



COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE
130 WEST CONGRESS, 10TH FLOOR
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701



CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
P.O. Box 27210
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85726-7210

**CITY/COUNTY WATER AND WASTEWATER STUDY
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**

**March 19, 2009
Meeting Summary**

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Jim Barry called the March 19, 2009 meeting of the City/County Water and Wastewater Study Oversight Committee (Oversight Committee) to order at 5:00 p.m. at the City of Tucson I.T. Bldg, Pueblo Conference Room, Tucson, Arizona.

Members Present:

Sean Sullivan
Vincent Vasquez
Bonnie Poulos
Jim Barry, Chairman
Tina Lee
Bruce Gungle
John Carlson
Rob Kulakofsky
Mark Stratton

Representing:

Citizens Water Advisory Committee (CWAC)
CWAC
County Planning & Zoning Commission
CWAC
CWAC
County P&Z Commission
Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Committee (RWRAC)
RWRAC
RWRAC

Absent:

James Watson
Marcelino Flores

Representing:

City Planning Commission
RWRAC

Alternate Absent:

Bob Cook

Representing:

County P&Z Commission

City/County Staff Present:

Nicole Ewing Gavin, City Manager's Office
Sabrina Cotta, City Manager's Office
Sandy Elder, Tucson Water
Melaney Seacat, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Greg Hilt, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Nicole Fyffe, Pima County Administrator's Office
Ed Curley, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department

A quorum of the Committee was established.

2. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Jim Barry introduced Thomas Sayler-Brown, a newly appointed committee member who is waiting confirmation from the Mayor and Council.

Approval of the February 19, 2009 meeting summary passed by a voice vote of 9-0.

3. **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE**

4. **DISCUSS/APPROVE CHANGES TO PHASE I DRAFT REPORT***

Jim Barry stated that everyone's point of view had a place in the committee themes section, the rest of the report is to be based in fact.

The Committee reviewed the draft report page by page making multiple edits.

The Committee reached consensus on the report and approved the report with the changes discussed.

5. **REVIEW SCOPE/ SCHEDULE FOR PHASE 2 REPORTS***

Nicole Ewing Gavin explained the schedule for phase II and reviewed what items would be addressed.

6. **PRESENTATION: CITY/COUNTY CONSOLIDATED DROUGHT MANAGEMENT PLAN TECHNICAL PAPER**

No discussion held, item continued to next meeting.

7. **DISCUSSION/ Q & A WITH PRESENTERS**

No discussion held, item continued to next meeting.

8. **COMMITTEE DISCUSSION ON DROUGHT RECOMMENDATIONS***

No discussion held, item continued to next meeting

9. **CALL TO AUDIENCE**

William Crosby requested to see a water budget added to the report including acre feet per year used in Tucson basin and stated that the water budget needs to be transparent. William Crosby questioned if all stakeholders were at the table and referenced the energy corporations right to divert water and store it. William Crosby also questioned if the desalinization plant and Mississippi River canal should be referenced in the report, referring to them as pipe dreams.

Colette Altaffer reminded the committee that energy is part of the cost of water and discussed the cost of the Yuma desalinization plant.

10. **ADJOURNMENT***

The meeting was adjourned by Jim Barry at 8:50 p.m.

Meeting Attendees:

Rick Franz-Under, Pima County DSD
Fernando Molina, Tucson Water
Barbara Watten
Alan O'Brien, Gannett Fleming
Dyer Lytle
Karen LaMartina, Tucson Water
Kathleen Chavez, Pima County
William Crosby, ECCO
Val Little, Water CASA
Monica Moxley-Wilson, Town of Sahuarita
Chris Brooks, CWAC

Donna Branch-Gilby
Colette Altaffer



COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE
130 WEST CONGRESS, 10TH FLOOR
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701



CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
P.O. Box 27210
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85726-7210

Legal Action Report City / County Water & Wastewater Study Oversight Committee

Thursday, March 09, 2009

5:00 P.M.

City of Tucson I.T. Bldg., Pueblo Conference Room
481 W. Paseo Redondo
Tucson, Arizona 85701

1. Call to Order
Quorum was established
2. Committee Business
 - Announcements**Discussion held, no action taken**
 - Approval of meeting summary from 02/21/2009***Motion to approve the minutes passed by a voice vote of 9 to 0**
3. Call to the Audience
Discussion held, no action taken
4. Discuss/ approve changes to Phase I Draft Report*
Committee reached consensus on report and approved draft with changes
5. Review Scope/ Schedule for Phase 2 Report*
Discussion held, no action taken
6. Presentation: City/ County Consolidated Drought Management Plan Technical Paper
No discussion held, item continued to next meeting
7. Discussion/ Q&A with Presenters
No discussion held, item continued to next meeting
8. Committee discussion on drought recommendations*
No discussion held, item continued to next meeting
9. Call to the Audience
Discussion held, no action taken
10. Adjournment* **8:50p.m.**



COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE
130 WEST CONGRESS, 10TH FLOOR
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701



CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
P.O. Box 27210
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85726-7210

**CITY/COUNTY WATER AND WASTEWATER STUDY
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**

April 23, 2009

Meeting Summary

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Jim Barry called the April 23, 2009 meeting of the City/County Water and Wastewater Study Oversight Committee (Oversight Committee) to order at 5:35 p.m. at the Tucson Association of Realtors, 2445 N. Tucson Blvd, Tucson, Arizona.

