NEWS RELEASE

Arizona House of Representatives
Representative Gail Griffin (R-19)
1700 West Washington • Phoenix, Arizona • 85007

Thursday, April 24, 2025
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Governor Hobbs Vetoes Legislation That Would Have Provided Critical Groundwater Data

STATE CAPITOL, PHOENIX – Rural Arizonans want to know how much groundwater they have beneath their feet, but Democrat Governor Katie Hobbs has vetoed the only legislation that would have provided them with that information.

House Bill 2271 (supply and demand; assessment; groundwater), sponsored by Representative Gail Griffin, Chair of the House Natural Resources, Energy & Water Committee, would have required the Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR) to provide basic information—such as the number of active index wells and average depth-to-water level— in its annual supply and demand assessments for each rural groundwater basin.

Importantly, the bill would have also required ADWR to provide the total volume of groundwater available in each basin, which is a critical metric that Arizona state lawmakers and local constituents have been asking for.

Last Friday, Governor Hobbs vetoed the bill, stating in her veto letter that knowing how much groundwater is available in each basin would not "make a difference in solving the [state's] water policy challenges." Representative Griffin disagrees, as do many rural constituents.

State and local officials *want* complete and accurate groundwater information to make informed decisions on rural policy matters.

In 2023, La Paz County Supervisor Holly Irwin said: "If you don't know what's underneath the ground, how can you even determine how much your supply and demand is going to be?" "The county needs to know how much water is in the ground … You need to know what's down there." "We don't know how much water we have in these aquifers."

In 2023, La Paz County Supervisor Duce Minor said: "This issue is the unknown. No one knows how much is in the aquifers."

In 2023, Democrat Attorney General Kris Mayes said: "[W]e have no idea … how much water is left."

In 2023, Sarah Porter, Director of ASU's Kyl Center for Water Policy and member of the Governor's Water Policy Council, said: "You need to know … how much water is there."

In 2010, Former ADWR Director, Herb Gunther, who served under Democrat Governor Janet Napolitano, said that gathering "information on existing supplies" was "necessary" and "important" "for the future needs of the … state."

In 2010, Ron Doba, Administrator for the Northern Arizona Municipal Water Users Association and member of Governor Hobbs' Water Policy Council said that gathering this information is the "first step" in "address[ing] the state's water needs on a statewide basis."

In 2022, ADWR Director Tom Buschatzke said: "[I]f you want to manage something well, you need to have the data. … [Having the data] would be a benefit to the state, and we could build consensus." "Certainly, to put together a robust and successful regulatory program, you need the data…." "You cannot manage something you cannot measure."

State and local officials have fought to obtain this information, but ADWR keeps deflecting, won't provide it.

Last year, House and Senate Republicans sought to obtain this critical groundwater information, sending a letter to ADWR in December 2024 asking, "How many years' worth of water do we have?"

Republicans acknowledge that some rural groundwater basins are facing challenges, but they believe they are not receiving a complete picture, leading some to suspect the Governor may be trying to mislead lawmakers into thinking that certain basins are in a more "critical" condition than they actually are.

In 2024, La Paz County Supervisor Holly Irwin said: "I requested updated hydrology studies. And we're almost in 2024 now… and I've yet to get any updated hydrology studies." Kris Mayes called the lack of information "outrageous" and said that La Paz County is "begging for a hydrological study."

In 2022, the Legislature included a provision in the landmark Water Infrastructure Finance Authority (WIFA) legislation (SB1740) to require ADWR to provide a recurring supply and demand assessment for each basin that would include the amount of "supply" in the basin, with the first set of assessments to be completed in 2023.

In 2022, ADWR Director Tom Buschatzke testified in support of the bill, saying: "[The supply and demand assessment] is a key to eventually get to a place where we can find a way to start getting better data than we have now."

On July 6, 2022, Governor Doug Ducey signed SB1740, providing hope that constituents like La Paz County Supervisor Holly Irwin and others would receive regular updates on the rural groundwater basins that mattered most to them.

