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Discussion Outline

Facilitated Discussion: Active participation and involvement will be encouraged in groups of 10 attendees at each of the 16 tables. Participants will engage in four discussion/exercises, and the discussions will be documented by neutral note-takers at each table:

Exercise #1: Issue Identification: What are the most important/urgent water management issues for Arizona which will need to be addressed? Identify which of these issues are short-term (less than 5 years) and which are long-term issues?

Exercise #2: Issue Discussion: From the initial list developed, choose issues with the most importance, and discuss and consider them using the following driving questions:

- Why is this issue critical?
- What are key components of this issue?
  - What are the critical challenges or obstacles, as well as opportunities, to resolving this issue?
- What do you believe are the key public policy questions that will need to be addressed to make progress towards resolving issue?
- What needs to happen to make progress – as specific as possible?
- Is timing critical to this issue, and if so, what does that timeline look like?

Exercise #3: The Legislative Docket: What are the key water related issues that need to be addressed by the Arizona Legislature in the next two years?

Exercise #4: Next Steps: How do we best move forward with this dialogue and address the agenda of issues identified at the workshop? How can the universities best assist in this dialogue and efforts to address the water issues identified?

Summary and Recap
Workshop on Water and Growth: 
Future Water Supplies for Central Arizona
Sponsored by the ASU Global Institute of Sustainability and the Sustainability Partnership
Phoenix, Arizona – June 21, 2006

Workshop: Summary of Participants

The workshop represented individuals and groups with interest in Arizona water from all over the state and from many different sectors. A total of 157 individuals participated in the workshop. 23 of those individuals were volunteers from the university who functioned as note takers and facilitators and did not participate in the conversations at the tables.

Of the 134 other participants:
• 29 worked for local government
• 23 worked for private companies
• 22 worked for state government
• 18 worked for federal government
• 18 worked for the state universities
• 17 came as citizens or representatives of citizen groups
• 4 worked for other states besides Arizona
• 3 were elected officials

Of the 134 participants:
• 98 came from Central Arizona
• 28 came from outside Central Arizona
• 6 came from out of state
• 2 unknown
# Workshop on Water and Growth:
## Future Water Supplies for Central Arizona
### Sponsored by the ASU Global Institute of Sustainability and the Sustainability Partnership
#### Phoenix, Arizona – June 21, 2006

## Most Important Issues - Exercise 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Important Issues</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WATER MANAGEMENT PLANNING</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long term planning vs crisis planning</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who decides what is &quot;best use&quot; - technical &amp; political sides</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future for Agriculture &amp; Agricultural Water Rights</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role of agricultural water</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>displacement of agriculture</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintaining strength of ag industry</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yuma ag water can't be the only solution</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linkages between water &amp; growth need attention</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>connecting land use planners and water manager/planners</td>
<td>5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land use pattern &amp; connection to water supply</td>
<td>2 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impact of &quot;first in time&quot; on growth patterns</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>growth in non regulated areas / supply issues</td>
<td>6 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>growth vs quality of life</td>
<td>5 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning for balanced water budget</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional / Watershed coordination</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statewide / regional collaboration</td>
<td>9 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional funding for collaboration</td>
<td>2 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recovery Planning / Aquifer Management</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for hydrologic information / data synthesis</td>
<td>9 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WATER MANAGEMENT LEGAL FRAMEWORK</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADWR funding</td>
<td>2 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulations needed outside of AMA's</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy rules</td>
<td>4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adequate water supply calculations</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legal availability to withdraw water exceeds physical ability</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preconditions for water companies</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to address exempt wells and/or lot splits</td>
<td>7 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need common rules for AMA &amp; non AMAs (statewide AMA)</td>
<td>2 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statewide uniformity approach to conservation, water pricing, gov controls, authority</td>
<td>3 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local authority &amp; control over supplies &amp; developments</td>
<td>2 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tools for managing water resources</td>
<td>5 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water banking outside of AMAs</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to update legal framework</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWS rules</td>
<td>2 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulation vs reality of use</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulations need to match goals</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how to meet safe yield</td>
<td>3 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual water rights vs. tragedy of commons</td>
<td>3 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>need to resolve adjudication issues</td>
<td>6 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unity of hydrologic cycle (gw &amp; sw interactions)</td>
<td>4 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulatory framework for marketing / transfers</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inter basin water transfers</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Exercise #1**