Members Present:

Jim Barry, Chairman
Vincent Vasquez
Bonnie Poulos
Tina Lee
John Carlson
Rob Kulakofsky
Mark Stratton
Marcelino Flores

Representing:

Citizens Water Advisory Committee (CWAC)
CWAC
County Planning and Zoning (P&Z) Commission
CWAC
Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Committee (RWRAC)
RWRAC
RWRAC
RWRAC

Alternate Present:

Bob Cook

Representing:

County P&Z Commission

Absent:

James Watson
Sean Sullivan
Bruce Gungle
Thomas Saylor Brown

Representing:

City Planning Commission
CWAC
County Planning and Zoning (P&Z) Commission
City Planning Commission

City/County Staff Present:

Nicole Ewing Gavin, City Manager's Office
Sabrina Cotta, City Manager's Office
Leslie Liberti, Office of Conservation and Sustainable Development, City of Tucson
Jeff Biggs, Tucson Water
Sandy Elder, Tucson Water
Chris Avery, Tucson Water
Melody Loyer, Tucson Water
Fernando Molina, Tucson Water
Nicole Fyffe, Pima County Administrator's Office
Mike Gritzik, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Kathleen Chavez, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Melaney Seacat, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department

A quorum of the Committee was established.

2. **APPROVAL OF MARCH 19, 2009 MEETING SUMMARY***

Approval of the March 19, 2009 meeting summary passed by a voice vote of 9-0.

3. **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE**

No one spoke.

4. **REQUESTED CHANGE TO EXECUTIVE SUMMARY***

Mike Gritzik requested a language change to Executive Summary Committee Themes Section Scope Item A. The committee voted to accept the requested change as written by Wastewater by a voice vote of 9-0.

5. **DISCUSSION OF PHASE 2 PROCESS**

Jim Barry stated that Phase 2 would have more interaction between committee members and less staff presentations. All subjects will remain open until September when the final report is written.

Jim Barry stated that though some still express concern about the composition of the Committee, the City Council and Board of Supervisors have appointed the committee to oversee Phases 1 & 2 and the invitation still stands for others to submit comments and attend meetings to comment. Mark Stratton agreed, stating that phases 3 - 5 will be regional. Vince Vasquez stated that he was still concerned about the viability of the study if more stakeholders are not invited to the table and asked that the committee show restraint when making recommendations that may affect stakeholders that are not present.

6. **CITY/COUNTY CONSOLIDATED DROUGHT MANAGEMENT WHITE PAPER***

Nicole Fyffe, Kathy Chavez and Sandy Elder presented the white paper to the committee.

Mark Stratton stated that having a consolidated drought plan would be a good thing. Bonnie Poulos agreed that when the local area declares a drought all water providers and jurisdictions should come together and have one voice.

Margot Garcia commented that an average is an average and comes from a range and if an area is below average in precipitation it does not necessarily mean that the area is in a drought.

Chris Brooks provided the committee with his definition of drought; a hydrological drought meaning a regional drought where there is a decrease of water from a water source or a meteorological drought which would be a decrease in precipitation.

Bill Crosby stated that the Governor has no idea what the needs of rural water users are and asked how they would be included within this discussion.

Jim Barry requested that the paper accentuate the positive aspects first, define drought and perhaps look at a new paradigm of drought resistance since we live in a naturally arid environment.

7. **RECLAIMED WATER WHITE PAPER***

Nicole Ewing Gavin, Kathy Chavez, Sandy Elder and Melody Loyer presented the white paper to the committee.

Jim Barry asked staff to define effluent and reclaimed water. Bonnie Poulos asked about the various uses for each. Bob Cook recommended that these white papers influence a statewide water plan. Rob Kulakofsky suggested reduction of turf should be a goal.

Michael Tony stated that the snow pack is dropping and that is related to how much water we receive here and the break up of large ice sheets will cause a further reduction in snow pack in the future.

Bill Crosby asked for clarification about regulatory requirements. Kathy Chavez responded that reclaimed water has more stringent requirements than effluent. Bill Crosby questioned the safety of recharge using Christopher City as an example. Sandy Elder responded that it is important to match the quality of the water and the aquifer you are recharging into. Bill Crosby asked the committee if they were moving in the direction of reforming state water laws. Jim Barry answered that the committee was focused on local water issues.