Since 2022, however, ADWR has issued 22 supply and demand assessments (7 in 2023; and 15 in 2024), and none of them have included the total volume of groundwater available in the basin to a depth below the "average well depth" in the basin, which is not a metric the Department has used before.

According to records dating back to 1994, the Department has consistently defined "groundwater in storage" as the total amount of groundwater available to a depth of 1,200 feet. ADWR under Governor Hobbs appears to have changed the definition to the amount of groundwater available to the "average well depth," which is only 409 feet in the Willcox Basin and only 35 feet in Ranegras Plain.

According to Representative Griffin, providing the amount of groundwater available to only 35 feet deep in a basin does not provide meaningful information nor respect the specific requests that state and local officials have been making over the last several years.

In subsequent correspondence received from the Department, the Hobbs Administration either explains why it cannot provide the requested information or why it thinks the information, if it could be provided, should not be used for the purpose of making policy decisions.

There could be hundreds of years' worth of water beneath the surface.

In 2010, Former House Speaker of the House Andy Tobin passed legislation (HB2661) to "identify and quantify the water supplies currently available in each county."

The bill received wide support, including from Democrat Governor Janet Napolitano's ADWR Director, Herb Gunther, who said the "goal" of the bill was, "number one," to "identify what water resources are available currently."

On May 11, 2010, Governor Jan Brewer signed the bill, and, on October 1, 2011, ADWR issued a statewide assessment, showing that, as of the end of the relevant assessment period, the following basins had the following non-adjusted estimated volumes of groundwater available in storage to a depth of 1,200 feet (page 27, table 9) (a complete copy of the table can be found attached):

Groundwater Basin/Subbasin	Groundwater Supply to 1,200 feet
Willcox Basin	42 million acre-feet
Douglas Basin	20.8 million acre-feet
Gila Bend Basin	17 million acre-feet
McMullen Valley Basin	14 million acre-feet
Harquahala Basin	13 million acre-feet
Big Chino Subbasin[1]	10 million acre-feet
Ranegras Plain Basin	9 million acre-feet
Hualapai Valley Basin	3 million acre-feet
Butler Valley Basin	2 million acre-feet

While the volumes reported above are substantial, they only reflect the amount available to 1,200 feet. Most of the groundwater basins are actually much deeper. The Willcox, Hualapai, and Ranegras Plain basins, for example, are 4,800, 8,000, and 3,200 feet deep at their maximum points, respectively.

Although the 2011 assessment did not express the total volumes of groundwater available in storage in each basin in terms of the "number of years" that the supply would last at the present rate of decline, the 2011 assessment did provide other relevant groundwater data—such as estimated annual demand and estimated annual recharge—that members of the public could use to calculate that figure independently.

[1] Data for the Big Chino Subbasin was not included in the 2011 assessment, but it was included in ADWR's Arizona Water Atlas Volume 5 (2009) (page 11) which the 2011 assessment was based (see page 28, footnote 4 of the 2011 assessment).

Based on the estimates included in ADWR's 2011 assessment, the following groundwater basins could be said to have had the following number of years' worth of groundwater available in 2011, based on the most recent rate of decline that was estimated for each basin at the time of the 2011 assessment:

Groundwater Basin/Subbasin	Years' Worth of Groundwater at the Reported Rate of Decline[2]
Willcox Basin	261 years' worth of groundwater
Douglas Basin	547 years' worth of groundwater
Gila Bend Basin	60 years' worth of groundwater[3]
McMullen Valley Basin	199 years' worth of groundwater
Harquahala Basin	199 years' worth of groundwater
Big Chino Subbasin	610 years' worth of groundwater[4]
Ranegras Plain Basin	317 years' worth of groundwater
Hualapai Valley Basin	441 years' worth of groundwater
Butler Valley Basin	148 years' worth of groundwater

While the information above likely does not reflect current groundwater trends—as additional pumping has occurred—that is exactly why state lawmakers in 2022 passed legislation requiring ADWR to update the 2011 information on a recurring 5-year basis.

As ADWR Director Tom Buschatzke testified in 2022: "The last major opportunity [we had] to do an assessment was … around the 2010 time period, and we really haven't updated that information since that period of time."

