

B. CONSULTATION
AND COORDINATION

APPENDIX B

CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

A. Public Involvement

The public involvement program in the Central Arizona Water Control Study began in January 1979 and established the following goals: 1) to meet legal and administrative requirements; 2) to inform the public; 3) to involve the public in plan formulation by insuring that decisionmakers received, understood, and integrated public views into the planning process; 4) to build credibility for the study by assuring the public that objectivity was being maintained; and 5) to develop consensus around a proposed action.

Methods used to achieve these goals fell into three categories: 1) provision of adequate and timely information to the public; 2) identification and response to concerns and preferences expressed by the public; and 3) use of techniques to develop consensus. Specific activities included: development of public involvement plan; use of advisory groups; newsletters; factbooks; public meetings and forums; presentations to civic, professional and community groups; information fairs; press releases, public service announcements, press kits, press briefings; public comment storage and retrieval system; Public Values Assessment; and written evaluations of each phase of the public involvement program.

The following reports describe the public involvement program of the CAWCS in detail and are available at the Arizona Projects Office, Bureau of Reclamation.

Evaluation of Stage I Public Involvement Activities
April 1979

Participants Workbook for Public Workshops
April - May 1980

Final Summary & Analysis of CAWCS Public Workshops
July 11, 1980

Public Involvement Plan
June 1980

Summary of CAWCS Public Involvement Activities
September - December 1980

Evaluation of Stage II Public Involvement Program
March 1981

Summary and Evaluation of CAWCS Public Involvement
Program 1979-1981

Public Values Assessment 1981

Appendices (3) for each Summary contain actual newsletters, meeting attendance, press releases, news clippings, and public meeting comments.

Four series of public meetings were held at each major decision point in the study. Additional public meetings were held in affected communities as needed.

In January 1979, Reclamation sponsored three public meetings in Buckeye, Mesa, and central Phoenix to present the study objectives, schedule, and preliminary alternatives. A total of 297 people attended.

During 1979, heavy emphasis was placed upon informing and educating various publics as to the study purpose, alternatives, and plan formulation process. A Governor-appointed 28-member citizens advisory committee began meeting monthly to provide general study guidance and review study progress. Members of this committee are listed in Table B-1.

A Technical Agency Group of approximately 50 groups (Table B-2) was established to provide technical information to the study team, review study data, and function as a coordination point for all involved agencies.

A series of nine workshops was held between April 16 and May 6, 1980 for the general public. The workshops had two purposes: 1) to inform participants about CAWCS objectives, progress to date, schedule, and alternatives under consideration and 2) to determine public opinion on the adequacy of the alternatives, their rankings of the evaluation criteria, and acceptable levels of flood flows along the Salt and Gila Rivers. These workshops were held in South Phoenix, Mesa, Scottsdale, North Phoenix, Buckeye, Superior, Tucson, Peoria, and Casa Grande. A total of 398 people participated in these workshops.

Four public forums were held in November and December 1980. These forums had four purposes: 1) to present alternative systems and the rationale supporting their formulation; 2) to present CAWCS staff recommendations on alternatives for Stage III; 3) to provide an opportunity for participants to question CAWCS technical experts; and 4) to obtain comments and suggestions from the public. The forums were held in Tucson, Casa Grande, Mesa, and Phoenix; 268 people attended.

During Stage III a more concerted effort was made to obtain the views and identify the values held by special interest groups. These groups had a direct stake in the outcome of the study for ideological, political, or institutional reasons. Over 100 of these "stakeholder" groups were identified by the study team, the Governor's Advisory Committee, other agencies, and by the groups themselves. These groups were requested to participate in a process which the public involvement staff called public values assessment (PVA). The PVA had three goals: 1) to identify the major study-related issues, or values important to the cross-section of stakeholder groups; 2) to match the values held by these groups with technical information about the candidate plans in order to determine how the plans satisfied the concerns of each group; 3) and to develop consensus about the plans among the groups, or to identify potential areas of compromise.

