

	What actions will you take to address the 7% cut to your M&I order specifically?	What entities are you relying on for help, if any, and how are they helping you? What entities might be affected by your actions?	What issues with your approach (operational, legal, or financial) can you identify today that will need further regulatory analysis for potential change?
City of Avondale	The 7% cut will impact our "off project" water balance, so we will have to utilize more of our effluent water for Annual Storage & Recovery. This means we will have less water to store in our aquifer and will accrue fewer Long Term Storage Credits.	The City of Avondale and City of Phoenix just signed an IGA for Phoenix to take delivery Avondale's CAP water to treat and deliver to Avondale. The City of Avondale is investing into this infrastructure, also known as an interconnect, and the project will be complete around 2021. The City is depending on the delivery of Avondale's CAP water to Phoenix in the range of 500-1,000 AF for treatment and delivery.	The other IGA that Avondale and Phoenix have agreed to is Storage and Recovery. Avondale is storing 5,000 AF/YR of Phoenix's CAP water in Avondale's McDowell Recharge Facility. If or when Phoenix calls on Avondale to recover their Long Term Storage Credits, CAP must make it possible for Avondale to exchange it's CAP allotment to Phoenix in the equal amount that Avondale recovered for Phoenix in LTSC.
City of Chandler	Actions depend on the cost of recovery and the cost of wheeling water in the CAP. Our first choice is to have firmed water supply sent to our WTP. However, if costs are prohibitive, Chandler would be willing to use its wells as a recovery partner with CAP and AWBA.	Direct delivery of credits to Chandler's SWTP will require assistance using CAP recovery infrastructure.	Clear expectations from ADWR regarding requirements for drought pumping exemptions. Clear expectations regarding guidelines to determine the quantity of credits to be recovered.
City of Glendale	The City's Drought Management Plan will continue to be active and will call for mandatory demand reductions for businesses and industry. We will either depend on firming by the Water Bank or will pull out Glendale's LTSC's. We also would not be recharging any CAP water and will be recharging SRP Association water at NAUSP to offset groundwater pumping on a monthly basis.	We are working with both Peoria and Phoenix to develop plans to help each other during a shortage or water treatment plant outage. This would be through interconnects, well sharing agreements, and exchanges.	To change the recharge statutes to have the ability to store surface water at a USF/GSF on a long-term basis. This could help better manage water levels and our water portfolio than currently having to utilize monthly storage and recovery. We would also like to see a mechanism to consider ICS for sub-contractors (municipalities). This would be beneficial for Lake Mead water levels and would be a way for muni's to create ICS to be taken out if water levels are above 1075 feet. I know that these are difficult items to tackle but I think they are worth considering for the betterment of water management.
City of Goodyear	Goodyear will store less in the USF.	Goodyear would anticipate that AWBA/CAP would firm the shortage (751.94 AF) in LTSCs which Goodyear would use to offset our groundwater pumpage.	Goodyear would like confirmation from AWBA/CAP on how the firming would occur in order for us to plan appropriately.
City of Mesa	Pump Service Area Groundwater Rights. Maximize use of Gila River Exchange Agreement. Esclate actions within Water Shortage Management Plan.	Look to AWBA to firm up to the 7%. Additional recovery in sub-basin could affect GW elevations.	The statute for AWBA to transfer credits to CAP and CAP transfers credits to subcontractor.
City of Peoria	1) Less Recharge; 2) More pumping of annual storage credits; 3) No recovery of city owned LTSCs; 4) Use GRIC lease water as needed for makeups.	1) Not relying on CAWCD or CAGR; 2) Not partnering currently with other cities or irrigation districts;	1) Continued funding for exchange is essential; 2) Extent to which city would require AWBA firming credits is not clear.
City of Phoenix	Store less in GSFs and USFs	1) Self-firming using Phoenix facilities 2) Salt River Project through Well Capacity Agreement	None at this time
City of Scottsdale	Reduce delivery for recharge.		Moving GSF recharge from Maricopa county partner to Pinal county partner which will require the ability to transfer LTSC's earned in one county to be recovered in a different county.
Metro Water	1) Reduce deliveries to USF by 942 AF -AWBA Firming dependent on projected demand for any given year; 2) If PHX needs water, exercise existing Inter-AMA Firming recovery/exchange agreement;* 3) If delivery exceeds demand a Lease agreement with a partner within this or another AMA could support M&I or AG subcontractor*.	1) No other parties involved; 2) PHX transfers number of LTSCs equal to the exchange volume; 3) Only Lease partner involved.	1) No issues at this time; 2) Recovery/Exchange Implementation agreement with CAP*; 3) Partner Lease agreement*. Note: * Opportunities for assisting other entities outside of AWBA Firming; will require CAWCD approval of capacity.
Tucson Water	Without additional information, Tucson Water questions the basis of the exercise to produce the desired results. In order to obtain a realistic assessment of the amount of firming needed, and what each M&I customer will do in a shortage, agencies will need to provide additional information, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projected cost in each separate AMA for recovery/treatment of Water Bank water for that AMA. This will allow customers to evaluate options for alternative water sources, if available at a lower cost. Each AMA will have different opportunities. An entity that already has wet water recovery/treatment should not be subject to pay for recovery/treatment needed by others. Define Firming Restrictions. What is the basis of the firming amount? Our assumption is that it is pro rata, based on allocation amount that is shorted. In any event, if TW were to experience a 7% cut, in any year, we would most likely request the transfer of 10,093 LTSC's from Water Bank at CAVSARP/SAVSARP/Pima Mine Rd into our long term storage account. No additional recovery or treatment infrastructure is needed at these recharge facilities. Our customers have paid to have the water stored in the AMA, and should not have to pay for recovery/treatment that may be necessary in other AMA's. 	N/A	See Statement Above