ASU - Global Institute of Sustainability
### Most Important Issues - Exercise 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPPLY RELIABILITY AND CLIMATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply reliability in general</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wet vs. paper in time of drought (need balance)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>firming CAP sub contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uncertainty about rights and supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diversification of supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexpected variability (drought &amp; climate change)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporating env. quality &amp; ecosystem needs in water policy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incorporating env. Quality &amp; water needs in policy discussion</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preservation of riparian areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment water rights</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC PERCEPTION &amp; EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public perception &amp; education</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water conservation education &amp; incentives</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water conservation education &amp; incentives</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public education</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how to get the message out</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flood irrigation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disincentives to conserve</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixed signals</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Phx (when should it happen?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoran Desert conservation plan (good model)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tier pricing not sufficient</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need legislative leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW SUPPLIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effluent -Reuse</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reuse for landscaping and urban ag</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recovery for potable use</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptance &amp; use</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where is the next bucket</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>integrated stormwater capture for new developments</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity / reliance on CAP</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wheeling water in CAP</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funding for infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political will to finance the infrastructure against public reaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINANCING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding new supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing new Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Most Important Issues - Exercise 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLORADO RIVER MANAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA &amp; NV - Interstate needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>firm the Co. River supply for AZ (deal with overallocation)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican treaty obligations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shortage sharing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>augmentation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WATER QUALITY: SALINITY MANAGEMENT &amp; INORGANICS</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arsenic, nitrates, salts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disposal of salts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brackish groundwater</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>using technology to increase water supply</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFRASTRUCTURE</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New infrastructure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>importing new supplies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>build regulatory storage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP Canal Capacity, Reliability &amp; Wheeling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQUITY ISSUES</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water as a right not a commodity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>financing equity between rural / urban &amp; generational</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distribution of supply vs need</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future allocations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allocation of NIA / CAP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAGRD</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structure &amp; governance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disconnect between areas of recharge and recovery</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDIAN WATER ISSUES</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Water Issues (in general)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don’t rely on GRIC settlement for M&amp;I supplies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>settlements / enforcement of deadlines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inter tribal issues for water rights / settlements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of water demand within the tribes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>removal of barriers for tribes to establish agreements with communities (re: disposition of tribal water rights)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Issues:** Specific issues identified on flipcharts were recorded and organized into representative issues which were organized under major categories.

**Totals:** Each table given a value of 1 on the chart if the issue was identified on the flipchart used during the exercise. Representative issues were totaled by summing the number of tables which listed issues under its categorization. Major categories were similarly totaled by summing tables which identified specific and representative issues which fell under its categorization. The maximum value any issue could receive was 16.

**Table:** Originally 20 tables were numbered for the workshop but there were only enough participants for 16 tables. A few tables were not seated during the workshop and were not included in this analysis.

This summary covers the second exercise. Groups were asked to discuss the most important issues from those identified in exercise #1. The facilitator asked groups to prioritize and discuss the top 5 issues. Questions were suggested to guide the conversation.

The list below summarizes of the issues that groups decided to discuss. Based on the notes collected from the conference, discussions ranged from in depth conversations to a simple listing of the issues without consistent conversation focused on the issue. We organized the issues into 11 broad categories (similar to the categories identified for Exercise 1 results).

- 12 groups discussed Water Management Planning issues
- 8 groups discussed Water Management Legal Framework issues
- 4 groups discussed Supply reliability and climate issues
- 4 groups discussed Environmental issues
- 3 groups discussed Public Perception and Education
- 3 groups discussed New Supplies issues
- 3 groups discussed Rural Water issues
- 2 groups discussed Financing issues
- 2 groups discussed Colorado River Management issues
- 1 group discussed Water Quality issues
- 1 group discussed Infrastructure issues

Three categories identified in Exercise 1 that we not further discussed in Exercise 2 were: Equity issues, CAGRD, and Indian Water Issues. A new category identified for Exercise 2 was Rural issues.

After the top issues were identified, groups were asked to frame their discussion of each top issue based on the following questions.

1. Why is this issue critical?
2. What are the key components of this issue?
3. What are the challenges, obstacles and opportunities related to resolving this issue?
4. What are the key public policy questions that need to be addressed?
5. What needs to happen to make progress?
6. If timing is critical, what is the timeline?

