



City of Goodyear

See meeting location
below

Meeting Minutes

Water Conservation Committee

Tuesday, December 20, 2016

6:00 PM

Goodyear City Hall, Room 117
190 N. Litchfield Rd.
Goodyear, AZ 85338

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Columbia called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: 8 - Chairman Columbia, Vice Chairman Barber, Committee Member Gilmore, Committee Member Kagan, Committee Member Kaino, Committee Member Minarik, Committee Member Moll and Committee Member Teiche

Excused: 5 - Committee Member Booth, Committee Member Faiello, Committee Member Smith, Alternate Lagunas and Alternate Neith

Staff Present: Public Works Director Javier Setovich, Water Resources Manager Mark Holmes, Public Works Administrative Assistant Vanessa Enriquez

Others Present: Facilitator Teresa Makinen and her assistant Anne Morton

MOTION BY Committee Member Kagan, SECONDED BY Committee Member Teiche to EXCUSE Committee Members Booth, Faiello and Smith, and Alternate Committee Members Lagunas and Neith from the meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 8 - Chairman Columbia, Vice Chairman Barber, Committee Member Gilmore, Committee Member Kagan, Committee Member Kaino, Committee Member Minarik, Committee Member Moll and Committee Member Teiche

Excused: 3 - Committee Member Booth, Committee Member Faiello and Committee Member Smith

3. APPROVE MINUTES

- 3.1 [MINUTES](#) Approve draft minutes of the Water Conservation Committee meeting held on
[89-2016](#) November 15, 2016.

MOTION BY Committee Member Kaino, SECONDED BY Committee Member Teiche, to APPROVE the draft minutes of the Water Conservation Committee meeting held on November 15, 2016. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 8 - Chairman Columbia, Vice Chairman Barber, Committee Member Gilmore, Committee Member Kagan, Committee Member Kaino, Committee Member Minarik, Committee Member Moll and Committee Member Teiche

Excused: 3 - Committee Member Booth, Committee Member Faiello and Committee Member Smith

4. CITIZENS COMMENTS/ APPEARANCES FROM THE FLOOR

None.

5. OLD BUSINESS

5.1 Meeting Schedule and Administration

Facilitator Teresa Makinen said they needed to discuss the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating (PVNGS). Water Resources Manager Mark Holmes said he had contacted the Public Information Officer and there are two options - a half day tour focusing on water resources or a full day tour that will also include the power side of the facility. The full day option includes drive time. February is the most convenient time for PVNGS and they will make anytime the committee chooses work. Makinen asked the members which they'd prefer - a half day or full day tour. One member asked if those interested in the full day tour could stay after the half day tour concludes and Holmes confirmed they could. After some discussion, it was determined that a full day tour would be reserved with the water resources portion in the morning so those that wish to leave after the half day tour could do so. After reviewing committee members' availability in February, the date of February 22nd was selected as the best date to schedule the tour. Holmes will schedule the tour with PVNGS and can reserve vans as well.

Committee Member Minarik remarked that this is the kind of excellent support the city provides. He had tried to schedule the tours but had a hard time connecting so it is great that the city could connect so quickly.

6. NEW BUSINESS

6.1 Presentations and Discussion

6.1.1 Presentation of Home Owners Association Landscape and Water Management - Todd Wuellner, Estrella Home Owners Association Facilities Director

Estrella Home Owners Association Facilities Director Wuellner provided a presentation of "Unique" Water Conservation Initiatives.

The following represents the question and answer segment of the presentation. Committee Member Moll said it would be worth speaking with the City's Engineering Department. They have a robust manual of design standards that would be worth looking into because it hasn't been fully explained how the city regulates design as referenced in Wuellner's presentation.

Committee Member Gilmore said he agrees with some but not all of Wuellner's points. For instance, an irrigation specialist is helpful on large systems but not necessary on smaller systems. The bigger questions are should we use turf, where is it most affective, how should it be irrigated. He agrees that soil condition and grading are important factors in water usage but there are additives that can be used to help add efficiencies and percolation of water. He also agrees that poly pipe shouldn't be used. Regarding design and inspection standards, a lot comes back to expense. Some cities are better at reviewing design, others only do so minimally.

Moll asked Gilmore if he believes the reason many cities don't inspect irrigation is because they don't have the expertise. Gilmore confirmed that is a primary reason and Committee Chairman Columbia added that they also may not have the staff.

Gilmore added that it is hard for municipalities to dictate design due to liability issues between the general contractor, subcontractor and designer.

Columbia asked what happens 20 years from now if we don't start today? There are other states and cities discussing conservation but none have come up with a plan.

Committee Member Minarik said he finds it intriguing that building inspection doesn't include water management. He then asked what the definition of "poly pipe" is as well as the difference between "class" and "schedule" as referenced in the presentation. Gilmore provided definitions.

Minarik then asked philosophically, how green should turf be to be efficient and how many golf courses are enough? Wuellner said that what drives greenness is correlated to snowbirds. They drive the market on how green turf should be since they typically come from places that are very green. There are two types of grass in the Valley: Bermuda which is a lighter, dingier grass that does not produce pretty stripes when it's mowed and the other is Winter Rye which must be established like a new crop each year until it dies off in the summer. Economic development wants corridors to look amazing. They are the engine driving overseeding. Overseeding uses a lot of water to get established. If you don't overseed, you wouldn't use any water since Bermuda dies off in the cold and comes back in the heat.

