ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
BEFORE THE DIRECTOR

IN THE MATTER OF THE ADOPTION OF THE MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR SANTA CRUZ ACTIVE MANAGEMENT AREAS FOR THE FOURTH MANAGEMENT PERIOD.

DECISION AND ORDER ON REVIEW IN RESPONSE TO MOTIONS FOR REVIEW AND REHEARING FILED BY SOPORI 12,500 INVESTORS LLC AND SOPORI DOMESTIC WATER IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

I. INTRODUCTION

On October 20, 2020, the Director of the Arizona Department of Water Resources ("director") entered an order adopting the management plan for the Santa Cruz Active Management Area ("SCAMA") for the fourth management period ("4MP"). The order adopting the 4MP ("Order of Adoption") provided that any person could request a rehearing on or a review of the 4MP by filing a motion for rehearing or review on or before November 26, 2020 at 5:00 p.m. Because November 26, 2020 fell on a holiday, the Arizona Department of Water Resources ("ADWR") extended the deadline to Friday, November 27, 2020 at 5:00p.m.

Sopori 12,500 Investors LLC and the Sopori Domestic Water Improvement District ("Sopori") filed a timely motion for rehearing or review concerning the 4MP ("Motion") in which it requested certain modifications to the plan. This Decision and the Order that follows set forth the Director’s decision and order granting review of the issues raised in Sopori’s Motion and denying rehearing.
II. DECISION

Sopori’s Motion states that the 4MP does not expressly recognize that it will not limit or affect senior surface water rights, and that well spacing criteria and riparian transpiration demands cannot be given preference over senior surface water rights. Sopori also argues that the SCAMA is currently maintaining safe-yield and therefore no additional conservation requirements are necessary for the 4MP.

The issues raised in Sopori’s Motion will be addressed in the order in which they were presented.

A. ADWR Does Not Expressly Recognize that the 4MP Will Not Affect or Limit Senior Surface Water Rights as required by A.R.S. § 45-411.04.

Sopori maintains that ADWR’s approach to the management of surface and groundwater rights under the SCAMA 4MP will affect the continuing use of its senior surface water rights.

Although the current statutory provision is for “coordinated management” of groundwater and surface water in the SCAMA, Section 11.2.5 of the 4MP references “conjunctive resource management.” The “conjunctive resource management” in the 4MP is simply acknowledged in Section 11.2.5 as a potential future tool for reaching the goal of the AMA. ADWR’s reference to this tool will not impede Sopori’s ability to continue to litigate its claim for surface water rights.


Baca Float requests that the 4MP expressly state that the plan will not affect surface water rights or limit surface water rights as provided in A.R.S. 45-411.04. However, A.R.S. § 45-411.04 speaks for itself, and since there is no statutory requirement that the 4MP include a reference to A.R.S. § 45-411.04, the Department does not believe it is necessary to do so.

B. ADWR Cannot Impose Well Spacing Criteria or Requirements in the SCAMA that Affect or Limit Senior Surface Water Rights Pursuant to A.R.S. § 45-411.04.
Sopori maintains ADWR cannot adopt well spacing criteria or requirements that modify or amend laws relating to surface water nor affect or limit senior surface water rights pursuant to A.R.S. § 45-411.04. Sopori requests that ADWR clarify in the 4MP that the well spacing requirements in Section 10-901 are not applicable to appropriable surface water rights, including wells withdrawing subflow of the Santa Cruz River.

ADWR disagrees with Sopori’s argument that the legislature did not intend that the well spacing requirements in the 4MP be applied to wells withdrawing surface water. Pursuant to A.R.S. § 45-563(B) management plans for the SCAMA are required to include “criteria for the location of new wells and replacement wells in new location consistent with the management goal of the active management area,” A.R.S. § 45-567(A)(9) provides that ADWR “[s]hall include in the plan for the Santa Cruz active management area criteria for the location of new wells and replacement wells in new locations consistent with the management goal of the active management area.” A.R.S. § 45-599(C) provides that the director of ADWR shall approve an application for a permit to drill a new well or a replacement well in a new location if the proposed well complies with ADWR’s well spacing rules and “if the proposed well is in the Santa Cruz active management area, if the location of the proposed well is consistent with the management plan for the active management area.” None of these statutory provisions contain an exception for wells withdrawing appropriable surface water, and it would be contrary to the management goal of SCAMA to exclude such wells from the well spacing requirements.

