

Online ARIZONA GENERAL STREAM ADJUDICATION BULLETIN
Office of the Special Master • June - August 2001

This issue is the first posting of the online Arizona General Stream Adjudication Bulletin. Online publication achieves our goals of greater distribution, easier access, longer articles, more information, and lower costs.

The Bulletin will be posted online in January, May, and September. Special reports will be posted to inform readers of significant rulings or breaking news. Your suggestions to improve the online Bulletin are always appreciated.

In This Issue

Your “New” Web Site	<u>2</u>
U.S. Supreme Court Denies Petition for Certiorari	<u>2</u>
In re the Preclusive Effect of the Globe Equity Decree on Specified Parties Contested Case No. W1-206	<u>6</u>
Saguaro National Monument Contested Case No. W1-11-2782	<u>8</u>
In re Fort Huachuca Contested Case No. W1-11-605	<u>9</u>
Hydrology Tutorial for the Court	<u>10</u>
Pocket Parts for Arizona Revised Statutes	<u>11</u>
Arizona Court of Appeals Interprets A.R.S. §§ 45-173 and 45-811.01	<u>11</u>
Arizona Hydrological Society 14 th Annual Symposium	<u>14</u>
C. Laurence Linser (1937-2001)	<u>14</u>
Successful Move!	<u>16</u>

YOUR “NEW” WEB SITE: <http://www.supreme.state.az.us/wm/>

Over the summer, the Web pages of Arizona’s general stream adjudications were expanded and updated. Copies of the opinions of the Arizona Supreme Court regarding the six interlocutory issues were added. More minute entries, pretrial orders, and reports are now on the Web site. The Court-approved mailing lists for the ongoing contested cases are posted. Our goal is to maintain a Web site that presents maximum information for the use and convenience of parties, attorneys, and the public. Education and usefulness are the objectives.

A new page - *What’s New* - was added. This new page will contain a calendar of deadlines and hearings, recent court decisions, items of general and legal interest, and breaking news. For example, we have posted the remarks of former Special Master John Thorson presented in June at the annual Natural Resources Law Center conference in Boulder, Colorado.

Suggestions for new postings and improvements to the Web site will always be appreciated and considered.*

THE INTERLOCUTORY APPEALS

Issue 2 (Subflow)

On June 25, 2001, the U.S. Supreme Court denied the petition of Phelps Dodge Corporation and Arizona Public Service (APS) to review the Arizona Supreme Court’s subflow decision issued on September 21, 2000.¹ The petition was summarized in the Bulletin’s January-May 2001 issue.

Briefs in Opposition to Petition for Certiorari

The Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), Apache Tribes, United States, and Salt River Project filed briefs opposing the petition for certiorari. In their petition, Phelps Dodge and APS argued that the Arizona Supreme Court’s interlocutory decision on subflow constituted a judicial taking of petitioners’ property without just compensation in violation of the Fifth Amendment to the

¹ *In re the General Adjudication of All Rights to Use Water in the Gila River System and Source*, 198 Ariz. 330, 9 P.3d 1069 (2000).

U.S. Constitution.² The Arizona Supreme Court affirmed retired Judge Stanley Z. Goodfarb's order defining the "subflow" zone as the "saturated floodplain Holocene alluvium."³

The respondents' arguments to deny the petition are summarized as follows.

A. Jurisdiction

The jurisdictional basis for the U.S. Supreme Court to review this case is a federal statute⁴ that limits review to "final judgments or decrees," and the Arizona Supreme Court's subflow decision is not a final judgment or decree. The Arizona Supreme Court's subflow decision has not adjudicated any water rights, resolved all issues of federal law, or concluded the adjudications. It is an interlocutory decision that sets forth a method for determining subflow, which method still remains to be applied to determine if a well is pumping appropriable subflow or percolating groundwater.