1 For exercise 2, groups generally grouped some issues from exercise 1 under certain broader themes which represented the larger issue. Rural water issues was such a category which was not specifically included in Exercise #1.
Within each broad category, the specific issue discussions covered the topics below. The number in parenthesis (#) indicates the number of groups that discussed this issue.

Water Management Planning - issues discussed:
- Regional collaboration (8)
- Maintaining the strength of Arizona’s agricultural sector (1)
- Discussions about linkages between water and growth (4)
- The need for comprehensive hydrologic data (3)
- Lack of funding for ADWR resulting in data gaps and poor enforcement of regulations (1)

Water Management Legal Framework- issues discussed:
- Assured Water Supply (2)
- Groundwater impacts on stream flow (1)
- Legal eligibility vs physical availability (1)
- Groundwater management (1)
- Exempt wells (1)
- Adjudications resolutions (1)
- Other Water management issues(2)

Supply Reliability & Climate – issues discussed:
- Long term uncertainty (1)
- Drought management (2)
- Water rights and supplies (1)

Environment - issues discussed:
- Reserving water for environmental needs (2)
- Environmental impacts (2)

Public Perception & Education - issues discussed:
- Conservation education (1)
- Public and legislative awareness of water issues (2)

New Supplies - issues discussed:
- Competition for water resources (1)
- Augmentation (1)
- Rules of engagement for the next bucket (1)

Rural - issues discussed:
- Rural growth, adequacy program, groundwater use and local control (3)

Financing - issues discussed:
- Cost of water and water markets (1)
- Financing water projects (1)
Colorado River Management - issues discussed:
  • Colorado river allocation (1)
  • Emerging metro areas competing for supply (1)

Water Quality - issues discussed:
  • Salt management (1)

Infrastructure - issues discussed:
  • Physical infrastructure (1)

Information contained in these detailed discussion may be incorporated into future revisions of the Discussion Paper presented at the workshop.
Exercise 3: Legislative Docket – Summary of Responses

The responses below are from 16 different discussion tables including approximately 160 individuals, when asked to provide the top 2 issues from their table they felt should be on the Arizona legislative agenda in the next two years. The number in parentheses is the number of different tables listing that recommendation:

1. Water adequacy authority in non-AMAs (8)
2. Disclosure of inadequate supplies (2) and GRD membership (1)
3. Local planning: consider water (2)
4. Growing Smarter statewide vision (2) or statewide planning process (1)
5. Exempt wells should not be exempt (7) or lot splits (4)
6. Statewide uniform water control (1) or regional water mgt. authority (2)
7. Create statewide authority for acquisition and assessment of supplies (1)
8. Rethink AMAs and ability to achieve goal (1)
9. Funding of adjudications (1)
10. Increased funding for ADWR (2) and Water Institute (1)
11. Fund additional water resources data collection, monitoring, studies (4)
12. GRD Wet vs paper water and sharing cost of developing and delivering supply (1)
13. Loan program for developing rural water supplies (1)
14. Maintain agricultural land uses (1)
15. Connect groundwater and surface water laws (3)
16. Protection of stream flow and riparian areas (1)
17. Drought triggers and recovery plan (1)

Verbatim responses (Categorized as Above)

1. Water adequacy authority in non-AMAs (8)
   - Require/ determine adequacy outside AMAs for all subdivisions
   - Legal availability to withdraw H2O exceeds physical ability
   - Address adequacy of water supplies – ADWR should have enhanced powers
   - Adequacy/assured water supply; definitely enable local government to tie growth to water and do not allow development without water
   - Give rural areas the ability and authority to deny new subdivisions on the basis of inadequate H2O supply
   - No development without adequate water supply outside of AMAs (adequate water needs to be reviewed)
   - No development without assured actual water supply.
   - Water adequacy in non-AMAs (outside AMAs) at all levels: towns, cities, subdivisions

2. Disclosure of inadequate supplies (a) and GRD membership (b)
   a) Disclosure of inadequacy determination (2)
      - Enforce full disclosure
      - Disclosure of inadequate water supplies to all future prospective home buyers
   b) Disclosure of property enrolled in GRD
      - [Notification of] future prospective home buyers as to [whether property] is in GRD
3. Local planning: consider water (2)
   - Grant local authority to manage land use, make planning decisions, taking into account water availability
   - Rural issues, including local growth management (water related)

