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What is Swan?

**GOAL**  
*Build Research Links Between the EU and US*

- EU 7\textsuperscript{th} Framework Programme
- Duration 4 years (2012-2016)
Major Goals

1. Enhance scientific cooperation between USA & Europe.
2. Promote Multi-Disciplinary and Multi-Regional collaboration regarding Water Sustainability.
3. Combine Physical & Social Sciences, with Governance perspectives.
4. Develop a foundation for future collaboration.
Origins

Arose out of conversation between UofA and UMI scientists

→ successes and failures of the 10-year

“SAHRA” Science & Technology Center project funded by NSF
SAHRA was a Very Successful Working Partnership
**MISSION**

**Mission:** To promote sustainable management of water resources in semi-arid regions.

**Qn?** How can science help communities manage water resources in a sustainable manner?
SAHRA

More than 523 Participants
Including 222 Grad and 94 Undergrad Students
100+ projects
Focused on Three “Stakeholder Relevant” “Integrating Science Questions”

Q1: What are the impacts of vegetation change on basin scale water balance?

Q2: What are the costs and benefits of riparian restoration and preservation?

Q3: What kinds of water markets & banking are feasible?
A Story 😊
SAHRA Goals

SAHRA’s science and research goal is to develop new and improved multidisciplinary understanding of semiarid hydrology.

SAHRA’s stakeholder engagement and outreach goals are to
(a) enhance stakeholder/scientist dialog and develop mechanisms to support stakeholders in their decision-making; and
(b) disseminate and transfer SAHRA-relevant knowledge to scientists, water professionals, elected officials, and the public.

SAHRA’s education goal is improving the multidisciplinary hydrologic literacy of the general public and within the educational system.
The Participatory Processes

The Upper San Pedro

The Middle Rio Grande
## Drivers of the Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drivers of Collabor. Process and Modeling</th>
<th>Upper San Pedro</th>
<th>Middle Rio Grande</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protected Riparian Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Suits threatening the economic motor of the basin (Fort Huachuca, through BRAC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>State-wide Planning Process (Middle Rio Grande Planning Region)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress Mandate to attain sustainable yield by 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Process Structure Comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circle of Influence</th>
<th>Upper San Pedro</th>
<th>Middle Rio Grande</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Modelers</td>
<td>The University of Arizona Modeling Team</td>
<td>Sandia National Labs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Experts, Advisors</td>
<td>Technical Committee of the USPP</td>
<td>Cooperative Modeling Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: The public</td>
<td>open to the public</td>
<td>open to the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Decision Makers</td>
<td>Partnership Advisory Commission &amp; Executive Committee</td>
<td>Middle Rio Grande Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shared Vision Planning

Circle A: Core planners and model developers.
Circle B: Stakeholder representatives and technical experts.
Circle C: The general public.
Circle D: The decision makers.

Figure from Cardwell et al. (2009): The Circles of Influence in SVP
## Process Structure Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circle of Influence</th>
<th>Upper San Pedro</th>
<th>Middle Rio Grande</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td>Upper San Pedro Partnership</td>
<td>Middle Rio Grande Water Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Modelers</td>
<td>The University of Arizona Modeling Team</td>
<td>Sandia National Labs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Experts, Advisors</td>
<td>Technical Committee of the USPP</td>
<td>Cooperative Modeling Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: The public</td>
<td>open to the public</td>
<td>open to the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Decision Makers</td>
<td>Partnership Advisory Commission &amp; Executive Committee</td>
<td>Middle Rio Grande Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21 Member Agencies and Organizations (aka “stakeholders”)

MISSION & GOALS

A consortium of 21 agencies and organizations working together to meet the long-term water needs of the Sierra Vista Subwatershed by achieving sustainable yield of the regional aquifer by 2011 and beyond to: 1) preserve the San Pedro Riparian National Conservation Area (SPRNCA), and 2) ensure the long-term viability of Fort Huachuca.

The purpose of the Partnership is to coordinate and cooperate in the identification, prioritization and implementation of comprehensive policies and projects to assist in meeting water needs in the Sierra Vista Subwatershed of the Upper San Pedro River Basin.

The San Pedro Basin: A Timeline

- **SPRNCA is created**: 1988
- **USPP is created**: 1998
- **BRAC process (DoD) Law**: Suits from CBD-ESA Fort Huachuca at Stake
- **SALSA Conference**: 1999
- **“321 Bill” Passed sustainability deadline**: 2004
- **BoR Augmentation Alternatives Report**: 2007
- **Strong Science Involvement: USGS, USDA-ARS, etc.**: Discussions for a DSS model start 2000/2001
- **DSS starts being operational**: 2008
- **321 Bill Deadline**: September 30th 2011
- **Sustainability Met?**
- **Use by Decision and Policy Makers !!!**
Integrating Science into Basin Models

