Hi Kyle,

I wanted to provide some possible edits for ADWR's consideration on the above draft separate from my role as a Tucson GUAC member.

Page 17, last paragraph, 2nd sentence, substitute "maintaining" in place of "meeting" to be consistent with the language (maintain) used on Page 69 under 3rd paragraph, 2nd sentence and on Page 341 under the Groundwater section in 2nd paragraph at the end of the first sentence.

Page 31, under Clean Water Act section there is no mention of Pima Association of Governments as the designated areawide water quality management planning agency in Pima County.

Page 35, I thought the WQARF Advisory Board had been sunset by rule or the legislature?

Page 35, under the Poor Quality Groundwater Withdrawal Permits section, can ADWR link a table listing which six entities have permits and the volumes? It is unclear in the 5MP what volume is under permit and where they are located. The eight WQARF sites are listed on Page 46, but it is unclear if any of those sites have a Poor Quality Groundwater Withdrawal Permit.

Page 49, Section 1.2.7.1., 3rd paragraph, 2nd sentence, use of "good water quality" is inconsistent with the Arizona Environmental Quality Act. The state's aquifers are classified for protection as "drinking water quality" for current and future uses.

Page 50, Section 1.2.8., 2nd sentence, suggest adding "unless treated" at the end of the sentence.

Page 58, Section 2.4.2, remediated water is not listed in the first sentence as a supply.

Page 59, 2nd paragraph, this paragraph is too general and its relevance is not stated how it relates to the TAMA, especially since the first paragraph on Page 58 in Section 2.4.2 states the TAMA uses storage and recovery over direct water treatment of Colorado River water.

Page 60, Section 2.5, mining is not mentioned as a use in the second sentence.

Page 88, Section 3.4.2, no mention that Oro Valley and Metro Water District are connected to Tucson Water's reclaimed water system. Tucson Water's SHARP and Santa Cruz River Heritage Project are also not mentioned.

Page 101, 1st paragraph, 3rd sentence states there is only one irrigation district in the TAMA, but on Page 57 under Section 2.3.1, first sentence says there are two.

Page 330, Section 7.9.6, would it be possible to mention that the Director increased the WMAP fee by 25 cents for 2022 by the Tucson GUAC's recommendation because of the declared Tier 1 shortage?

Please feel to contact me if you have any questions on these suggestions. I will be out of the country from February 28th through March 10th.

Sincerely,

Mike Block