Colette Altaffer brought up the issue of increased salt content in CAP water and that this will alter the soil composition here over time and could make it unlivable.

8. **EXTERNAL PERSPECTIVE ON WATER CONSERVATION***

Val Little from Water Casa presented the white paper to the committee. The committee will discuss conservation at their May meeting.

Tina Lee stated that all of the presentations suggest the importance of ongoing water education.

9. **AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING**

No discussion.

10. **CALL TO AUDIENCE**

Margot Garcia requested that the meetings be alternated between evenings and mornings and be held at a more neutral meeting place.

11. **ADJOURNMENT***

The meeting was adjourned by Jim Barry at 8:55 p.m.

Attendees:

William Crosby, ECCO
Val Little, Water CASA
Monica Moxley-Wilson, Town of Sahuarita
Chris Brooks, CWAC
Colette Altaffer, NIC
Michael Tony
Dale Keyes
Margot Garcia
Bill Crouse
Holly Lachowicz, Ward 3
Charles Cole
Jim Dubois, PCRWRD

Claire Zucker, PAG
Rebecca Kunsberg, Town of Marana
David Godlewski, SAHBA



COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE
130 WEST CONGRESS, 10TH FLOOR
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701



CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
P.O. Box 27210
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85726-7210

Legal Action Report City / County Water & Wastewater Study Oversight Committee

Thursday, April 23, 2009

5:00 P.M.

Tucson Association of Realtors
2445 N. Tucson Blvd.
Tucson, Arizona 85716

1. Call to Order
Quorum was established
2. Approval of March 19, 2009 Meeting Summary*
Motion to approve the minutes passed by a voice vote of 9 to 0
3. Call to the Audience
Discussion held, no action taken
4. Requested Change to Executive Summary*
Motion to approve the recommended changes passed by a voice vote of 9 to 0
5. Discussion of Phase 2 Process
Discussion held, no action taken
6. Presentation: City/ County Consolidated Drought Management Plan White Paper*
Discussion held, no action taken
7. Reclaimed Water White Paper*
Discussion held, no action taken
8. External Perspective on Water Conservation*
Discussion held, no action taken
9. Agenda for Next Meeting
No discussion, no action taken
10. Call to Audience
Discussion held, no action taken
11. Adjournment* **8:55p.m.**



COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE
130 WEST CONGRESS, 10TH FLOOR
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701



CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
P.O. Box 27210
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85726-7210

**CITY/COUNTY WATER AND WASTEWATER STUDY
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**

May 21, 2009

Meeting Summary

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Vice-Chairman Marcelino Flores called the May 21, 2009 meeting of the City/County Water and Wastewater Study Oversight Committee (Oversight Committee) to order at 5:11 p.m. at the Randolph Golf Course Club House Copper Room, 600 S. Alvernon Way, Tucson, Arizona.

Members Present:

Marcelino Flores, Vice-Chair
Vincent Vasquez
Bonnie Poulos
Tina Lee
John Carlson
Rob Kulakofsky
Mark Stratton
Bruce Gungle
Thomas Sayler-Brown

Representing:

Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Cmte (RWRAC)
Citizens Water Advisory Committee (CWAC)
County Planning and Zoning (P&Z) Commission
CWAC
RWRAC
RWRAC
RWRAC
County P&Z
City Planning Commission

Absent:

James Watson
Sean Sullivan
Jim Barry
Bob Cook (alternate)

Representing:

City Planning Commission
CWAC
CWAC
County P&Z

City/County Staff Present:

Nicole Ewing Gavin, City Manager's Office
Leslie Liberti, Office of Conservation and Sustainable Development, City of Tucson
Sandy Elder, Tucson Water
Melody Loyer, Tucson Water
Fernando Molina, Tucson Water
Ralph Marra, Tucson Water
Tom Arnold, Tucson Water
Nicole Fyffe, Pima County Administrator's Office
Kathleen Chavez, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Greg Hitt, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Melaney Seacat, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Eric Wieduwilt, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Suzanne Shields, Pima County Flood Control District
Bill Zimmerman, Pima County Flood Control District

Frank Postillion, Pima County Flood Control District
Evan Canfield, Pima County Flood Control District
Sherri Ruther, Pima County Development Services

A quorum of the Committee was established.

2. **APPROVAL OF APRIL 23, 2009 MEETING SUMMARY***

Approval of the April 23, 2009 meeting summary was delayed until the June meeting because the summary was not distributed to Committee members prior to the meeting for review.