The United States argued that "The Arizona Supreme Court's decision is an 'intermediate step' and not the 'final word' on water rights claims in the Gila River Basin." The subflow decision "provides prospective guidance to the superior court" on how to distinguish subflow from percolating groundwater, a process yet to be implemented. Consequently, there is no final judgment or decree, and the U.S. Supreme Court lacks jurisdiction to review the decision of

² ASARCO Incorporated filed a response supporting the petition for certiorari. The State of Arizona and several cities, towns, irrigation districts, and water companies waived filing a response.

³ In 1993, the Arizona Supreme Court rejected the Superior Court's "50%/90 day" rule for determining subflow and remanded the matter to the trial court. *In re the General Adjudication of All Rights to Use Water in the Gila River System and Source*, 175 Ariz. 382, 857 P.2d 1236 (1993). Following an evidentiary hearing, the Maricopa County Superior Court (Hon. Stanley Z. Goodfarb, Ret.) entered an order regarding the method for determining subflow. The interlocutory appeal of the order on remand resulted in the Arizona Supreme Court's decision issued in September 21, 2000.

⁴ The U.S. Supreme Court has jurisdiction to review "[f]inal judgments or decrees rendered by the highest court of a State...where any title, right, privilege, or immunity is specially set up or claimed under the Constitution or the treaties or statutes of...the United States." 28 U.S. Code § 1257(a).

the Arizona Supreme Court.

B. Ripeness

The issue presented to the U.S. Supreme Court is not ripe for adjudication. No final determination has been made as to whether any wells, including those of the petitioners, are pumping subflow and impacting the petitioners' vested water rights. The technical process of applying the Arizona Supreme Court's criteria for determining subflow to existing wells has not begun. The superior court has not made any determinations in either the Gila or Little Colorado Adjudications that any well is pumping subflow as defined by the Arizona Supreme Court. Until such determinations are made and impacts are known, the question petitioners wish to be reviewed is not ripe for adjudication and its answer would not be more than an advisory opinion.

As the Apache Tribes stated, "Until such time as a determination is made as to the petitioners' wells, petitioners cannot allege a 'particularized injury' or taking....Phelps Dodge and APS do not allege and cannot show any harm or injury in fact which has been caused by the Arizona Supreme Court's" subflow decision.

C. Judicial Taking

The Arizona Supreme Court's interlocutory decision was not a "judicial taking" of claimed vested water rights. First, the Court's subflow decision was not a sudden and unpredictable departure from state law. The Arizona Supreme Court interpreted the requirements of its 1931 decision in *Southwest Cotton*⁵ that first articulated the test of what constitutes subflow.⁶ The Court did not expand, reverse, or in any way change the subflow holding in that case. As the Apache Tribes argued, the Arizona Supreme Court's "test for subflow fits squarely with the precedent set in *Southwest Cotton*." The Arizona Supreme Court determined

⁵ *Maricopa County Municipal Water Conservation District No. One v. Southwest Cotton Co.*, 39 Ariz. 65, 4 P.2d 369 (1931).

⁶ The Arizona Supreme Court articulated the test for determining if a well is pumping subflow as "Does drawing off the subsurface water tend to diminish appreciably and directly the flow of the surface stream? If it does, it is subflow..." *Southwest Cotton*, 39 Ariz. at 96, 4 P.2d at 380.

that its decision involved the same definition of subflow the Court has been using since 1931.

As Salt River Project argued, the Arizona Supreme Court's decision "marked at most only an incremental and reasoned development of Arizona precedent as part of the evolutionary process of distinguishing subflow from percolating groundwater."

Respondents also disagreed with the petitioners' argument that the Arizona Supreme Court had "transform[ed] vast quantities of what had formerly been percolating groundwater into subflow that is suddenly subject to appropriation." The Arizona Supreme Court's subflow decision did not change the long-standing state law a landowner does not own the groundwater. The Arizona Supreme Court did not change this legal status of percolating groundwater.