Moreover, A.R.S. § 45-451(B) provides that the Groundwater Code “shall not be construed to affect decreed and appropriative water rights. Nothing in [the Groundwater Code] shall be construed to affect the definition of surface water in section 45-101 and the definition of water subject to appropriation in section 45-141 or the provisions of article 9 of chapter 1 of this title.” However, A.R.S. § 45-451(C) provides as follows:

C. Notwithstanding subsection B of this section, solely in the Santa Cruz active management area:
1. The withdrawal of water, other than stored water, from a well and the distribution and use of water, other than stored water, withdrawn from a well shall be subject to any applicable conservation requirements established by the director in the management plans for the active management area pursuant to article 9 of this chapter.

2. The withdrawal of water from a well shall be subject to any applicable well location requirements contained in article 10 of this chapter.

The language in A.R.S. § 45-451(C) makes it clear that the legislature intended that wells withdrawing appropriable surface water in SCAMA be subject to conservation requirements and well location requirements adopted by ADWR. For that reason, ADWR will not change the 4MP to include the language requested by Sopori.

C. Riparian Transpiration Cannot Be Given Preference Over Senior Surface Water

Rights under the Coordinated Management Approach Required by A.R.S. § 45-411.04.

Sopori argues that transpiration demands are increasing and exceed all other demands in the SCAMA and are given preference over other water demands in the 4MP. ADWR disagrees with Sopori’s argument.

The 4MP calculates riparian transpiration as a component of net natural recharge in ADWR’s regional groundwater models. Doing so does not assign riparian transpiration a preference over all other water demands, but rather allows to account for various aquifer inflows and outflows.

Sopori requests that ADWR acknowledge that coordinated management of wells in SCAMA does not give ADWR the authority to deny senior surface water users the right to change points of diversion in order to protect increasing downstream riparian demands. ADWR declines to include such an acknowledgement in the 4MP. The management goal of SCAMA is to maintain a safe-yield condition in the AMA and to prevent local water tables from experiencing long-term declines. A.R.S. § 45-562(C). The well spacing requirements in the 4MP are designed to be consistent with that management goal, as required by A.R.S. §§ 45-563(B) and 45-567(A)(9).

As explained in the previous section, the well spacing requirements apply to wells withdrawing
appropriable surface water. Therefore, ADWR has authority to deny a surface water user the
ability to change its point of division to a new well if the location of the proposed new well does
not comply with the well spacing requirements.

D. SCAMA is Currently Maintaining Safe-Yield, so No Additional Conversation

Requirements Are Necessary in the 4MP.

Sopori argues that SCAMA is maintaining safe-yield, so no additional conservation
requirements are necessary in the 4MP. ADWR disagrees with this argument.

Sopori’s analysis and suggestion that conservation requirements are unnecessary fail to
address the ongoing drought and changing conditions of the area. As noted in Section 3.3 of the
4MP, “ongoing drought may be driving SCAMA out of a safe-yield condition.” Increasing
conservation requirements in successive management plans is consistent with statutory
requirements and can assist the SCAMA with achieving its management goal as required by
A.R.S. § 45-563(B). For that reason, ADWR will not make any changes to the 4MP in response
to Sopori’s argument.

III. ORDER

Based on the record, and the foregoing decision, IT IS ORDERED AS FOLLOWS:

1. Sopori’s request for rehearing on the 4MP is denied.

2. Sopori’s request for review of the 4MP is granted. The relief requested by Sopori
   is denied as set forth above.

3. This Decision and Order and the Final Order of Adoption adopting the 4MP are
   the final decisions in this case, and any appeal pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-901 through 12-914 shall
   be of this Decision and Order and Final Order of Adoption.

   GIVEN, under my hand and the Official Seal of the Arizona Department of Water

Resources, this ___ day of December, 2020.
Seal

A copy of the foregoing is sent by certified mail this 16th day of December, 2020, to:

Lee A. Storey & Alexandra Arboleda
TSL Law Group, PLC
8096 N. 85th Street, Suite 105
Scottsdale, Arizona 85258
Attorneys for Sopori 12,500 Investors, LLC and the SDWID
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