3. **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE**

No one spoke

4. **FOLLOW UP ON RECLAIMED AND DROUGHT PAPERS**

Nicole Ewing Gavin handed out two documents that listed follow up items from the Committee discussion of the Reclaimed and Drought papers presented at the April meeting. Nicole asked the Committee to review the documents and provide any feedback to staff at the next meeting. The follow up documents are posted to the study website.

5. **PRESENTATION: CITY/COUNTY WATER CONSERVATION PAPER***

Melaney Seacat presented the highlights from the City/County Water Conservation paper. Staff on the panel included Sandy Elder, Fernando Molina, Leslie Liberti, and Suzanne Shields.

John Carlson asked for clarification about what is meant by “water efficiency goals”. Staff responded that it is a broader way of looking at conservation that doesn’t just focus on reducing water use but making sure that water is being put to the best use. An example is making sure that irrigation systems are operating properly.

Marcelino Flores asked about the capacity of our pipes and whether this affects the need to conserve. Sandy Elder described the daily and yearly fluctuations in water demand and the Beat the Peak program which is aimed at decreasing water usage during the highest demand periods.

Mark Stratton cautioned against using GPCD (gallons per capita per day) as the sole benchmark of conservation progress because each water provider has different types of customers and systems that affect GPCD. We have for a long time had a strong conservation ethic in Tucson. The next increment of improvement in conservation is going to be more expensive to achieve.

Vince Vasquez stated that conservation requirements have a cost associated with them that someone must pay and we need to be aware of this. We need to consider cost effectiveness of solutions as well as reliability and compare these costs to the cost to acquire new water. Vince brought up the City’s Community Conservation Task Force (CCTF) as a good model for evaluating various conservation approaches based on costs and benefits. The CCTF process also brought about a conservation fee on water bills which helps with conservation price signals.

Mark Stratton asked about Tucson Water’s education programming related to conservation ordinances. Staff described Tucson Water’s base program as well as new programs recommended by the CCTF process and related to implementing new ordinances like those requiring rainwater harvesting and greywater systems.

Rob Kulakofsky discussed the need for retrofit requirements to mandate the replacement of appliances with more efficient models. There could be a 10 year grace period and incentives. We also need to ban inefficient appliances and high water use plants from being sold at retail establishments in Tucson.

Vince Vasquez stated that a retrofit ordinance that requires upgrades at the time of sale increases the price of a home.

John Carlson stated that low-flow toilets can create sewer conveyance problems in some areas and maybe we should educate people about them rather than requiring them.

Tina Lee brought up the importance of letting people know what they are paying for on their water bill (energy, commodity, infrastructure) – base rate vs. commodity rate.

Val Little (audience) stated that she feels a different way of rate making will be coming soon that will not link less water used with higher rates and it will involve base rates going up.

Bruce Gungle stated that the reason water usage is going down is that it is “hip to conserve”. He stated that there are two things that limit growth: land and water. We should acknowledge that at the end of the day, using less water does allow more people to move here.

Vince Vasquez stated that more efficient use of water isn’t just about growth but can be about better use of water to improve quality of life.

Bonnie Poulos stated that the paper does not focus enough on conservation in the existing built environment and that this is harder than in new areas. We need to set standards for redevelopment and infill that include requirements, incentives and rebates in the permitting process. We also need to address barriers in the current code that prevent people from redeveloping. Suzanne Shields replied that building permits discussed in the report refer to infill and redevelopment also.

Bonnie Poulos pointed out an error on p. 6 of the report regarding the role of the Planning and Zoning Commission. Staff will correct this in the on-line version.

Mac Hudson brought up no-flow toilet fixtures and suggested that we should provide incentives for these.

Vince Vasquez reiterated that we need to look at cost-benefit and cost comparisons of conservation options. In some cases, retrofitting the built environment would be cheaper than mandating requirements for new development (e.g. toilet replacement is cost-effective and has measurable and reliable results).

Bonnie Poulos suggested that Tucson Water and Pima County Wastewater should factor in alternative energy and alternative water sources to help stimulate the green energy market here and to set an example of what citizens need to do.

Bonnie Poulos stated that we should be conserving reclaimed water, not just potable.

John Carlson brought up the fact that Las Vegas limits the amount of turf that golf courses can have.

William Crosby stated that water efficiency is an important aspect of conservation. An example is that aerating turf makes better use of water.

Nancy Freeman stated that it is important to distinguish water use by commercial, residential, indoor and outdoor use. We need to stop the sale of high water use plants in Tucson.

6. **PRESENTATION: STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PAPER***

Suzanne Shields presented the highlights from the Stormwater Management technical paper.

Mark Stratton asked about further upstream solutions to slow urban flows. Suzanne Shields responded that it is easier where new development is taking place. She gave the example of the Golder Ranch dam that was breached and was not an effective solution. The geology of our area makes it difficult and dams would not be desirable in many areas.