As GRIC stated, "Arizona appellate courts have, over the last twenty years, consistently and unequivocally held that one does not own groundwater in Arizona." The Arizona Supreme Court's subflow decision did not change "the twenty-year old determination that there are no ownership rights to percolating groundwater." According to the Salt River Project, the petitioners' claim "that landowners have a vested property right in future groundwater use has repeatedly been rejected in decisions by both Arizona and federal courts." Hence because petitioners do not have property that can be taken, there can be no violation of the Fifth Amendment's takings clause.

Reply Brief

In their reply, Phelps Dodge and APS answered that:

1. They had not argued they own groundwater, but rather they claimed to have a property interest in the *use* of groundwater. Petitioners "enjoy a right to reasonably use percolating groundwater," which right is a property right entitled to protection under the Fifth Amendment. The right to use groundwater is subject to prospective regulation but "it is *not* subject to retroactive revocation."

2. The question presented is a "final judgment" for purposes of the reviewing authority of the U.S. Supreme Court because the federal issue

resolved by the Arizona Supreme Court (whether a taking has occurred) “will survive and require decision regardless of subsequent litigation in the” Gila River Adjudication. The U.S. Supreme Court has identified four categories of “cases in which the Court has treated the decision on the federal issue as a final judgment for the purposes of 28 U.S.C. § 1257 and has taken jurisdiction without awaiting the completion of the additional proceedings anticipated in the lower state courts.”⁷ The question Petitioners present falls within this category of cases that the U.S. Supreme Court has determined to have the requisite finality for review because the takings issue will be litigated in numerous future cases.

Petitioners further argued that deferring review of the takings issue until the end of the Gila River Adjudication “would provide no meaningful remedy.” The Gila Adjudication will most likely last decades (“there may never be an ‘end of the adjudication’”), and “there is no credible possibility that...[it] will end in a time or manner that would provide petitioners with a meaningful opportunity to have their takings arguments heard at the conclusion of the proceedings.” Denying the petition would “deny justice by delay.”

3. The takings issue is ripe for review because the Arizona Supreme Court’s subflow decision is a “final, definitive position” which the superior courts, charged with implementing the technical aspects of the decision, cannot modify and “have no discretion to deviate from its conclusions.”⁸ Because the superior courts cannot alter the fundamental aspects of the Arizona Supreme Court’s subflow decision, the Court’s subflow decision is ripe for review.*

**IN RE THE PRECLUSIVE EFFECT OF THE GLOBE
EQUITY DECREE ON SPECIFIED PARTIES
CONTESTED CASE NO. W1-206**

This contested case is an effort to examine the possible preclusive effect of *Globe Equity No. 59 Decree* on other parties in the Gila River Adjudication,

⁷ *Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn*, 420 U.S. 469 (1975).

⁸ Petitioners argued that this position was based on the U.S. Supreme Court’s “most recent decision” on the subject of ripeness, *Suitum v. Tahoe Reg’l Planning Agency*, 520 U.S. 725 (1997).

including the San Carlos Indian Reservation and several Upper Gila River irrigators. The *Globe Equity Decree* is a 1935 federal court decree adjudicating water rights along the Upper Gila River. Contested Case No. W1-206 seeks to conclude the examination of the impact of the *Globe Equity Decree* on the Gila River Adjudication.

The Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), San Carlos Apache Tribe, City of Safford, Gila Valley Irrigation District, Franklin Irrigation District, San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, Phelps Dodge Corporation, and ASARCO filed motions for summary judgment. The motions addressed the various claims asserted by other parties.

Responses were due on June 1, 2001. GRIC, United States, San Carlos Apache Tribe, City of Safford, Gila Valley Irrigation District, Franklin Irrigation District, San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, ASARCO, and the Salt River Project filed responses. Most of the responses addressed GRIC's motion for partial summary judgment. The State of Arizona Agency Claimants filed objections to GRIC's motion for partial summary judgment and joined in Safford's motion to strike GRIC's partial summary judgment motion.

