

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

September 3, 2025

CLERK OF THE COURT
B. Powell
Deputy

SPECIAL WATER MASTER
SHERRI ZENDRI

In Re The General Adjudication of
All Rights to Use Water in the Gila
River System and Source
W-1, W-2, W-3, W-4 (Consolidated)

FILED: 9/10/2025

In re: Subflow Technical Report, San Pedro River Watershed
Contested Case No. W1-103

MINUTE ENTRY

Courtroom 301 – Central Court Building

10:00 a.m. This is the time set for a Status Conference to obtain a progress update from the technical committee and address the progress of the project, before Special Water Master Sherri Zendri.

The following parties/attorneys appear virtually through Court Connect:

- Mark McGinnis and Mike Foy on behalf of Salt River Project (“SRP”)
- Jenny Winkler on behalf of the City of Chandler
- Kevin Crestin and Eric Wilkins on behalf of the Arizona State Land Department (“ASLD”)
- Marisa Hazel and Mark Widerschein on behalf of the United States Department of Justice, Environment and Natural Resources
- John Burnside on behalf of on behalf of Arizona Public Service (“APS”) and BHP Copper

- Brian Heiserman on behalf of the City of Cottonwood, St. David Irrigation District, Gila Valley Irrigation District and Franklin Irrigation District
- Nyla Knox and Sean Hood on behalf of Freeport Minerals
- Phillip Londen on behalf of the Arizona Water Company
- Susan Montgomery on behalf of the Yavapai Apache Nation and observing for the Pascua Yaqui Tribe
- Joe Sparks on behalf of San Carlos Apache Tribe
- Charles Cahoy on behalf of the City of Phoenix
- Karen Nielsen on behalf of the Arizona Department of Water Resources (“ADWR”)
- Michael Rolland on behalf of the cities of Avondale, Glendale, Mesa, Tempe and Scottsdale.
- Katya Norris on behalf of the Navajo Nation
- Merrill Godfrey on behalf of the Gila River Tribe
- The following Groundwater Flow Model Technical Committee (the “Committee”) members are present:
 - Jerry Shi and Emily LoDolce (ADWR)
 - Dean Alford (City of Tempe)
 - Doug Bartlett (Clear Creek Associates)
 - Dave Colvin (LRE Water)
 - Amy Hudson (Tetra Tech)
 - Conor Kingston (Stetson Engineers, Inc.)
 - Colin Kikuchi (Montgomery & Associates)
 - Nathan Miller (Matrix New World Engineering)
 - Peter Mock (PMGC, Inc.)
 - James Wells (LEA Environmental, Inc.)

A record of the proceedings is made digitally in lieu of a court reporter.

The Special Master addresses the parties regarding an update on the progress of the committee and their thoughts on how it is working.

Emily LoDolce provides an update for the Court. She shares that the Committee has met three more times since the last hearing – June 19th, July 31st, and August 28th.

Ms. Lo Dolce explained that at those meetings the members continue to work well together in discussing the timeline for the project and the major areas of disagreement (model structure, review of calibration targets, review of boundary conditions, recalibration, and testing and use.) The focus of the last 3 meetings has been the model structure and figuring out how to split up a review of the driller logs so that each committee member can have a chance to review how ADWR has decided on the layering elevations for the different geologic layers in the model.

Ms. LoDolce explained that 6 zones were proposed for review. Not every committee member took a zone because there are more zones than members, but all the well logs are on the ADWR website. The Committee is using an ADWR-internal secured Google Share website to share files.

Ms. LoDolce also explained the Committee is also looking at the model grid design - the cell size used. The Committee has been discussing where additional discretization might be warranted, cell size, and the strategy of where cells should be smaller.

The Committee has requested that ADWR provide another grid proposal to the Committee with the agency's technical reasoning

The next meeting of the Committee is September 11, 2025. ADWR expects to present the revised grid, and the driller log reviews for Committee discussion.

Ms. LoDolce stated once the Committee has the model structure redesigned, they will have a better idea of the timeline for the following steps: review of boundary conditions, review of calibration targets, recalibration testing, and use.

The Special Master asked for clarification regarding the potential areas of disagreement.

Ms. LoDolce explained that the Committee has been focusing on identifying bedrock contacts and the fine-grained unit that could be an impediment to groundwater flow. Some of the driller's logs don't hit bedrock and/or are inconsistent with how they describe the fine-grained material.

The Special Master gives Committee members the opportunity to add any additional information.

Mr. Colvin indicates he feels it the collaboration with the other committee members has been successful. All members participate and remain objective.

Mr. Mark echoes Mr. Colvin's comments

Ms. LoDolce also states the Committee is working well together and the driller log review is a good example.

Sean Hood (Freeport) also agrees, stating he has heard secondhand the Committee is making progress. Mr. Hood also expresses concern that participation could have an unintended effect of disadvantaging participating parties when reviewing the model. He states other parties might suggest that an objection is misplaced because the objecting parties' consultant worked on the model, and to address this concern some of the parties put together a stipulated motion to confirm that participation on the technical committee

does not disadvantage any parties. It is anticipated the Court will receive the stipulation in a few days.

Mr. Sparks (San Carlos Apache Tribe) states the San Carlos Apache Tribe's position is that members of the Committee should not take advocacy positions on the process and therefore a stipulation is inappropriate.

The Special Master agrees there should be no advocacy as part of this process. Decisions made here should be based upon the best science, not necessarily what is best for any individual clients, in which case there may be some clients that will not necessarily get what they want from the model results and would therefore object.

The Special Master indicates she will wait to see the language of any proposed stipulation before making any decision in the appropriateness.

The Special Master thanks everyone for their participation and reminds the group of the next progress update from the Committee on **November 12, 2025, at 10:00 a.m.**

10:23 a.m. Matter concludes.

A copy of this order is mailed to all persons listed on the Court-approved mailing list.