Bruce Gungle brought up the water harvesting/traffic calming devices on 9th St. in Rincon Heights neighborhood as a good model.

Vince Vasquez asked about the functioning of stormwater harvesting at the lot-scale and how this relates to detention basins. Suzanne responded that one of the purposes of stormwater harvesting is flood control and that lot-scale systems can reduce the size of basins but wouldn't likely completely replace them.

John Carlson discussed the need to coordinate between local, state and federal projects that are dealing with flood control. John stated we should produce information for homeowners regarding stormwater harvesting opportunities in their neighborhood.

Tina Lee asked about the possibility of having a stormwater utility on a regional scale. Suzanne Shields responded that this is closely tied to land use so each jurisdiction wants to maintain control. It could make sense for projects on major rivers.

Bruce Gungle asked for clarification on various figures and charts in the report. Staff provided explanation.

Vince Vasquez asked about how stormwater is best used with other water resources for riparian benefits. Suzanne responded that the Kino (KERP) project is an example of this as is Swan wetlands. We're learning how best to design these projects making best use of water resources. In these cases, reclaimed water is used only for the establishment of the vegetation.

Rob Kulakofsky stated that we should reconfigure watercourses most like their natural state. The Santa Cruz River south of Irvington is an example.

Nancy Freeman stated that we are permitting development and roadways in floodplains without concern for downstream impacts.

William Crosby brought up the issue of climate change and future flood events.

7. **PRESENTATION: RIPARIAN PROTECTION PAPER***

Suzanne Shields presented the highlights from the Riparian Protection technical paper.

Mark Stratton brought up pumpage in the Sabino Creek area and the fact that exempt wells are so significant in number there. We would need a way to limit existing exempt wells at the local level to really protect riparian areas.

Mark Stratton asked about the location of surface water diversions in the region. Staff responded that the primary one is at Cienega Creek for Del Lago golf course (400 acre-feet).

John Carlson asked for definitions of hydro-riparian, meso-riparian and shallow groundwater.

Bonnie Poulos suggested the use of satellite imagery as an educational tool to help people see the impacts of groundwater pumping.

Vince Vasquez stated that we need to wheel renewable supplies to areas with wells if we really want to improve riparian areas. Whether the community would be willing to subsidize this is a question.

Bonnie Poulos asked about taxing wells. Staff responded that non-exempt wells are already taxed and that there is no mechanism to tax exempt wells because they are not even tracked.

Vince Vasquez stated that planned communities are much better than “wildcat” developments, from a riparian protection perspective. We need to make sure we are not encouraging “wildcatting” by heaping too many regulations on subdivisions.

Margot Garcia stated that exempt wells were sunk in midtown neighborhoods prior to the change in the law.

Beryl Baker cautioned that we don’t want to regulate people out of being able to own their own water.

Marcelino Flores mentioned the importance of articulating the legislative issues in the committee report.

8. **AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING***

No discussion

9. **CALL TO AUDIENCE**

Beryl Baker stated there is phosphorous in wastewater and that maybe we could mine it.

11. **ADJOURNMENT***

The meeting was adjourned by Marcelino Flores at 8:55 p.m.

Attendees:

Nancy Freeman
Sheila Bowen

Mac Hudson
Claire Zucker
Kathy Cheney
Val Little
William Crosby
Andrea Borlizzi
Tim Cloninger
Rich Franz
Beryl Baker
Anne Campbell
Chuck Freitas
Holly Lachowicz
Cindy Shimokusu
Margot Garcia



COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE
130 WEST CONGRESS, 10TH FLOOR
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701



CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
P.O. Box 27210
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85726-7210

Legal Action Report City / County Water & Wastewater Study Oversight Committee

Thursday, May 21, 2009

5:00 P.M.

Randolph Copper Room
600 S. Alvernon Way
Tucson, Arizona 85716

1. Call to Order
Quorum was established
2. Approval of April 23, 2009 Meeting Summary*
Item delayed until next meeting
3. Call to the Audience
Discussion held, no action taken
4. Follow up on Reclaimed and Drought Papers
Discussion held, no action taken
5. Presentation: City/ County Conservation Paper *
Discussion held, no action taken
6. Presentation: Stormwater White Paper*
Discussion held, no action taken
7. Presentation: Riparian Protection *
Discussion held, no action taken
8. Agenda for Next Meeting
No discussion, no action taken
9. Call to Audience
Discussion held, no action taken
11. Adjournment* **8:55p.m.**



COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE
130 WEST CONGRESS, 10TH FLOOR
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701



CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
P.O. Box 27210
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85726-7210

CITY/COUNTY WATER AND WASTEWATER STUDY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

June 25, 2009

Meeting Summary

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Jim Barry called the June 25, 2009 meeting of the City/County Water and Wastewater Study Oversight Committee (Oversight Committee) to order at 5:18 p.m. at the Randolph Golf Course Clubhouse, Copper Room, 600 S. Alvernon Way, Tucson, Arizona.