GRIC filed a response to Safford's motion to strike GRIC's motion for partial summary judgment. On June 11, 2001, Safford replied to GRIC's response.

On June 1, 2001, GRIC asked to remove Phelps Dodge as a party subject to GRIC's motion for partial summary judgment for the reason that these parties have entered into a settlement agreement that settles all disputes between them with regard to the Gila River Adjudication. The settlement agreement awaits federal approval before it is implemented.

The United States filed a response to the San Carlos Apache Tribe's motion on June 18, 2001, after Judge Ballinger granted the United States an extension of time to file a response to this motion.

The San Carlos Apache Tribe and the Buckeye Irrigation Company and Buckeye Water Conservation and Drainage District filed a stipulation based on prior agreements and the court's decree approving the San Carlos Apache Tribe

Water Rights Settlement Agreement of March 30, 1999. These parties stipulated that “the court may determine as a matter of law that the Company and District have waived and relinquished any rights to object or contest in any way any claims by the Tribe, or by the United States on behalf of the Tribe, to the waters of the Gila River or its tributaries upstream from Gila Crossing, and any claims by the Tribe, or by the United States on behalf of the Tribe, to other waters described” in their agreement dated March 30, 1999.

Based on the extension given to the United States, ASARCO requested a uniform extension of time until July 31, 2001, to file replies. On June 14, 2001, Judge Ballinger granted the request for an extension until July 31, 2001, to file all replies.

On June 27, 2001, Judge Ballinger, by minute entry stating “without addressing the substantive merits of the legal issues raised,” denied Safford’s request for an expedited ruling on its motion to strike GRIC’s motion for partial summary judgment.

GRIC, San Carlos Apache Tribe, City of Safford, Gila Valley Irrigation District, Franklin Irrigation District, San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, ASARCO, and Phelps Dodge filed responses.*

**SAGUARO NATIONAL MONUMENT
CONTESTED CASE NO. W1-11-2782**

In an order filed on July 24, 2001, Judge Ballinger entered a partial decree for five reserved water rights located in the Rincon Mountain Unit of the Saguaro National Monument.

This contested case began in 1995, pursuant to objections filed to the San Pedro River watershed hydrographic survey report, and was settled in March 1996. The United States, Gila River Indian Community, Silas Kisto, Salt River Project, San Carlos Apache Tribe, ASARCO, Phelps Dodge, and then Magma Copper stipulated as to the water rights associated with five springs to be decreed for Saguaro National Monument. These parties stipulated and agreed “to entry of decrees for these claims on terms no less restrictive than those”

agreed upon, and that the stipulation “shall have no precedential effect in this or any other pending or future general stream adjudication or case.”

The reserved water rights relate to five springs, for wildlife and diverse park administrative uses, with a date of priority of March 1, 1933. Former Special Master John Thorson organized a contested case to hear the objections. The parties involved in the contested case filed a stipulation on March 19, 1996. Master Thorson accepted the stipulation and proposed water rights and filed a report on June 2, 2000, recommending the approval of the stipulated proposed water rights. The Master served all persons on the Court-approved mailing list and gave claimants in the Gila River Adjudication a period of 180 days, or until November 29, 2000, to file an objection or comment to the report, and until December 20, 2000, to file responses to the objections. No objections, comments, or responses were filed to the Master’s report.

Judge Ballinger’s order stated:

THE COURT FINDS that notice of the Master’s report was given as required by law and the period for filing objections or comments to the report has passed; no objections or comments to the report were filed; and the stipulation among the litigants and their proposed water rights for Saguaro National Monument (Rincon Mountain Unit) should be accepted.

THE COURT ADJUDICATES AND DECREES the water rights for the Saguaro National Monument (Rincon Mountain Unit) as set forth in the five abstracts of proposed water rights stipulated by the involved litigants and reported to the Court in Special Master Thorson’s Report of June 2, 2000.