Table B-1

GOVERNOR'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mr. Herschel Andrews,
Salt River Pima-Maricopa
Tribal Council

Mr. Ben Avery,
Wildlife Groups

Mr. Tom Chauncey, Sr.,
Channel 10 Television

Hon. Herbert R. Drinkwater,
Mayor of Scottsdale

Ms. Joan Enos,
Fort McDowell Tribal Council

Mr. Tom Fannin,
Real Estate

Hon. Art Hamilton,
State Legislator

Hon. Margaret Hance,
Mayor of Phoenix

Hon. John Hawley,
Mayor of Buckeye

Mr. Thomas Jones,
Fort McDowell Tribal Council

Ms. Sue Lofgren,
League of Women Voters

Hon. Dessie M. Lorenz,
Mayor of Avondale

Hon. Manuel G. Marin,
State Legislator

Mr. Chet McNabb,
Buckeye School District

Hon. Harry Mitchell,
Mayor of Tempe

Mr. John R. Norton III,
Agriculture

Hon. Ed Pastor
Maricopa County Board of Supervisors

Ms. Eva Patten,
Governor's Commission on the Environment

Mr. Hank Raymond,
Central Arizona Project Association

Mr. William R. Schulz,
Developer

Mr. Norris Soma,
San Carlos Irrigation District

Hon. Don Stauch,
Mayor of Mesa

Dr. Lee Thompson, Chairman,
former Dean, College of Engineering, A.S.U.

Mr. Don Tostenrund,
Arizona Bank

Mr. Keith Turley,
Arizona Public Service Company

Mr. Mason Walsh,
Arizona Republic and Phoenix Gazette

Dr. Robert Witzeman,
Maricopa County Audobon Society

Mr. Howard Wuertz, Central
Arizona Water Conservation District

The results of the Public Values Assessment showed strong consensus across all stakeholder groups. The process indicated that three of the eight CAWCS alternatives would meet their values and could be used for compromise.

Three public meetings were held in Phoenix and Mesa in September 1981 to obtain views and comments about the candidate plans. A total of 230 people attended. At the final meeting of the Governor's Advisory Committee on October 2, 1981, Governor Babbitt asked the committee to present him with a unanimous recommendation on a preferred plan. He stressed the importance of Arizona's support for one plan. After deliberations and discussions, they voted twenty to one to recommend Plan 6 to the Governor, contingent on Congressional authorization and funding for safety of dams, regulatory storage, and flood control.

Many activities were undertaken to meet the goals and objectives of the public involvement program. These activities are presented thoroughly in the documents listed on page B-1.

A mailing list of approximately 4,500 names was maintained continuously. Since January of 1979, 24 newsletters, two brochures, a tabloid, and two 150-page factbooks were published and made available to those on the mailing list.

Presentations to civic groups, professional organizations, governmental agencies, and other stakeholders were a continuous part of the public involvement program. Over 150 presentations were made by the study team, primarily during Stage II. Two slide/tape shows and a video show were developed for these and other presentations.

All comments received from the public during the study were coded according to their geographic origin, the form in which they were received, the organizational affiliation of the respondent, the date, and the content. An analysis of these comments was compiled for decisionmakers at pivotal points in the study.

A variety of publicity and public relations techniques were employed during the study to make current information available and to advertise public meetings including: Information Fair, exhibits at the State Fair, billboards, radio and television talk shows, public service announcements, and news articles.

Public involvement had both direct and indirect influences on the final decisionmaking process. Indirectly, the choice of a proposed action was based in part on CAWCS staff recommendations, which included as a major factor the public acceptability of plans. Bureau of Reclamation officials and Interior Secretary James Watt had direct contact with many of the publics involved in the study through letters and personal visits and were aware of public views regarding the plans.