Cheryl Lombard, CEO of the Valley Partnership, also reiterated Director Buschatzke's point, saying that the "needs assessment" was "created … when Speaker Tobin was in office [in 2010]," and that "it is very important that [this assessment] will be kept up via this legislation."

When Governor Hobbs took office in January 2023, it became her responsibility to administer the 2022 legislation and ensure that ADWR's supply and demand assessments included this critical information.
So far, however, they have not—leaving constituents guessing as to how much water is left.

Even considering the partial information ADWR provided in the last supply and demand assessment, the Ranegras Plain Basin, for example, should have at least 62 years' worth of water available at the current rate of decline in just the top 35 feet of the basin alone.

Whether 62 years is sufficient or not is state and local policymakers' decision, but the point of HB2271 was that the only way policymakers get to make that important decision is by having the information in the first place—and that means receiving all relevant information, not just small slices of it.

[2] "Years' Worth of Groundwater" was calculated using columns 3, 5, and 6 of table 9 on page 27 of the 2011 assessment, as follows: "Estimated Groundwater in Storage" / ("2006 GW Demand" – "Estimated Natural Recharge").
[3] It is unclear whether the 2011 assessment adequately accounts for the substantial additional amount of inflow that occurs following major rain events. ADWR's Arizona Water Atlas Volume 5 reports that annual recharge in the Gila Bend Basin is between 10,000 and 37,000 acre-feet. It also reports that estimates for groundwater available in storage "range widely" from 17 to 61 million acre-feet. Using these alternative figures results in 236 years' worth of groundwater.
[4] "Years' Worth of Groundwater " was calculated for the Big Chino Subbasin using total 2006 GW Demand for the entire Verde River Basin (including Verde Canyon and Verde Valley Subbasins) and adding the annual outflow from the subbasin to the Verde River of 17,700 acre-feet (for annual outflow, see pages 10-11 of ADWR's Arizona Water Atlas Volume 5).

Governor Hobbs is listening to radical special interest groups and ignoring reason; she's not listening to Arizona constituents.

House and Senate Republicans are working on tools to address groundwater in rural areas, including by conserving water, increasing groundwater recharge, providing solutions for domestic well owners, and increasing local control, but lawmakers need additional information before they adopt additional tools that could negatively impact local communities.

With Governor Hobbs' veto of HB2271, it seems clear the Governor is putting the cart before the horse and trying to push through a predetermined outcome on rural groundwater legislation without regard to the basins that actually need it or the tools that would be appropriate for those basins.

According to Representative Griffin, the Governor isn't listening to reason; she is listening to the most radical wing of the environmental community, who don't have Arizonan's best interests at heart. They don't want rural Arizonans to know how much water they have beneath the ground.

As Former ADWR Director Alan Kleinman wisely said in 1994: "Beware of those politicians, or others, who 'create' a crisis and then appear suddenly with the solution to the 'fabricated crisis', which they just created."

If Governor Hobbs wants to make an informed, science-driven decision, then she should be asking for this information too. She should stop listening to the radical extremists, take the time to gather and provide the updated information we requested, and tell us how much groundwater is available in each basin—just like we asked for in 2022, 2024, and 2025.

Had the Governor taken these steps from day one of taking office—such as by requiring the Department to include them in its first supply and demand assessments in 2023 and 2024, as the Legislature required in 2022—then we would have already had this information by now.

Gail Griffin is a Republican member of the Arizona House of Representatives serving Legislative District 19, which includes areas of Greenlee, Graham, Cochise, and eastern Pima and Santa Cruz Counties. She Chairs the House Natural Resources, Energy & Water Committee.