Members Present:

Vincent Vasquez
Bonnie Poulos
Jim Barry, Chairman
John Carlson
Rob Kulakofsky
Mark Stratton
Marcelino Flores
Bruce Gungle
Christopher Brooks
Joesph Maher

Representing:

CWAC
County P&Z Commission
Citizens Water Advisory Committee (CWAC)
Wastewater Management Advisory Committee (WMAC)
RWRAC
RWRAC
RWRAC
County Planning and Zoning (P&Z) Commission
CWAC (to be confirmed July 7, 2009)
City Planning Commission (to be confirmed July 7, 2009)

Alternate Present:

Bob Cook

Representing:

County P&Z Commission

Absent:

Thomas Saylor Brown
Tina Lee

Representing:

City Planning Commission
CWAC

City/County Staff Present:

Nicole Ewing Gavin, City Manager's Office
Sabrina Cotta, City Manager's Office
Sandy Elder, Tucson Water
Chris Avery, Tucson Water
Ralph Marra, Tucson Water
Nicole Fyffe, Pima County Administrator's Office
Kathleen Chavez, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Melaney Seacat, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Greg Hitt, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Mike List, Pima County GIS
Eric Wieduwilt, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Arlan Colton, Pima County Planning

Albert Elias, City of Tucson Planning
Chris Kaselemis, City of Tucson Planning
Jennifer Burdick, City of Tucson Planning
Leslie Liberti, City of Tucson Office of Conservation and Sustainable Development

A quorum of the Committee was established.

2. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Melaney Seacat announced that the Committee was receiving Phase II notebooks and also informed the committee about the Energy Policy and Water retreat that City and County staff attended.

Jim Barry introduced two new members of the Committee, Chris Brooks to replace Sean Sullivan from CWAC and Joseph Maher to replace James Watson from the City Planning Commission. Both are to be confirmed July 7, 2009 by the Mayor and Council and Board of Supervisors.

3. **APPROVAL OF APRIL 23 AND MAY 21, 2009 MEETING SUMMARIES***

Marcelino Flores commented that the meeting summaries are not fully capturing the Committee's comments, are vague and abstract, and requests a better meeting summary so that the Committee can use it to help write the Phase II report. Jim Barry requested that staff be sure not to miss the Committee's colorful comments. Rob Kulakofsky stated that the Committee gets the papers ahead of time and should be able to discuss and come to consensus on ideas, and get these into the meeting summaries.

Approval of the April 23 and May 21, 2009 meeting summaries passed by a voice vote of 7-0.

4. **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE**

No one spoke.

5. **PHASE 2 SCHEDULE**

Nicole Ewing Gavin requested a proposed amendment to the Phase 2 schedule shifting some technical papers into September and using October-November for Committee report writing. Jim Barry mentioned that Mayor and Council and Board of Supervisors gave the Committee until November to complete Phase 2. Rob Kulakofsky stated that this makes sense given the Committee is being asked to do a lot and needs to do whatever it takes. Mark Stratton agreed stating that he would rather take the time to review the papers and give them the appropriate focus than gloss over some of them. The indication was that the Committee was comfortable with the change in the Phase 2 schedule.

6. **FOLLOW UP ON WATER CONSERVATION, STORMWATER AND RIPARIAN PROTECTION WHITE PAPERS**

Melaney Seacat distributed follow up documents on the May technical papers, which are intended to capture key themes from the Committee's discussion as well as respond to questions.

7. **PRESENTATION: LOCATION OF GROWTH, URBAN FORM AND COST OF INFRASTRUCTURE WHITE PAPER***

Jim Barry reminded the Committee that population growth numbers were a part of the Phase I discussion. He stated that there are variations in and disagreements about projections and that this is important to remember during this presentation about growth. He suggested that most would agree there are inherent limits on how big Tucson can grow, and the question is how to manage the form and location of a population of around two million people.

Bob Cook brought up the long term trend of growth rates declining and requested an explanation from Tucson Planning/PAG/DES about why they project a population increase despite evidence otherwise.

Nicole Fyffe introduced the white paper by reviewing the Scope for the paper which stated that the City and County were to come to agreement on location and form of future growth. The Committee's themes and values from the Phase 1 Report also gave direction for the paper. Consultants Stantec and Curtis Lueck & Associates assisted in preparing the paper because of their past work with the County on SWIP.

Jim Barry disclosed his association with the consultant team but stated he had no involvement in this paper.