In evaluating the CAWCS public involvement program key participants and the general public were asked whether they felt their views and comments had been considered in the decision. Approximately 84 percent of those who responded said yes. This seems to indicate satisfaction with the choice of a

Table B-2

TECHNICAL AGENCY GROUP MEMBER AGENCIES

National Park Service	Inter-Tribal Council of Arizona
Salt River Pima Indian Council	Bureau of Indian Affairs
City of Phoenix	Environmental Protection Agency
Arizona Department of Water Resources	Gila River Indian Community
U.S. Soil Conservation Service	Maricopa County Highway Department
Arizona Department of Health Services	City of Mesa
Arizona Outdoor Recreation Coordinating Commission	Governor's Office
Town of El Mirage	Arizona Land Department
Rio Salado Development District	U.S. Geological Survey
Arizona Game & Fish Department	City of Glendale
Central Arizona Water Conservation District	Town of Tolleson
Maricopa County Health Department	Salt River Project
Arizona Department of Transportation	Maricopa County Planning Department
City of Scottsdale	Maricopa County Audubon Society
Wildlife Society	Western Area Power Administration
Fort McDowell Mohave-Apache Tribal Council	Federal Highway Administration
U.S. Forest Service	City of Peoria
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	City of Avondale
Arizona Division of Emergency Services	Arizona State Parks Board
Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service	U.S. Bureau of Land Management
Arizona Public Service Company	Maricopa County Municipal Water Conservation District #1
Town of Buckeye	Maricopa Association of Governments
	Maricopa County Parks Department
	Flood Control District of Maricopa County
	City of Tempe

plan and with the effectiveness of the public involvement program in integrating public views into the decisionmaking process.

B. Agency Consultation

1. Cultural Resources

Formal consultation required by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, has been completed through negotiation of a Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement for all CAP features remaining to be constructed. Under the terms of this agreement a general historic preservation plan for the entire CAP is being prepared in continuing coordination with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Arizona and New Mexico State Historic Preservation Officers. Section 110(f) of the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, requires special consideration to minimize damage to any National Historic Landmarks. This requirement has been addressed by preparation of a document which describes the complete range of alternatives that have been considered in justification of the conclusion that the proposed adverse impacts of Plan 6 upon Roosevelt Dam are necessary to achieve overriding goals. The planning of the cultural resource aspects of CAWCS has benefited throughout the study from consultation and coordination with various other agencies, organizations, and individuals. The Bureau's Central Arizona Project Ad Hoc Committee for Cultural Resources has been informed about CAWCS planning and decisions. Members of this Committee include representatives of the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, affected Federal agencies (such as the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, and the National Park Service), local agencies such as the Salt River Project, and professional societies. In addition, the Arizona Archaeological Council's (AAC) CAP Committee has been consulted, and information about CAWCS has been presented at AAC meetings. The AAC passed a resolution in support of Plan 6 on October 1981. A presentation regarding cultural resources was also made for the CAWCS Governor's Advisory Committee.

In a more general way a broader public of individuals and groups has been kept informed about the entire CAP cultural resource program by means of a bimonthly newsletter. When development of a general historic preservation plan for the entire CAP was initiated in January 1982 almost 250 individuals and organizations were solicited for ideas, comments, and suggestions.

2. Biological Resources

The Fish and Wildlife Service involvement in CAWCS began with the development of the scope of work for the study. Throughout the planning process the FWS and AGFD have, as Technical Agency Group members, provided technical guidance, EIS documentation review, and input into conceptual mitigation measures used to evaluate alternative plans. Working under the auspices of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, the FWS took the lead role in conducting the Habitat Evaluation Procedures (HEP) study to determine quality of the affected habitat, and in developing a mitigation plan based on replacement of habitat quality. Included on the HEP team were biologists from the Bureau of Reclamation, AGFD, FWS and Dames & Moore. This team has worked closely with the CAWCS planning team for the last two years in conducting the

HEP analysis. The recommendations of the HEP team form the technical basis for, and are part of, the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act for Plan 6 report which outlines the FWS recommendations for mitigation of Plan 6 (see Appendix G). The FWS mitigation plan closely parallels the proposed mitigation initiatives presented in Chapter IV of the EIS.