**Process Understanding**

- Upscale process level understanding
- Derive effective parameters (30m) for partitioning precipitation and snowmelt through techniques such as Monte Carlo simulations
- Assimilate remotely sensed products

**Basin-scale model**

- PPT/SWE
- ET
- runoff
- infiltration
- recharge

**Partitioning**

**Upscale**

**Hillslope Modeling**

**Remote Sensing**

- SWE
- ET
- PPT
The San Pedro Basin: A Timeline

- SPRNCA is created in 1988
- BRAC process (DoD) Law Suits from CBD-ESA Fort Huachuca at Stake
- SalSA Conference 1999
- USPP is created in 1998
- Discussions for a DSS model start 2000/2001
- Strong Science Involvement: USGS, USDA-ARS, etc.
- BoR Augmentation Alternatives Report 2007
- DSS starts being operational 2008
- “321 Bill” Passed sustainability deadline 2004
- “321 Bill” Passed sustainability deadline 2004
- Sustainability Met? 2008
- Use by Decision and Policy Makers !!!

321 Bill Deadline September 30th 2011

Sustainability Met?
Outcomes of the Participatory Process
(as reported by the Stakeholders)
Communication

- The development of the DSS focused discussions on particular topics.
- Definition of sets of conservation measures, and their overlaps.
- Collaborative process:
  - every decision iterative communication
- Have ongoing discussions on different issues simultaneously is a continuous "opportunity to ask questions, focused questions, the good questions"
- Focused and Itemized communication → key to common understanding.
Understanding

The Physical System

- Greatly Improved understanding of the physical system: thanks to DSS + GW modeling + others
- Spatial dimension of the problem
- Understanding of models themselves

Each Other

- Each other’s language and jargon
- Drivers and constraints of each stakeholder:
  - “what drives each one’s decision-making”
  - “I understand now the challenges of legislation”
- Measures: what is politically feasible, legally possible and economically viable.
Understanding

- Spatial dimension of the problem
  - Capture Map (USGS)

Source: USGS
Influence on Policy Making

The science processes within the partnership have influenced policy in two issues (although the USPP has no power to impose policies or regulations):

1. Cochise County (SV subwatershed): development density limits imposed within two miles of the river.
2. Transfer of development rights in areas far away from the riparian corridor.
Other Outcomes

1. Some stakeholders reduced their water use significantly, by their own initiative
   Fort Huachuca the best example.

2. Retirement of farmland
   (which used groundwater to irrigate).

3. Waste-water reuse and recharge into the aquifer
Latest Update from the San Pedro Basin

- GW Deficit:
  - 14-15,000 af/y without Conservation Measures
  - 6,000 af/y with Conservation Measures

- Sustainability Deadline was NOT met (Bill321, Sept 2011)
  - No consequences stated in the Bill.
Key Contributions of the Process

1. Allowing more focused discussions on particular issues simultaneously
2. A shared understanding of the system, both physical and human
3. Joint acknowledgement of what is NOT reasonable or convenient

4. Builds TRUST and OWNERSHIP:
   - “The DSS is not seen as a black box, everybody’s concerns went into it”
   - “The DSS project has been like a micro-cosmos for consensus building”

5. Engaging stakeholders and managers before decisions are taken:
   Understanding ➔ Actions & Behavior Change
What would they do different?

1. Try to do it faster (acknowledged it’s a slow process)
2. Better management of expectations

3. More clear chain of responsibility:
   - More expeditious (less chance of catching up on particip.)
   - Modelers reporting back to one person
   - Reduce need of Tech Committee to check back with broader USPP
   - Still with academia, but with a business contract, tied into a budget and deadlines

4. Allow for less participation:
   - Some democratic process but not all of it, it takes forever

5. More outreach and public input:
   - A more aggressive approach to bringing the understanding of the model to all involved stakeholders and the public: for TRUST

6. Show examples beforehand:
   - Initially not a clear idea of where the DSS would lead us
   - Define its purpose, how it would be used and limitations
   - Perhaps provide a short written document (vs only oral explanations)
   - “The Partnership didn’t know what they wanted until they saw what Kevin had”

7. Involve policy people from the beginning:
   - No “call me when you’re finished” policy
   - “They should have been more involved”

8. Change NOTHING:
   - “The DSS was like creating something that had never been done. A really good process”
Stakeholder Relevant

“Integrating Science Questions”

Q1: What are the impacts of vegetation change on basin scale water balance?

Q2: What are the costs and benefits of riparian restoration and preservation?

Q3: What kinds of water markets & banking are feasible?
Key Element – Multi-disciplinary Integrated Modeling

- How Viable is Modeling at each level?
- Bridge across Physical and Behavioral Aspects
- Transactional Costs of Complexity?
- Transparency and Comprehensibility?
BUT ...  
Who Drives the Science Agenda?