Arlan Colton spoke to the Committee stating that in his professional opinion this was very good planning work and was at a scale and depth as allowed by budget and time. Arlan stated that work like this had never been done before in the community. In the 1970s they tried to do something similar but not as this level of scenario visioning and benchmarking. There are many drivers of urban form and this paper is good food for thought as the City and County move forward in updating their General and Comprehensive Plans. He stated that this document is a 'what if' document, and that moving forward at the status quo is not acceptable for the future.

John Take from Stantec presented a powerpoint presentation on the white paper which looked at effects of urban form and at suitability of various growth areas. John made the point that design of the built environment is important and affects a variety of factors. Overall U.S. cities are less dense than other major world cities. John talked through benchmark data comparing Tucson to peer cities on a variety of factors.

Vince Vasquez stated that land values strongly affect density and asked if the paper took this into account. John Take answered that it did not.

John Carlson stated that water is a natural limit to population growth. He also asked John Take what is meant by the term "robust". John Take replied robustness refers to the quality of the study and whether conclusions are backed up by facts.

Marcelino Flores questioned if Tucson could go in a declining direction. John Take used the example of Flint, Michigan facing an economic decline and explained how the city was changing its form by tearing down homes and reclaiming open space. Marcelino Flores stated that economics are a big factor in how communities grow.

Bob Cook made the point that higher density areas use infrastructure more efficiently and subsidize low density.

Bonnie Poulos stated that she has a problem with the paper because the correlations aren't that strong and don't prove cause and effect. Over-simplification can lead us down paths we should not be on. She also does not agree with the correlation between potable water usage and density. Bruce Gungle stated that with so many data points there are correlations here. John Take stated that this is not meant to be causal.

Vince Vasquez stated that its only logical that smaller lots use less water.

John Take presented growth scenarios with varying affects on transportation, economy, water the environment, etc. He presented a status quo scenario, habitat protection scenario, infrastructure efficient scenario, and transit-oriented development scenario.

Bruce Gungle requested a set of maps that only showed the difference between the scenarios.

John Carlson questioned what date this scenario would be arrived at. John Take answered that these scenarios weren't date-specific, just population-specific (2 million).

Marcelino Flores commented that there was land that was undeveloped but not undevelopable and that growth would go to these areas unless we protect them.

Vince Vasquez stated that developers would be drawn to private land first and when and to what degree State Land comes to market will influence where development goes. With so many factors driving growth to different places, how would you realistically achieve these scenarios?

Jim Barry stated that a regional dialogue is clearly needed on this topic. He stated that this paper raises important questions and gives scenarios with rules and if the rules are changed, outcomes change.

John Carlson asked if we have enough water for 2 million people and stated that consolidating utilities or governments may be worth pursuing.

Mark Stratton stated that a blend of the scenarios might make the most sense. He also stated that taxpayer savings through more efficient growth should be invested in better infrastructure and amenities to serve more dense areas.

Rob Kulakofsky suggested that the peer cities chosen all had surface water and questioned whether they have habitat protection plans. The problem with the white paper is that we are quantifying suppositions. In addition, these are all things we already know and that have been looked at before. The disruption to existing neighborhoods through density increases and tearing down existing neighborhoods make these scenarios impractical.

Rob Kulakofsky asked how much money was spent on consultants for this paper. Nicole Ewing Gavin answered that it was in the \$30,000 range.

Jim Barry stated that he strongly disagrees with Rob's comments and that this paper is very useful.

Marcelino Flores questioned where was the analysis of the impact of the economy? Where are the job centers? Where are the areas of recreation? The benchmark cities Tucson was compared to have a lot more water.

Albert Elias continued the presentation stating he hopes the paper initiates dialogue and that it is written to be provocative. There are no easy answers and these issues are worth talking about. We need to help the community understand the issues. Do we want to target growth areas? Urban form? Reinvest in neglected areas? Provide more varied housing opportunities? We should strive to improve the quality of design and encourage better maintenance of aging housing stock. Is everyone going to have a voice? This takes a commitment to make choices a reality and that takes education, outreach and engagement, without these there are no choices. We need to approach this from a regional level and there is opportunity to engage those who have not been involved in the past. The youth of the community need to be

involved, it is their future. Albert Elias stated he is optimistic about dialogue and there is a sense of urgency and a price to pay if the community does not engage in discussion about these issues.

Nicole Ewing Gavin summarized the recommendations in the paper.

Vince Vasquez stated that he was not comfortable making an official statement about the paper until the end of the process. The Committee needs to consider this paper in the context of other papers.

Mark Stratton said it would be best to wait until the Committee hears all the environmental and planning papers over the next few months and blend issues for recommendations. There is some overlap and the committee should make a few solid recommendations.

Vince Vasquez stated that the white paper was a good starting point but should be the center of a real thorough study of the whole region and gains importance in that forum. He doesn't want to spend more than thirty minutes talking about density.