###

Table 9 Current Groundwater Supply for All Basins (4/5/2011)

All Basins Current Groundwater Supply Analysis [1] Rev 4_5_2011

Basin	Sub-Basins	2006 GW Demand [2] (AF)	2006 AG Drainage Pumping [2] (AF)	Estimated Natural Recharge [3] (AF/YR)	Estimated Groundwater in Storage [4] (AF)	Adjusted Groundwater in Storage [5] (AF)	No. of Non-Cancelled, Non-abandoned, Production wells including	Sum of tested pump capacity of wells in column to the left (gpm)	Maximum Current Pump Capacity (AF/YR)[21]	Historical Committed Demand (Since 1973) (AF/YR)	Committed Demand Since 1995 (AF/YR)	Adjusted GW in Storage divided by 100 years (AF/YR)	2006 GW Demand Exceeds Natural Recharge?	Ratio 2006 GW Demand: Storage [6]	Recent Negative Water Level Change Rate [7] (Ft/Yr)	Available Supply [8] (Assumption 1) Long-Term GW Supply >= Current GW Demand	Available Supply [9] (Assumption 2) LongTerm GW Supply = Current GW Demand	Available Supply [10] (Assumption 3) Long-Term GW Supply < Current GW Demand	Available Supply [11] (Assumption 4) For AMAs Provided By CR Basin Model Projections	Available Supply [12] (Assumption 5) Long-Term GW Supply >= Current GW Demand For Basins with Direct or Potential Colorado River Connections	Documented Historic or Current GW/SW Impacts?[13]	Perennial Stream [14] (Miles)
Agua Fria	None	3,600		9,000	600,000	480,000	1,168	16,157	26,061	1	0	4,800	No	1:150	-0.1	3,600					?	107
Aravaipa Canyon	None	500		7,000	5,000,000	4,000,000	190	10,941	17,648	0	0	40,000	No	1:8,000	-0.1	500					N	50
Big Sandy	Fort Rock	15,000		22,000	9,500,000	7,600,000	2,074	23,506	37,915	110	110	76,000	No	1:500	-0.4	15,000					?	49
	Wikieup														-0.5							
Bill Williams [16]	Burro Creek	3,300		32,000	10,000,000	8,000,000	4,970	196,310	316,649	8	8	80,000	No	1:2,400	NA					3,300	N	152
	Alamo Reservoir														-0.2							
	Clara Peak														NA							
	Skull Valley														-1.3							
	Santa Maria														-0.1							
Bonita Creek	None	3,300		9,000	1,000,000	800,000	4	650	1,048	0	0	8,000	No	1:250	NA	3,300					N	14
Buller Valley	None	14,500		1,000	2,000,000	1,600,000	1	14,270	23,018	0	0	16,000	Yes	1:100	-1		14,500				N	
Cienega Creek	None	1,100		8,500	5,100,000	4,080,000	1,050	11,731	18,922	427	427	40,800	No	1:3,700	-0.3	1,100					?	46
Coconino Plateau	None	500		NA	3,000,000	2,400,000	84	3,486	5,623	67	67	24,000	UNK	1:4,800	-0.5	500					Y	197
Detrital Valley [16]	None	150		1,000	1,000,000	800,000	187	2,212	3,568	19,181	19,129	8,000	No	1:5,300	-0.8					150	N	27
Donnelly Wash	None	19		3,000	140,000	112,000	53	1,356	2,187	0	0	1,120	No	1:5,900	NA	19					N	3
Douglas	Douglas	53,500		15,500	20,800,000	16,640,000	1,382	319,410	515,211	0	0		Yes	1:300	-1.2		53,500				?	2
	Douglas INA [15]														-1.3							
Dripping Springs Wash	None	11		3,000	150,000	120,000	56	5,441	8,776	0	0	1,200	No	1:10,900	-0.4	11					N	7