IT IS ORDERED that the five abstracts of proposed water rights shall be incorporated in the tabulations or lists of all water rights and their relative priorities on the Gila River system and source in the form that the Court shall determine, pursuant to A.R.S. § 45-257(B)(2), to be most appropriate.*

IN RE FORT HUACHUCA
CONTESTED CASE NO. W1-11-605

On June 8, 2001, the City of Sierra Vista and the State of Arizona Agency Claimants filed motions to intervene in this contested case. Both motions stated

that the claims and interests of these parties are implicated by the issues raised in the objections filed in this contested case. These issues may become issues of broad legal importance whose disposition may as a practical matter impair or impede these parties' ability to protect their interests. Both parties wished to preserve their right to participate in this contested case as it might affect their claimed water rights.

The United States objected to the City's motion to intervene asserting that the City had not shown an entitlement to a water right subject to adjudication or that a claimed water right would be impaired, and therefore, the City lacked standing to intervene in this contested case.

The City filed a response claiming that its right to intervene was supported by the "law of the case" (prior orders and rulings made in the general adjudications), concepts of fundamental fairness, and compliance with the requirements of the rules of civil procedure for standing.

On August 17, 2001, the Special Master granted both motions and allowed the State of Arizona Agency Claimants and the City of Sierra Vista to intervene, finding that these parties met the requirements of Rule 24(a), of the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure, to intervene in this contested case.

On August 31, 2001 (following an extension of time), the Bella Vista group of objectors filed a memorandum clarifying the identity of this group of objectors.

The status of this contested case is that Fort Huachuca was given until November 30, 2001, to file amended water right claims, and ADWR was directed to submit a status report on January 31, 2002, reporting its progress on finalizing GRIC's HSR and the anticipated start and completion dates for updating the fort's watershed file reports.*

HYDROLOGY TUTORIAL FOR THE COURT

On May 24, 2001, the Arizona Department of Water Resources presented a hydrology tutorial to Judges Ballinger and Dawson and Special Master Schade. Messrs. Gregory L. Wallace, Richard T. Burtell, and Donald J. Gross reviewed

basic hydrology principles and presented a factual overview of the adjudications. The judges and the Special Master found the tutorial instructive and helpful.

The tutorial included a presentation of slides. A printed copy of the slides is available for review in the Office of the Special Master.*

POCKET PARTS FOR ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES

A step has been taken to make the general adjudication statutes more complete and easier to follow. The pocket parts for several sections of the general adjudication statutes will soon have additional references to the Arizona Supreme Court's opinion in [San Carlos Apache Tribe v. Superior Court](#). In *San Carlos*, the Court found unconstitutional several of the legislative amendments passed in 1995 and upheld others. In future pocket parts, Sections 45-187, 45-258, and 45-262 will have additional coverage of the Court's opinion to assist readers.

West Group prepares the annual pocket parts for the Arizona Revised Statutes that contain the most recent legislative amendments and citations of relevant court decisions. West reports the statutory text as approved by the Legislative Council and as certified by the Secretary of State. West, however, does not take the initiative to manipulate text when a Supreme Court declares sections invalid in whole or in part.

The pocket parts for the general adjudication statutes contain the 1995 legislative amendments as enacted and a citation to the Arizona Supreme Court's opinion. In order to understand the correct status of the 1995 amendments, readers must be familiar with the Court's opinion as it relates to specific provisions, sentences, and internal references.*

ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS INTERPRETS

A.R.S. SECTIONS 45-173 and 45-811.01

The Arizona Court of Appeals held that an applicant for an underground storage facility permit, pursuant to A.R.S. § 45-811.01, does not need the consent of a landowner whose property is traversed by the natural channel being

used for the storage facility. The decision is [West Maricopa Combine, Inc. v. ADWR](#) (1 CA-CV 00-0086, June 5, 2001).