Informal Endangered Species Act consultation, as required under Section 7 of the Act for Plan 6, was initiated with the FWS in July 1979, when Reclamation requested a list of proposed and listed threatened and endangered species occurring in the CAWCS study area. The FWS presented Reclamation a list of species (see Chapter III.B.1.a. of the EIS) in September 1979, and Reclamation produced a preliminary biological assessment on those species in March 1980. Review of assessment by FWS indicated that more definitive data on specific project actions was required prior to rendering an opinion of effects on the species. Subsequently, an indefinite extension was requested and granted for this phase of the consultation process.

The data required for completion of the assessment has been developed and reviewed. Upon completion of the review process, the FWS must render an opinion regarding the effect of Plan 6 on the endangered species. This opinion has been rendered and is included in Appendix F of the EIS.

At the present time Reclamation anticipates that all impacts to endangered species can be mitigated or completely avoided through the attainment of the mitigation goals detailed in Chapter IV.D. of the EIS.

The AGFD and FWS have recently raised concerns over the potential introduction of Colorado River fish into the sport fishery of the proposed New Waddell Reservoir under CAWCS Plans 6 and 7, and potential adverse effects on existing fish species in the lower Salt and Verde Rivers from importation of Colorado River ichthyofauna. This latter concern is due to CAP water deliveries to the Salt River Project at Granite Reef Dam and is independent of the CAWCS action. However, CAWCS Plans 6 and 7 could compound this potential problem by providing a means for white bass to move from New Waddell Reservoir via the reversible canal and Granite Reef Aqueduct into the lower Salt and Verde Rivers.

The concern is that such introduction may adversely impact the sport fishery at New Waddell due to competition and predatory impacts from the introduced blue tilapia and striped bass. Introduction of the white bass into the lower Salt and Verde Rivers could potentially exert an additional predatory impact on native fishes and carp, which could alter the current forage base for resident bald eagles.

A meeting of biologists from the AG&FD, FWS, and Reclamation was held on October 25, 1982, to discuss the concern. It was decided that an extensive review of the literature was necessary in order to correctly predict the probability and consequences of the introduction. This literature review should help determine whether the Colorado River fish would survive the pump lifts and transportation to central Arizona in the aqueduct, whether they could establish themselves in the receiving reservoirs and river systems, and if so, to what extent they would affect or degrade the sport fishery at New Waddell Reservoir and the forage base for the bald eagles resident on the lower Salt and Verde Rivers. Personnel from the above agencies have been

assigned to participate in the literature research and an attempt is being made to hire a highly qualified fishery biologist on a temporary basis to direct the work. Reclamation proposes to transfer funds to the FWS under a Memorandum of Understanding for reimbursement of expenses.

3. Water Quality

The Bureau of Reclamation has recognized the need for establishing more comprehensive baseline water quality data for the selected regulatory storage site. At Reclamation's request, the U.S. Geological Survey initiated a water quality sampling network in January 1982 which brackets the New Waddell site. Since that time, monthly samples have been collected from the Agua Fria River above Lake Pleasant at Rock Springs and in the Beardsley canal below Lake Pleasant.

These two stations will remain active sampling sites for as long as necessary to establish baseline data and to monitor the water quality impacts after the regulatory storage reservoir becomes operational.

4. Social Resources

Reclamation and Tonto National Forest are currently negotiating to identify and prepare suitable exchange lands on which to relocate Roosevelt Lake area residents who wish to remain in the vicinity. Forest Service land is required because no privately-owned land is available in the area. The exact number of households and individuals subject to relocation will be identified by Reclamation and the appropriate amount of land required for the relocatees acquired through an exchange with the Forest Service.