Duncan Valley	None	8,100		6,000	9,000,000	7,200,000	351	44,090	71,117	0	0	72,000	Yes	1:900	-0.2	8,100					?	26
Gila Bend	None	295,300		10,000	17,000,000	13,600,000	382	464,411	749,098	36,645	36,645	136,000	Yes	1:50	-1.3			< 295,300			Y	
Grand Wash	None	2		NA	NA	NA	6	40	65	0	0	N/A	NA	NA	NA	2					N	4
Harquahala	None	66,200		1,000	13,000,000	10,400,000	255	239,697	386,633	22,986	22,986	104,000	Yes	1:150	-1.1		66,200				?	
Hualapai Valley	None	8,800		2,000	3,000,000	2,400,000	843	15,138	24,418	96,702	83,785	24,000	Yes	1:250	-0.9		8,800				N	21
Kanab Plateau [16]	None	1,300		NA	NA	NA	178	3,176	5,123	412	412	N/A	NA	NA	-0.1					1,300	N	139
Lake Havasu [16]	None	0		35,000	1,000,000	800,000	69	3,695	5,960	209	209	8,000	No	NA	NA					0	Y	38
Lake Mohave [16]	None	3,500		183,000	1,200,000	960,000	900	32,981	53,199	24,053	23,925	9,600	No	1:250	-0.1					3,500	Y	122
Little Colorado River Plateau [16,17]	C-aquifer	98,700		319,000	413,000,000	330,400,000	5,742	224,777	362,567	38,764	34,145	7,632,000	No	1:3,300	-1.4					98,700	Y	884
	D-aquifer			5,400	15,000,000	12,000,000																
	N-aquifer			20,200	525,000,000	420,800,000																
	Joseph City INA [15]			NA	NA	NA									NA							
Lower Gila [16]	Childs Valley	110,350	104000	9,000	100,000,000	80,000,000	2,199	998,628	1,610,794	0	0	800,000	Yes	1:700	NA					110,350	Y	11
	Dendora Valley														-1.7							
	Wellton-Mohawk														-0.4							
Lower San Pedro	Camp Grant Wash	23,700		24,000	11,000,000	8,800,000	1,382	111,318	179,557	1,265	1,203		No	1:350	-0.2	23,700					Y	77
	Mammoth														-0.6							
McMullen Valley	None	71,500		1,000	14,000,000	11,200,000	335	50,896	82,096	36,351	36,103	112,000	Yes	1:150	-2.2		71,500				?	
Meadview	None	150		4,000	1,000,000	800,000	38	651	1,050	0	0	8,000	No	1:5,300	-1.1	150					N	7
Morenci	None	9,200		15,000	3,000,000	2,400,000	331	35,094	56,607	0	0	24,000	No	1:250	-0.6	9,200					?	355
Paria	None	100		NA	15,000,000	12,000,000	10	1,060	1,710	452	0	120,000	UNK	1:120,000	-1.2		100				N	27
Parker [16]	Cibola Valley	1,800		241,000	14,000,000	11,200,000	4,410	80,607	130,020	985	909	112,000	No	1:6,200	NA					1,800	Y	147
	Colorado River Indian Reservation														-0.1							
	La Posa Plains														-0.9							
Peach Springs	None	350		NA	1,000,000	800,000	27	1,628	2,626	0	0	8,000	UNK	1:2,300	-0.1		350				N	14
Phoenix [18,19]	Carefree	689,300		172,300	80,400,000	64,320,000	86,793	15,103,060	24,361,344	631,935	594,224	643,200	Yes	1:93	NA							
	East Salt River														-1.1							
	Fountain Hills														-2.1							
	Hassayampa														-0.2				TBD		Y	
	Lake Pleasant														-0.4							
	Rainbow Valley														-0.6							
	West Salt River														-1							
Pinal [18,20]	Aguirre Valley	434,700		96,300	35,200,000	28,160,000	11,580	3,555,490	5,735,031	235,237	232,175	281,600	Yes	1:65	-0.8							
	Eloy														-1.8							