West Maricopa Combine (WMC) applied for an underground storage facility permit (USF permit) to store Central Arizona Project (CAP) water, for which it has a subcontract, in a segment of the Hassayampa River. The proposed project would allow WMC to move CAP water through six miles of the Hassayampa River. About 1.5 miles of the riverbed ran through the property of objector 10K, L.L.C. (10K). 10K did not give WMC consent for the use of the riverbed that crossed 10K's property.

ADWR granted WMC a USF permit but subject to the condition that WMC obtain 10K's legal consent. 10K appealed ADWR's issuance of the permit. The appeal was referred to the Office of Administrative Hearings. Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Casey J. Newcomb recommended to ADWR that the permit be rescinded for the reasons that A.R.S. § 45-814.01(H) protected 10K's property rights, and the Arizona Legislature by virtue of A.R.S. § 37-1129.01 had disclaimed any ownership of the riverbed. ADWR adopted ALJ Newcomb's recommendation and rescinded WMC's permit.

WMC sought judicial review in the Maricopa County Superior Court, which upheld ADWR's decision. ADWR supported 10K's motion for summary judgment before the superior court. WMC appealed, and the Arizona Court of Appeals reversed the rescinding of WMC's USF permit and remanded to the superior court with instructions to enter summary judgment for WMC.

The Court of Appeals (Thompson, J.) held that A.R.S. § 45-811.01, which sets forth the criteria for a USF permit, does not include the consent of adjacent property owners. Such consent is not one of the criteria.

Further, A.R.S. § 45-173(A)⁹ states that a "channel may be used to carry

⁹ A.R.S. § 45-173(A) states, "Although the waters which naturally flow in the natural channel of a stream have been previously appropriated and put to beneficial use by others, the channel may be used to carry water of another or used for the location of an underground storage facility pursuant to chapter 3.1 of this title, if such use can be made without diminishing the quantity of water which naturally flows therein the use of which has been appropriated."

water of another or used for the location of an underground storage facility.” The Court held that, “The plain language of A.R.S. § 45-173 specifically contemplates that private property be used to carry ‘water of another or used for the location of an underground storage facility’.” This statute “provides a longstanding statutory basis” for carrying and storing waters through natural channels “without prior consent by persons owning property along the route of the river,” and “codifies a longstanding principle encouraging the beneficial use of Arizona’s scarce supply of water.”

“Based on Arizona’s enduring and fundamental policy encouraging the full use of scarce water resources and the plain language of A.R.S. § 45-173, we hold that real property owners such as 10K may not prevent a beneficial user from using an existing natural watercourse for water storage purposes.”

The Court rejected 10K’s argument that A.R.S. § 45-173 only governs the relative rights of two competing water users, holding that A.R.S. § 45-151(A) addresses relative rights and would be rendered redundant and superfluous if A.R.S. § 45-173 was interpreted as 10K proposed.

The Court rejected 10K’s argument that A.R.S. § 45-173 contemplates that the use of a channel for carrying water is exclusively limited to “natural” water flow that would not include imported CAP water. The Court held that such an interpretation is not supported by the language of A.R.S. § 45-173, and would conflict with Arizona’s policy of making the maximum beneficial use of a scarce resource.

The Court did not find any language in A.R.S. § 45-814.01(H) that allowed a property owner to “exclude others” from using a natural watercourse passing through the owner’s property to carry water for a beneficial use. Arizona has “for the past century” distinguished water rights from property rights. Arizona does not have riparian rights. “Water rights can be bought and sold distinct from the land,” and property rights are subject to beneficial uses of water that are prior in time.

The Court held that WMC’s proposed facility did not constitute “a governmental taking without just compensation” because 10K’s title to the land

adjacent to the river “was taken subject to existing water rights,” and further, did not constitute a trespass because 10K does not have a right to exclude others from using the Hassayampa River for the proposed storage facility.