As it relates to golf courses, Wuellner doesn't believe they'll be viable in the next 10-20 years. The demand isn't what it used to be so now developers are looking for other ways to grow communities. Golf doesn't drive home sales like it used to.

Gilmore said that there are probably a dozen different types of Bermuda grass now, like at the ball field, it looks perfect in the summer but they have the optimal specifications for soil, grading and maintenance. City parks can't compete. The species has improved but most don't like common Bermuda since it has too much pollen although it can operate on much less water.

Committee Member Barber said that when the general manager from the ball field presented, he discussed technology - is there any new technology on the horizon to help in situations like those referenced? Wuellner said that they intend to switch controllers in the next three years. The new controllers will communicate with each other for irrigating. Now, each zone works in

a standard “on” mode but you need to have a “true central” to see all the irrigation clocks in the community. That’s the biggest improvement we could make. Barber asked if he works with new builders coming in and looking at their design. Wuellner said that he and Committee Member Teiche have a good relationship and they do look at some but when they inherit it, it is different.

Barber said that she wouldn’t want to encourage over regulation on homeowners but education could be a factor. Wuellner replied that he thinks it comes down to regulation. If it isn’t required, developers won’t do it. As a suggestion, if a resident wants to put in a lawn, there could be 12 designs for them to choose from and set EvapoTranspiration (ET) based controllers and heads. I’ve seen it happen through incentives where you could turn in your old clock for an ET based controller.

Barber asked if Wuellner knows of any other cities the committee should look at that are already doing this sort of thing. Columbia said that he looked at several cities and it seems that everyone is scratching the surface but no one is taking initiative.

Barber asked Wuellner what happened with the water main break at Estrella Elementary School last week. Wuellner said that the HOA doesn’t manage that, it is considered commercial so he doesn’t have that information.

Columbia said this presentation was a good example of cosmetics versus conservation and they’re caught in the middle. Columbia said that Wuellner said in his presentation that in an area they inherited, it [design and irrigation] was already set up so it was too late. Can’t you dictate that you aren’t going to acquire it unless it is brought to your specifications? Wuellner said that when he accepts it, it’s saying he agrees with the system and he can make corrections; however, most people don’t have a facilities director to address these issues. Most just say “it’s green” and move on. Columbia replied saying that if the regulations were in place before that then you’d receive something with conservation in mind. Wuellner said he’d like to see the city involved at various stages - critical points - with an obligation to review like you would a trade. Gilmore said that Gilbert and Chandler require as-builts of irrigation and Teiche said that Goodyear does as well. Moll said that Wuellner talked a lot about what the city is or is not regulating but the questions were asked to the wrong department - the Building Department. They handle vertical builds so they wouldn’t inspect that. It would be the Engineering Department.

Committee Member Kagan said if you could get the builder of the development on board with conservation to help set up the HOA rules and regulations to incorporate conservation into their individual home lots as a mandate, then design requirements for each lot could be included. Wuellner said that for every homeowner that he has helped, he probably cut their water usage in half. The greatest abuser of water is the resident over any community user.

6.1.2 Staff Presentation of Climate Change Relative to the Committee's Objectives - Mark Holmes, Water Resources Manager

Water Resources Manager Mark Holmes said that there is a huge range of models and they primarily show a rise in temperatures and a decrease in precipitation. While there is a lot of

variability, his recommendation is that for any recommendations created by the committee take that into consideration.

6.1.3 Discussion on Developing Information for Council Progress Update and Committee Recommendations

Water Resources Manager Mark Holmes explained what was needed for the Council update and stated that there isn't a set date yet, although it may be in February. Holmes recommended a short presentation by the chairman and vice chairman for 5-10 minutes on what the Committee has learned and done to date. Holmes said he'd start working on it and Facilitator Makinen said they'd discuss it further in January. There was some concern from a few committee members that they would be approaching Council without a "message". Holmes said that the best message is to show the Committee is standing shoulder to shoulder with the city and understand the issues. Committee Member Moll said the Committee needs to acknowledge that there are other interests out there other than water conservation, for example, cosmetics, expense and other departments' interests.

Makinen said she sent several documents for the Committee to review in consideration of the recommendations they will be drafting. One of the concerns was that the Water Planning Committee's recommendations were never implemented. Holmes said he believes they were lacking an implementation strategy and/or funding mechanism. Makinen provided what she sees as the steps in creating the recommendations as follows:

- > The Committee would discuss and identify the concept for the recommendations (i.e., what is the goal, or metric we're trying to achieve, and why is it important). The Committee could formulate that through their discussions and then provide that to staff.
- > Staff could do somewhat of an "evaluation" of this information from the Committee to determine what might be the process to achieve the recommendation, the resources (human or otherwise) needed, costs, and what might be desired outcomes that are measurable, all for the Committee's thoughts. Staff would also be able to ask for additional information/details related to the recommendations.
- > This information would go back to the Committee where staff could ask for any clarification from the Committee, if needed, and the Committee could discuss with staff the information they've provided. The Committee could then prioritize the recommendations and determine the goal or desired outcome from each recommendation.
- > This draft-final document would undergo a final staff review.
- > Finally, the draft-final document would go back to the committee for their final review/approval to provide to Council.

This topic will be explored further at the January meeting.

7. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

None.

8. INFORMATION ITEMS

Committee Member Minarik asked if anyone knew what was happening with the water issues in Buckeye. Committee members did not have any information.

8. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, Chairman Columbia adjourned the meeting at 8:17 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by:

Mario Columbia, Chairman

Date: _____