4. Growing Smarter statewide vision (a) or statewide planning process (b)
   a) Growing Smarter (2)
      - Take "Growing Smarter" legislation further. Create guidelines, policies to help create statewide vision that incorporates regional (either defined politically or ecologically) culture, infrastructure, and goals.
      - Arizona needs a statewide "water vision" that is guided at a state level but designed, implemented, and endorsed by locality or regional
   b) Statewide planning process (1)
      - Request funding for the development of guidelines under the present "Growing Smarter" legislation that allows an agency, such as ADWR, to draft methods etc. that aid municipalities, counties and other entities in meeting the intent of the legislation. State policy / local flexibility and decision making, well-defined approach to balanced water budget (including funding considerations for more information). Establish statewide water planning process or commission

5. Exempt wells should not be exempt (a) or lot splits (b)
   a) Exempt wells (7)
      - Loopholes: exempt wells, AWS
      - New statewide legislation for regulation of assured water supply including exempt wells
      - Rural issues, including exempt wells
      - Eliminate exempt wells statewide
      - Exempt wells: should in fact not be exempt from regulations
      - Address exempt wells: county rule over these issues
   b) Wildcat development (4)
      - New statewide legislation for regulation of assured water supply including lot splits
      - Rural issues, including lots splits
      - Address lot splits: county rule over these issues
      - Local (county) authority to regulate lot splits

6. Statewide uniform water control (a) or regional water mgt. authority (b)
   a) Statewide uniform control of water (1)
   b) Regional control of water (2)
      - Regionalized authority of water management
      - Need statutory authority for the creation of water management structures outside of AMAs.

7. Create statewide authority for acquisition and assessment of supplies (1)
   - Statewide planning and funding for quantifying all supplies; single authority (ADWR) for assessment/acquisition of supplies while understanding regional differences

8. Rethink AMAs and ability to achieve goal (1)
   - Rethink statutory authority of AMAs and their ability to achieve their safe yield goal: contradictory statutes, absence of needed statutes
9. Funding of adjudications (1)
   - Increase major funding to complete the adjudications!

10. Increased funding for ADWR (a) and Water Institute (b)
    a) ADWR (2)
       - Increase funding for ADWR
       - Permanent funding for ADWR to conduct water availability studies and other water issues including public education
    b) Water Institutes: Permanent funding for to conduct water availability studies and other water issues including public education

11. Fund additional water resources data collection, monitoring, studies (4)
    - Increased monitoring in critical areas of state
    - Legislative Study Comm: Need DATA! We need to get the facts about how much & where the water supply is: Involve stakeholders, collect data across watersheds

12. GRD wet vs. paper water and sharing cost of developing and delivering supply (1)
    - GRD Wet vs paper; GRD cost share in plumbing & transportation not just replenishment

13. Loan program for developing rural water supplies (1)
    - Loan program for rural areas to develop water supplies

14. Maintain agricultural land uses (1)
    - Maintain agricultural land uses: economic value; water resource buffer against drought; agriculture independence/security

15. Connect groundwater and surface water laws (3)
    - GW – SW, CAGRD \rightarrow downstream replenishment of upstream withdrawals
    - Reconnecting groundwater and surface water legally and tweak current laws
    - Address the disconnect between groundwater and surface water: define groundwater and surface water; define the connections; this is a process that needs to be set in motion; this would incidentally address exempt wells

16. Protection of stream flow and riparian areas (1)
    - Resolving problems with AZ groundwater law to address well impacts and stream flow issues – “tragedy of commons” issue

17. Drought triggers and recovery plan (1)
    - Establish drought triggers and recovery plan
Exercise 4: Next Steps – interpretation & highlights.

As the final exercise the groups were asked...

What happens from here – how do we move forward with this dialogue and these issues we’ve discussed?