Regarding A.R.S. § 37-1129.01 (the State of Arizona’s ownership of non-navigable waterways), the Court noted that since this appeal was briefed, the Arizona Court of Appeals has held this statute to be unconstitutional.¹⁰ The Court stated, however, that, “A.R.S. § 45-173(A) *alone* provides sufficient independent legal basis for WMC’s use of the watercourse to transport its allocated CAP water, even if the legislature’s disavowal of property rights in A.R.S. § 45-1129.01 had been deemed constitutional.” (Emphasis in opinion.)

In conclusion, neither A.R.S. sections 45-173(A) nor 45-814.01 require a permit applicant to obtain the consent of landowners adjacent to a channel, before ADWR can grant a USF permit to use the channel as an underground storage facility pursuant to A.R.S. § 45-811.01.*

ARIZONA HYDROLOGICAL SOCIETY
14TH ANNUAL SYMPOSIUM

On September 12-15, 2001, the Tucson Chapter of the Arizona Hydrological Society will present the 14th Annual Symposium at the Presidio Plaza Hotel in Tucson. Scheduled are four plenary speakers, three half-day workshops, two full-day workshops, seventeen technical sessions, three field trips, and sixteen poster sessions on continuous display. A trade exhibit and a student poster competition will be held. Many of the State’s best-known hydrologists and water experts will make presentations.

C. LAURENCE LINSER (1937 - 2001)

On June 17, 2001, Larry Linser passed away. Larry devoted his

¹⁰ *Defenders of Wildlife v. Hull*, 199 Ariz. 411 , 18 P.3d 722 (App. 2001).

professional life to the management of water resources. He thrived on Colorado River water issues, and his knowledge of the Law of the River was immense. His leadership and generosity will be greatly missed.

The Bulletin's October 1993 issue highlighted Larry's career as follows:

C. Laurence Linser, or Larry as he prefers to be called, became a deputy director in the Department of Water Resources in November 1984. He now heads up the Department's Adjudications Division as well as the Engineering, Hydrology, and Colorado River Management Divisions. The Adjudications Division provides the technical information used by the Superior Courts in the adjudication of water rights in the Little Colorado and Gila River systems. This Division is charged with investigating some 77,000 claims to water rights which have been filed to date. To do this, his staff prepares comprehensive surveys of each watershed, known as Hydrographic Survey Reports (HSRs). The Division also prepares HSRs for Indian reservations and fulfills Court orders to investigate and report on special issues.

The Department of Water Resources is responsible for the safety of all non-federal dams in Arizona. The Engineering Division carries out this function as well as providing technical assistance and administering state funds in connection with flood control projects. The Division is the state coordinator for the National Flood Insurance Program and works with the Federal Emergency Management Agency as well as with local communities on flooding issues.

The Hydrology Division provides technical support to other groups within DWR. Its work consists of collecting and analyzing hydrogeologic data, developing groundwater models, and examining instream flows in relation to riparian vegetation and fish and wildlife habitat.

Larry's professional work includes representing the State in matters relating to the Colorado River. He has been one of Arizona's appointed representatives for several years on the Colorado River Salinity Control Forum and is the current chairman of the organization.

Larry served as Acting Director of ADWR for several months, and since 1988 represented Arizona on the Western States Water Council as an alternate member. After retiring from ADWR in 1995, he worked for Bookman-Edmonston

Engineering, now a division of Navigant Consulting, Inc. He was serving as Managing Director in August 2000, when he ceased work. His responsibilities at that time included all of the water resources operations for Bookman-Edmonston Engineering in Oregon, California and Arizona.*

SUCCESSFUL MOVE!

The Clerk of the Maricopa County Superior Court has relocated the following offices to a new Customer Services Center at 601 West Jackson in Phoenix:

Central Court Public Records Office

Central Court File Room

Discovery and Confidential Materials Section

Probate File Room

Records Management Center

Marriage Licenses and Passports Office

The Gila River Adjudication statements of claimant files and old water right decrees are now located at 601 West Jackson.*