


CPTAC/CPWP Coordination Meeting
Sustainable Water Management Plan
Scope Determination Questions for the CPWP
July 29, 2016

1. What do you envision the SWM effort to include? Check all that apply.
 - A. Coordination to establish a regional watershed monitoring effort on the Coconino Plateau
 - B. Water resources availability on the Coconino Plateau (surface water, ground water, effluent water, harvested water)
 - C. Current and projected water demands on the Coconino Plateau
 - D. Potential for significant reduction in water demands by increased water conservation
 - E. Identification of at-risk ecosystems on the Coconino Plateau
 - F. Social impacts of sustainable water supplies (e.g. eco-tourism, fishing, boating, quality of life)
 - G. Economic impacts of sustainable water supplies (e.g. industrial needs, institutional needs, commercial needs, jobs, cost of developing new supplies)
 - H. Compilation of existing information
 - I. Collection of new data
 - J. Identification of environmental flow thresholds to protect T&E species and other riparian area demands involving research data collection/compilation of existing data



Commented [K1]:

Q1--SUSTAINABLE WATER MANAGEMENT SHOULD INCLUDE:

Stats that represent majority

- B. 71%--Water availability
- C. 81%--Current and projected demands
- D. 71%--Potential for reduction in demand
- E. 66%--ID at-risk
- G. 57%--Economic impacts of water supply
- H. 66%--Compilation of existing info

Less than majority:


- A. 38% Regional watershed monitoring
- F. 48% Social impacts
- I. 38% New data collection
- J. 43% Flow thresholds to protect threatened and endangered species

***Questions B, C, D and E seem linked to the possibility of collection of new data, which respondents stated, overall, they don't want from the CPWP. In that case, it seems pertinent to do an overview of existing info and data to agree what the gaps are. Partners might then divide this work out incrementally. It might also work well to prioritize needed data for each category.

CPTAC/CPWP Coordination Meeting
Sustainable Water Management Plan
Scope Determination Questions for the CPWP
July 29, 2016


2. What do you envision the SWM plan to look like?

- A. Infographic posters and tables for sharing
- B. Small report 10-50 pages
- C. Medium report 50-100 pages
- D. Large report 100+ pages



3. Who do you envision collecting data, writing the report and generating posters, etc.?

- A. TAC volunteers
- B. CPWP Coordinator
- C. Contract with other agencies (USGS, NAU, and Reclamation)
- D. Contract with private consultant



Commented [K2]:
Q2--TYPE OF REPORT OR GRAPHIC

28 responses


The fact that respondents had more than one view on this is pertinent. This might be dependent on the issue at hand.

Commented [K3]:
Q3--WHO COLLECTS DATA
40 responses


Even more so than the last response, this also might be dependent on the issue being studied. As has been stated, people often don't understand that volunteer work often has extreme limitations regarding both focus and endurance.

CPTAC/CPWP Coordination Meeting
Sustainable Water Management Plan
Scope Determination Questions for the CPWP
July 29, 2016

4. How do you envision the SWM plan to be used?
- A. General information to be presented to the CPWP
 - B. A guide for local policy and regulators
 - C. Public information
 - D. Utilization to affect policy (lobbying on the Plateau)



5. Assuming the majority of the SWM effort is contracted for, what level of financial support should be considered by the CPWP?
- A. \$0 - \$50,000
 - B. \$50,000 - \$100,000
 - C. \$100,000+



Commented [K4]:

Q4 HOW WILL SWP BE USED

51 responses

Majority

B. 95%--Guide for policy makers

C. 71%--Public information

D. 52%--Lobbying

This is a pretty clear message and can direct the issues mentioned above.

Commented [K5]:

Q5--MONETARY SUPPORT LEVEL FROM CPWP


20 responses

B. 48%

I'm assuming this is per year. This is obviously the highest number and would require buy-in from many partners or significant grant funding.

CPTAC/CPWP Coordination Meeting
Sustainable Water Management Plan
Scope Determination Questions for the CPWP
July 29, 2016

6. Prioritize the following sustainable water topics that you believe are important to the sustainable water management plan (1=highest priority, 4=lowest priority). Feel free to use the same priority for more than one topic if you believe they are equally important.
- A. Water resources (includes the following)
 - i. Surface water
 - ii. Groundwater
 - iii. Treated effluent
 - iv. Harvesting stormflows
 - B. Ecosystems (includes the following)
 - I. Endangered species
 - II. Threatened species
 - III. At risk species
 - IV. Aquatic species
 - V. Non-aquatic Riparian species
 - C. Social impacts (includes the following)
 - I. Eco-tourism
 - II. Sustainable Fishing
 - III. Lost jobs / displacement
 - IV. Quality of life
 - D. Economic impacts (includes the following)
 - I. Business water needs, profitability, lay-offs
 - II. Reduced income from fishing permits
 - III. Increased costs to pump water from greater depth
 - IV. Abandoned, replaced, or new groundwater wells and equipment as water levels decline



Commented [K6]:
Q6 PRIORITIZATION

[#1—33 responses
I THESE TWO SEEM MOST IMPORTANT
[#2—26 responses

#3—13 responses

#4—9 responses

I don't see 2v here, and I haven't tallied that number. I'm assuming aquatic species is represented in 2iv.

The first two categories—59 responses

The last two categories—22 responses

One caveat here. In the social sciences, we often see that even severe social problems are not well represented in some stats. In a blind study there is no way to see which respondents thought issues like *lost jobs and displacement* were important and what the relevance of that term means to them. In other words, we can't tell how strongly people feel about that particular topic. We can only measure it against the other topics. Does that make sense?

