the project site and inquired whether the recharge project would only use effluent from the 91<sup>st</sup> Avenue WWTP.

Mr. Turek indicated that decisions on sources of effluent would be made by the SROG. He indicated that project recharge would not begin until 2010, and some cities may have needs before that time.

Mr. Frost inquired whether recharge capacity of the project was limited by the amount of available water or by hydrologic capacity of the sediment.

Mr. Turek indicated that capacity is limited by the amount of available water, and the design of the project would ensure that hydrologic capacity of the sediment imposed no limitations on recharge capacity.

## 5. Call to the Public

An opportunity was provided to members of the public to address the Water Quality Advisory

Committee. No comments were received and the meeting was adjourned.