	Maricopa-Stanfield														-1				TBD		Y	
	Santa Rosa														NA							
	Vekol Valley														-0.1							
Prescott [18,19]	Little Chino	20,300		8,200	3,000,000	2,400,000	14,556	233,594	376,789	25,052	22,381	24,000	Yes	1:100	-1.4		20,300				Y	
	Upper Agua Fria														-1.4							
Ranegras Plain	None	29,350		1,000	9,000,000	7,200,000	403	55,092	88,864	312	312	72,000	Yes	1:250	-0.9		29,350				N	
Sacramento Valley	None	4,000		1,000	3,600,000	2,880,000	911	13,349	21,532	31,807	30,805	28,800	Yes	1:700	-0.5	4,000					N	5
Safford	Gila Valley	84,900		105,000	27,000,000	21,600,000	5,820	781,140	1,259,984	7,438	3,433	216,000	No	1:250	-0.2							
	San Carlos Valley														NA	84,900					Y	157
	San Simon Valley														-1.2							
Salt River	Black River	12,500		178,000	8,700,000	6,960,000	4,260	147,064	237,215	0	0	69,600	No	1:550	NA							
	Salt River Canyon														-0.3	12,500					?	1187
	Salt River Lakes														-2.2							
	White River														NA							
San Bernardino Valley	None	19		9,000	1,600,000	1,280,000	74	2,050	3,307	0	0	12,800	No	1:67,400	-0.4	19					?	2
San Rafael	None	22		5,000	4,000,000	3,200,000	102	6,048	9,755	0	0	32,000	No	1:145,500	-0.4	22					?	14
San Simon Wash	None	1,500		11,000	6,700,000	5,360,000	4	5	8	0	0	53,600	No	1:3,600	NA	1,500					?	
Santa Cruz [18,19]	None	20,600		50,800	160,000	128,000	774	69,058	111,391	22,100	21,920	1,280	No	1:6	-0.5	20,600					Y	
Shiwits Plateau	None	2		NA	NA	NA	9	5	8	0	0	NA	UNK	UNK	NA		2				N	61
Tiger Wash	None	2		1,000	700,000	560,000	6	140	226	0	0	5,600	No	1:280,000	NA	2					N	
Tonto Creek	None	3,000		17,000	2,000,000	1,600,000	1,301	15,969	25,758	25	25	16,000	No	1:550	-0.4	3,000					?	129
Tucson [18,19]	Avra Valley	216,900		99,100	61,000,000	48,800,000	12,080	1,083,028	1,746,932	141,606	135,095	488,000	Yes	1:200	-1.5				TBD		Y	52
	Upper Santa Cruz														-1.6							
Upper Hassayampa	None	3,800		8,000	1,000,000	800,000	1,219	18,050	29,115	2,696	2,306	8,000	No	1:200	-0.4	3,800					Y	52
Upper San Pedro	Allen Flat	24,000		35,800	19,800,000	15,840,000	8,198	363,864	586,915	27,570	20,881	158,400	No	1:650	-0.4	24,000					Y	101
	Sierra Vista														-0.5							
Verde River	Big Chino	29,000		107,000	13,000,000	10,400,000	25,143	474,255	764,977	56,219	53,816	104,000	No	1:350	-0.2							
	Verde Canyon														-2.4	29,000					Y	475
	Verde Valley														-1.2							
Virgin River	None	1,600		30,000	1,700,000	1,360,000	309	16,831	27,149	11,310	11,301	13,600	No	1:850	-0.1	1,600					Y	47
Western Mexican Drainage	None	6		1,000	3,000,000	2,400,000	9	274	442	0	0	24,000	No	1:400,000	-0.5	6					N	
Willcox	None	175,700		15,000	42,000,000	33,600,000	2,310	261,777	422,248	2,007	2,007	336,000	Yes	1:200	-2		175,700				Y	32
Yuma [16]	None	104,200	99,000	213,000	34,000,000	27,200,000	1,522	165,668	267,224	16,377	12,311	272,000	No	1:250	-0.4					104,200	Y	53