The CPWAC is particularly sensitive to these needs, and understanding these discrepancies is consistent with that view.

CPTAC/CPWP Coordination Meeting
Sustainable Water Management Plan
Scope Determination Questions for the CPWP
July 29, 2016

7. What else should be addressed in the SWM effort?

- Suggest the SWM effort be done in four phases
- Are not the at-risk ecosystems already identified?
- Adopt regulations for Northern Arizona outside the framework of an AMA
- Impacts of climate change
- Create benchmarks (could not read specifics)
- Politics of water allocation
- Use the CPWP to do solo info as appropriate
- Guidance for best ways to use and manage during drought and times of low supply
- Ag needs
- Healthy watershed
- Accumulate ???? studies info
- Weren't the supply and demand numbers established in the Appraisal Study?
- There is no environmental flow threshold
- New data should be collected where gaps are identified
- Recommendation for next steps
- Water conservation education
- Water reuse education
- Collection of new data as needed
- Funding should be identified over a range of years
- ???? species
- Pumping scenarios
- Growth projections
- Would like to see ICLEI objectives for planning
- No need to collect new data
- Must distinguish between potable and non-potable water uses
- Tribal sacred sites
- Water treatment cost variability
- Is return water a significant contributor to water supplies?
- Cost per gallon, potable, tiered
- Usage per capita, municipal vs. rural, tribal vs. non-tribal
- Only monitor high priority water for people and environment rather than region wide
- Monitor at-risk ecosystems
- Policy recommendations to be implemented at city, county and state levels
- Whatever funds are needed
- Water conserving initiatives to be implements at city and county level
- Identify at-risk ecosystems using existing data
- Identify social impacts based on existing studies
- Only collect new data within limits

Commented [K7]: Phase work is particularly useful and keeps people on task. My opinion. This could go along nicely with the benchmark comment. Phases and benchmarks within that phase.

Commented [K8]: It seems like it would be useful to do a survey of previous work—including appraisal study. Maybe we could do this in a TAC meeting.

Commented [K9]: I like the idea if policy supports this.

Commented [K10]: We would be behind the curve if we weren't considering this.

Commented [K11]: From the political end, it creates long-term teams and people who are thinking about all interests if there is, in fact, an emergency. This creates a "we" mentality.

Commented [K12]: Part of the assessment of need and how we value water

Commented [K13]: Makes sense

Commented [K14]: This is important with regard to the ability for the CPWAC to stay current and fluid.

Commented [K15]: Amanda already does this well.

Commented [K16]: An important goal for conservation so that water users are invested.

Commented [K17]: Maybe Erin or Brad has these stats.

Commented [K18]: The cost of water, in general, is dependent on location, maintenance, etc. In monetary terms, that value is static. I wonder if this respondent is addressing the idea of water as a human right.

Commented [K19]: This makes sense and could be included on the benchmarks.

CPTAC/CPWP Coordination Meeting
Sustainable Water Management Plan
Scope Determination Questions for the CPWP
July 29, 2016

7. Continued...What else should be addressed in the SWM effort?
- Explore options for who collects data after framework and priorities are determined
 - Identifying a sustainable supply/demand that maintains stream flows will go a long way toward supporting environmental demands/ecosystems w/o a primary ecological focus of the plan that will use more \$ resources
-

CPTAC/CPWP Coordination Meeting
Sustainable Water Management Plan
Scope Determination Questions for the CPWP
July 29, 2016

Karen Modesto surveyed responses and tallied boxes checked for Questions #1 and #6.

All but five of the responses prioritize "Water resources" and "Ecosystems"(question #6) as the sustainable water topics that are believed to be the highest priority, and is consistent with the number of boxes checked in Question #1.

Out of the 21 responses of what might be included in the SWM effort (Question #1), only eight responses checked "Coordination to establish a regional watershed monitoring effort..." question #1; less than half support.

- 15 responses checked "Water resources availability on the CP..." and one comment: "Weren't these done for appraisal study?"
- 17 responses checked "Current and projected water demands on the CP"
- 15 responses checked "Potential for significant reduction in water demands..." with comment: "As it relates to sustainability."
- 14 responses checked "Identification of at-risk ecosystems..." with comments: "Already completed?", "How defined?" and "based on existing data"
- 10 responses checked "Social Impacts of sustainable water supplies..."
- 12 responses checked "Economic impacts..."
- 14 responses checked "Compilation of existing information"
- Only seven responses checked "Collection of new data" with comments: "Where gaps are identified.", "As needed.", "No need.", "Within limits."
- Only nine responses checked "Identification of environmental flow thresholds..."
- One responder added "Ag needs" [would be included in current and projected demands] and another added "Policy recommendations" [Good recommendation.]
- Considering the comments regarding ecosystems, there may be a need for clarification,
- "Already completed?"
- "How defined?" [regarding] "at-risk"
- "Data exists in many areas."

[E.g., by using the term "Identification of..." does it mean to include the results of work that has already been completed, or to go through the process of identification? Regarding the responder who asked if it was already completed, perhaps they are referring to the CP At-risk Waters Project?]

Generally, there appears to be the most support for a SWM "plan" that is focused on water demands and availability of supply with support for acknowledgement of (?) at-risk ecosystems.

7705

Commented [K20]: It makes sense to have a discussion about the definition of these terms.

Commented [K21]: Overall, I see this as a useful survey. It provides useful insight and direction. Given focus and longevity, it seems to me that the partnership can attain many suggested goals.

In partnerships, I think it is also important to acknowledge when not all members are on the same footing. There are obvious obstacles toward goal attainment for some groups represented within the partnership.

It might be useful to set a time frame for other partnership surveys to see if the goals are still intact.