5. Institutional Issues

Institutional issues are the legal and contractual arrangements which must be in place prior to the implementation of Plan 6. Because the solution of these issues involves numerous concerned agencies, Reclamation has coordinated and continues to coordinate closely with affected agencies in developing solutions. Institutional issues have been discussed at Technical Agency Group meetings and are the subject of ongoing negotiations between Reclamation and involved agencies.

a. Hydropower Development

Plan 6 will result in increased potential for hydropower development at Roosevelt, New Waddell, and possibly Stewart Mountain Dams and user turnouts. Institutional issues to be resolved involve power development and power benefits. Salt River Project (SRP), Maricopa County Municipal Water Conservation District #1 (MCMWCD#1), and Arizona Public Service Company (APS) have expressed interest in developing power at dams and at user turnouts. The Federal government could also develop additional power. Power could be marketed by the Federal government or by public utilities; questions remain regarding the distribution of power marketing benefits among owners, developers, and users of power generating and transmission facilities and to the Central Arizona Water Conservation District (CAWCD) to repay the CAP.

b. Water Ownership

SRP, MCMWCD#1, City of Phoenix, Fort McDowell Indian Community, Salt River Indian Community, and others have historic water rights to the Salt, Verde, and Agua Fria watersheds. Issues have arisen regarding maintenance of water rights, allocation, contracts, and ownership, and rights to water developed in new conservation and flood control space.

The potential purchase of additional water is also a question. Both SRP and MCMWCD#1 have indicated an interest in purchasing additional conservation space to augment their current capacity. This could occur either through the purchase of space in the Plan 6 reservoirs as currently planned or through financing of additions to the dams to provide increased storage capacity. Either of these options could impact CAP yield and operations and water rights.

c. Operating Considerations

The operating entity/entities for Cliff, Roosevelt, Stewart Mountain, and New Waddell Dams have not been finally determined. All of these structures will be placed within existing water and hydropower systems. The current operators, SRP and MCMWCD#1, have both stated their desire to operate the new dams for water conservation and flood control within their respective systems. However, the CAWCD has been designated by the State of Arizona as the official CAP operating and repayment agent. It is possible that different agencies may operate different functions (i.e. CAP-related water conservation, non-CAP-related water conservation, flood control) or that a single entity would operate all functions within a system.

Operating criteria for flood control and water conservation/delivery are not finalized. There is currently no mandated flood control operation on the Salt and Verde Rivers, and no operating criteria exist for joint water operations among agencies. The jurisdictional control of flood control space at Cliff and Roosevelt Dams and responsibility for developing operating criteria are issues which remain to be settled. The Corps of Engineers has responsibility to mandate flood operations at their structures; however, such operations could impact other SRP-operated structures within the system.

Institutional issues involving water conservation and delivery include necessary contractual arrangements, delivery facilities to be used, and responsibility for delivery of CAP water developed at various locations. CAP water could be delivered to users through existing SRP delivery systems, thus eliminating the need to construct parallel CAP delivery systems. Interagency arrangements would, however, be required.

d. Financing Considerations

Financial questions and problems are inherent in all institutional issues as well as in the actual construction of Plan 6 features. The CAP regulatory storage, flood control, and dam safety functions of the plan fall under the jurisdiction of various agencies, legislation, and appropriations. Regulatory storage costs are included in CAP appropriations while the Corps of Engineers normally finances flood control features, and dam

safety modifications are authorized separately under the Reclamation Safety of Dams Act. Federal appropriations from these sources may not be sufficient to complete construction of Plan 6 in a timely manner; therefore, additional state and local financing sources may be required.

Financing and cost-sharing policies and techniques are being developed for the construction of Plan 6 as well as for various aspects of its operation such as water supply and delivery and hydroelectric development. The Governor of Arizona has appointed a group of citizens and representatives of agencies involved in water issues (Plan 6 Development Committee) to develop strategies for financing Plan 6 construction and operation. Institutional issues regarding cost-sharing for Plan 6 operations are also the subject of ongoing discussion between Reclamation and involved agencies such as SRP.