Table 9 Notes:

NA - Not Available

1 Natural recharge estimates, groundwater-in-storage from ADWR Arizona Water Atlas report and AMA Assessment reports.

2 2006 Groundwater demand and drainage pumping for non-AMA basins from unpublished USGS data. Drainage pumpage for Lower Gila and Yuma basins provided by USGS estimates. Please note that drainage pumpage may occur in other basins but is not differentiated from other groundwater withdrawals. A portion of current drainage pumping is used to satisfy US/Mexico Colorado River water settlements. Some drainage pumpage may be available to supply additonal future water demands. 2006 Groundwater demand totals and related ratios not rounded if less than 100 AF, rounded to nearest 50 acre-feet if >100AF and <1000AF, rounded to nearest 100 AF if > 1,000AF.

3 See Atlas Volumes 2 through 7 for non-AMA natural recharge data sources. Where more than one estimate of natural recharge was available the lowest estimate is shown here.
Note: Natural recharge for AMAs taken from most recent AMA Water Demand and Supply Assessments.
AMA natural recharge assessments generally include stream channel infiltration from natural flows and reclaimed water discharged to natural channels not associated with recharge projects, mountain front recharge and basin groundwater underflow (inflow only).

4 See Atlas Volumes 2 through 8 for groundwater-in-storage data sources. Where more than one estimate of groundwater-in-storage was avaialable the lowest estimate is shown here. All groundwater-in-storage is to 1,200 feet below land surface (BLS) unless otherwise indicated.

5 Value shown is 80% of estimated groundwater-in-storage. Adjustment reflects hydrologic, practical and other limitations on actual volume of groundwater that may be produced from a groundwater basin. (Adjustment percentage is not based on basin specific data or analysis)

6 A low ratio of demand to storage is of less concern in basins where the natural recharge exceeds demand.

7 Recent water level decline rate is based on (circa 1990 to mid to late 2000's) groundwater level data for wells showing declines in each basin. Many basins also have wells that show rises over the same period. A complete analysis of basinwide water level change is available by reviewing maps and tables found in WRDC Water Supply Infoshare directory.

8 Available Supply Assumption 1 - Long-term (at least 100-years) basinwide groundwater supply is at least equal to current groundwater demand. Any local or basinwide groundwater overdraft that may be indicated by basin wl negative change rate or from water budget data, is not considered likely to impact future available groundwater supply within next 100 years (at current rate of demand).

9 Available Supply Assumption 2 - Long-term (at least 100 years) basinwide groundwater supply is about equal to current groundwater demand. Any local or basinwide groundwater overdraft that is indicated by basin wl negative change rate or from water budget data, is significant and may impact future available groundwater supply within next 100 years (at current rate of demand). Basins lacking natural recharge estimates were placed in this Available Supply Assumption (ie, Paria, Peach springs, and Shivwitz Plateau) however it is likely that these basins could have been grouped in Assumption 1.

10 Available Supply Assumption 3 - Long-term (at least 100-years) basinwide groundwater supply is less than current groundwater demand.
Any local or basinwide groundwater overdraft that is indicated by basin wl negative change rate or from water budget data, is significant and will impact future available groundwater supply within next 100 years (at current rate of demand).

11 Available Supply Assumption 4 - Long-term (at least 100 years) basinwide groundwater supply will be analyzed using Colorado River basin model (work in progress, results to be determined, as of 3/7/2011).

12 Available Supply Assumption 5 - Long-term (at least 100 years) basinwide groundwater supply (for basins with direct or potential Colorado River hydraulic connection) is at least equal to current groundwater demand. However, estimated basin groundwater storage has not been dis-aggregated into separate Colorado River and non-Colorado River components, and some future well withdrawal volumes greater than current demands could be disallowed due to potential Colorado River impacts.

13 Statewide assessment of documented historic or current groundwater/surface water impacts is preliminary and subject to additional review for completeness and accuracy. Identification and administration of any historic or current gw/sw impacts identified for Colorado River basins may be subject to federal procedures, rules and regulations that would not apply to in-state river systems.

14 Perennial stream miles per groundwater basin from ADEQ_USGS Perennial River Miles database

15 The Douglas INA and the Joseph City INA are political divides within the Douglas and Little Colorado River basins and are not sub-basins per se.

16 2006 Groundwater demand for Colorado River Basins has been analyzed to exclude any Colorado River water or other surface water that is produced from wells (4/5/11 update).

17 The C-, N-, and D-aquifers are not sub-basins, however separate recharge and storage data were available for them so they are included here

18 2006 Groundwater demand for AMAs from AMA Assessments (includes all demands identified as "Groundwater". However, does not include "In-Lieu" groundwater)

19 Storage is to a depth of 1,000 feet

20 Storage to a depth of 1,100 feet

21 Based on a query of all wells in the Gila Bend basin, using the water production, exempt, exempt-domestic, other and non-exempt categories, non-cancelled and a 100% duty cycle. See sheet "SQL."