In SAHRA ... it was clearly the “Physical” Scientists

Who “thought” that they understood the problems that needed solving
Origins of SWAN

The SWAN proposal to the EU was based on the notion of Social-Scientists driving the Agenda

&

a “HUMAN-CENTERED approach to Science
Major Theme

Integrating Hydrological and other Sciences into Urban-Plus Decision Making

We use the term “Urban-Plus” or “Urban+” to encompass urban areas and their entire supporting hydrological system.
Transdisciplinary ‘Post-Normal’ Science
Transdisciplinary ‘Post-Normal’ Science

Characterized by very high ‘stakes’
Transdisciplinary ‘Post-Normal’ Science

‘Normal Science’ believes it is possible to handle challenges in a rigorous and rational way – resulting in a ‘best course of action’ for society.

‘Post-Normal Science’ recognizes that non-equivalent perceptions and representations of reality result in legitimate but contrasting perspectives, and therefore large amounts of uncertainty.

Therefore, even the problem structure is under question

i. Socially and politically relevant (who decides?)
ii. Scientifically useful & consistent with knowledge

Funtowicz & Ravetz (1993), Science for the Post-Normal Age, Futures 25
According to Post-Normal Science

May be *impossible* to obtain an uncontested legitimization of the problem structure.

This shifts the focus of scientific investigation ...

*From* “Searching For A Best Course of Action”
(a definite technological ‘solution’ or policy implementation)

*To* “Fostering Social Learning”

- a) Looking for better issue definitions
- b) Attaining better understanding of existing trends
- c) Clarifying areas of uncertainty
- d) Helping the actors to arrive at a useful problem structuring
According to *Post-Normal Science*

May be *impossible* to obtain an uncontested legitimization of the problem structure.

This shifts the focus of scientific investigation ...  

From *“Searching For A Best Course of Action”*  
*(a definite technological ‘solution’ or policy implementation)*

To *“Fostering Social Learning”*

Thereby

*“Enhancing the social process by which sustainability issues are resolved”*

a) Looking for better issue definitions  
b) Attaining better understanding of existing trends  
c) Clarifying areas of uncertainty  
d) Helping the actors to arrive at a useful problem structuring
According to *Post-Normal Science*

May be *impossible* to obtain an uncontested legitimization of the problem structure.

1. In reality, *the indications* given by models and data are always mediated by political negotiation & common sense ... the issue is *how to handle this mediation*

2. The real issues instead are:
   a) RELEVANCE - How to decide which models can be useful for policy-making
   b) TRADE-OFFS - How to define what should be considered an acceptable compromise among legitimate but contrasting definitions of improvements
SWAN Has Been Operating Since March 2012
Numerous EU Student Visits & Ongoing Seminar Series

“Ecosystem Services” as a common ground bridging the physical and behavioral sciences ...

Very Rich Environment for Students !!!

Common Conceptual Model ?

Shared Language ?
The SWAN Project

SWAN (Sustainable Water Action): Building Research Links between EU and US, is a four-year International Cooperation Project granted by the European Commission (FP7-INCOLAB-2011). It focuses on the creation of a research center on water to reinforce links between Europe and United States research in the field. The project promises to strengthen European research capacity in the USA, promote competitiveness of European research and industry while also informing and involving policy-makers and the general public.

The SWAN project has five European Union Member States (Bulgaria, France, Netherlands, Spain and United Kingdom) and a University of Arizona team from the Hydrology and Water Resources Department. It is coordinated by the French CNRS (Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique), that created an International Centre (UMI "Water, Environment and Public Policy") in collaboration with the University of Arizona in 2008. This extension of the UMI broadens its current activities from a bi-national focus to one that incorporates ideas, disciplines and methods from Europe.
Past Workshops

Workshop on New Paradigms in Water Resources and Risk Management

University of Seville, January 25th, 2013

The identification of key data for water resource and risk management is an important contribution of the SWAN project, and the University of Seville team focused on the Workshop on New Paradigm in Data and Information Management. The workshop was focused on new and emerging paradigms in water resource management.

Over 50 experts including representatives of regional, local and water administrations, environmental groups, university researchers, water managers and other stakeholders were invited to participate and share their conclusions.
Past Workshops

Challenges of Integrating Hydrological Science into Urban-Plus Decision Making

2013 May (Tucson)
This Workshop

"Debates on Knowledge for Water Governance in Networked Societies"

SESSION 1:  Power, Communication and Policy Process
SESSION 2:  Key Debates on Water Management Models/Paradigms
SESSION 3:  Polycentric information for water governance: generation, quality control and sustainability
SESSION 4:  Key issues in information dissemination, visualization, and translation to different audiences

2014 June (Seville)
Eventual Goal

What constitutes a Productive Dialogue?

How should such a Dialogue be Structured?
Please Participate!
Thanks!

The Post-Normal “Pre-Conceptual” Scientist

** From Wiley Miller's ‘Non Sequitur’ Comic Strip