During an approximately 15 minute discussion¹

- 8 of 16 groups specifically identified a role for the Universities
  - 4 groups suggested a follow-up on the workshop with specific ideas including:
    - Disseminate findings from the workshop
    - Presenting findings to the Statewide Water Advisory Group
    - Preparing a white paper from workshop dialogue
    - Continuing dialogue with 2nd workshop in 6 months
  - 4 groups suggested the Universities could assist with data collection and research. Specific suggestions included research on:
    - Desalination
    - Water conservation
    - Water economics
    - Water policy
    - Quantifying long term sustainable supplies
  - 3 groups suggested the Universities do more to disseminate research findings and related information
  - 3 groups identified a need for applied research from the Universities with input from practitioners
  - Other ideas raised by at least one group included
    - Call for coordination among the Universities or support for Arizona Water Institute (3)
    - Universities could serve as a neutral ground for water discussions (3)
    - Establishment of internships with agencies to connect research and practice (1)
    - Create a clearinghouse of necessary hydrological information through AWI and AHIS (1)

- 9 of 16 groups identified legislative issues or areas where proposals needed to be developed for legislative action
  - Education of legislators on water issues & needs (4)
  - Identification of lobbyists for specific issues (3)
  - 4 groups suggested developing some type of advisory process or think tank to address specific issues. The specific issues mentioned included

¹ For the discussion of the possible role of the universities one group identified a number of potential university activities during exercise #2 but not during exercise #4. We add this information to this summary.
- Developing legislative recommendations
- Identification of current problems & desired conditions
- Interaction between water deliveries & quality of life
- Environmental impacts of water use & benefits of open space
- Addressing obstacles to re-use of effluent

Other issues related to legislation identified were:
- Need to resolve local control issues
- Need for an initiative to create a single, statewide AMA
- Need for an Arizona Environmental Policy Act – requiring an assessment of environmental impacts and for a fee to pay the costs of such impacts
- Finding a means for making water markets work for everyone

11 of the 16 groups identified some aspect of regional cooperation and coordination
- 3 groups identified a need to build coalition between regional groups
- 5 groups identified specific mechanisms to find common ground among the diverse groups in order to approach solutions including facilitating dialogue, understanding the obstacles and developing trust among stakeholders
- And 3 groups mentioned the concept of statewide water planning

8 of the 16 groups identified the need for public education and outreach concerning water issues
- 2 groups identified the use of media forums to address the issues and raise public awareness
  - The only specific issue mentioned was education about the impacts of exempt wells
- 2 groups identified the need for community and leadership input to drive the vision
- One group suggested a need for resources for educating more of the public to the issues.
Concern for Arizona’s water issues is shared by many diverse groups including state and federal agencies, water utilities, cities, towns, and counties, citizen groups, developers, consultants and environmental groups to name a few. The workshop was likewise attended by a diverse group of individuals. By design the participants were assigned to tables to mix up the conversation. The conversation was intended to be enriched from a variety of perspectives on particular issues.

To understand the dynamics of each table discussion, the note takers completed a survey at the end of the workshop. The survey asked about the passionate issues represented in the discussion, issues of consensus or polarization, insights for role of the universities and general suggestions for the workshop. The bullet points below summarize comments from two of the questions on the surveys.

Which issues were most passionately discussed at your table?

- Addressing weaknesses in the adequate water supply program (2)
- Exempt wells (6)
- Lot splits (2)
- Disclosure of water supply adequacy
- Coalition building and regional partnerships (5)
- Financing of water supplies and infrastructure
- The Central Arizona Groundwater Replenishment District (CAGRD) (4)
- Paper versus wet water issues
- Adjudications
- Disconnect between GW & SW (4)
- Development regulations rural & non-AMA areas (3)
- Equity issues between rural & urban (3)
- Local control issues (4)
- Connecting research and practice
- Indian water rights and availability for leasing
- Educating the public & leadership on water issues
- Long term versus crisis management approaches
- Drought
- Defining sustainability and upholding it as a goal for growth
- Sustained growth vision and quality of life
- Maintaining strength of the agricultural economy

Which if any issues caused the discussion to become polarized at your table?

- Note takers from 10 of the 16 tables indicated that there were no polarizing issues discussed during the workshop
• Note takers from 6 of the 16 tables indicated that there were polarizing issues brought up during the discussion. A few of these 6 note takers commented that there was general consensus at their table but disagreement on the specifics in resolving one or two issues. The following issues were mentioned as sources of polarized discussion:
  o Defining the relative roles of federal, state and local authorities in resolving water issues
  o How to create change in the legislature and within the legal framework
  o The adjudications and the distinction between groundwater, surface water and effluent
  o Indian water rights
  o How to best educate the public on the issues
  o Identifying the most appropriate regional planning tool.
  o Extent to which state wide regulations are needed

Was there a clear or even unanimous consensus at your table?

• All 16 tables noted that there was clear consensus to some degree for most of the issues