John Carlson stated that this was an incredible amount of information and that Tucson grew because people came here. The public needs to get educated and the scenarios need to be put out there for the public. Water cuts us off eventually.

Jim Barry said that during Phase I, population was one of the key variables that affect a sustainable water future, and that the most useful part of the paper was the raising of the question, "what does government have the most control over...how many people come? or what form growth takes?" This is why I disagree with Rob. This paper forces us to think of alternatives. Are there things we can do to make it go better? If not, we just throw up our hands.

Vince Vasquez questioned the policy of Tucson Water not to serve outside the obligated service area and if an area such as the southwest is labeled as a growth area what internal conversation would be had to determine if Tucson Water would serve the area. Nicole Ewing Gavin answered that the July technical paper will address this issue.

Mark Stratton stated that how much Marana and Oro Valley are expanding would have an impact on how the area looks and other areas are also looking at how to handle growth. Phase III and IV will become much more collaborative.

Rob Kulakofsky disagreed with Jim Barry. Rob doesn't think that we should just throw up our hands and not plan. We have been talking about these issues for years now and these scenarios have been considered. There is nothing new just a different way to put information out.

Arlan Colton agreed with Mark and it matters what Marana and Oro Valley and Sahuarita do. This paper assigned growth to those areas without planning for them. After doing this for thirty years, the planning options from 1970s are gone and the options are more limited today. It is interesting how much land actually has been taken up and what form. A lot of assumptions have been made, this is not a comprehensive plan and the study is based on a 30,000 foot view but it can inform the regional discussion.

Bonnie Poulo stated that we don't want to give the impression that these scenarios are mutually exclusive. We've seen an increase in density within the City without any benefits. An increase in population could mean a decrease in services when talking about density. Results

will only be achieved if many other things go along with an increase in density. There is no incentive to invest in transit. Legislature is thinking about revoking impact fees. These issues are not addressed in the white paper. There needs to be a holistic look. There needs to be a basis in reality.

Jim Barry stated we should do exactly this in our final report. We can take useful parts of the paper and put our own spin on it.

Vince Vasquez stated that the City and County should not be dictating density in terms of RAC. Instead, the City and County should put in new infrastructure in the growth areas.

Nicole Fyffe stated that the scenarios are not meant to be mutually exclusive and that staff hoped the Committee would pick the elements of each they like.

Rob Kulakofsky stated that upgrades in the existing built environment need to be looked at as well as investment in new growth areas.

Jim Barry suggested that the picture on the back page of the report be removed and some of the language within the report goes too far and damages the credibility of the findings.

Rob Kulakofsky questioned the CO2 emissions number on page 6, thinking it would be reduced by a lot more since multi-dwelling buildings cause a snowball effect in saving energy and requested to see the source of the number.

Bob Cook stated that this is a useful exercise and a good way to introduce smart growth. The bad news is in the implementation. The status quo is not economically sustainable. The most significant variables are the economy and energy costs. Bob Cook stated that keeping 2 million people a constant was not reality. Tucson is not growing and no one is talking about why and the economic factors that each scenario faces should be looked at.

Christopher Brooks stated that it is important to give the general public ideas on how to grow but as far as the committee, importance of urban form and how it affects constraints on water and infrastructure is what should be focused on.

Joseph Maher stated that in the past growth has been a four letter word. We've ignored managed growth. In the past there has been a fear of imposing zoning. In 25 years, he's never seen these things mapped. Portland is an example of a place with a growth boundary that forced growth within a certain area. There are disadvantages to this but it is a managed growth plan. Tucson still needs a plan. It is the chicken and the egg debate, is it transit first or higher density housing first? Maintenance is an important issue and can have a domino effect. We still have one of the ugliest streets in America. He hopes that Tucson's older neighborhoods can be revitalized.

8. **AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING***

Jim Barry reminded the Committee that the paper for the next meeting is Integrating Land Use Planning with Water Resources and Infrastructure.

9. **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE**

Margot Garcia stated that she appreciated the tremendous amount of work that went into modeling and the GIS gentleman (Mike List) should get a round of applause. We all learn from modeling and it was very interesting the constraints the Conservation Land System put on us. Other constraints should be tried for example a bond for a million dollars or how far water pipes are extended. What about the destruction of neighborhoods? There is a natural

evolution. Models give us ideas and raise questions. If we continue on the status quo, other people make decisions for us.

Donna Branch-Gilby stated that the scenarios had many unknowns and some knowns that were not included in the presentation. The scenarios need to include real experiences. For example we are past peak oil production and the source is finite. She hopes we can get realistic about what the valley can sustain and there are hard decisions to be made.

Colette Altaffer stated she appreciates the work that went into the paper but is disappointed at the City's refusal to plan holistically addressing global warming, long term drought, etc. This paper will get out as the example of what we can do and it is not realistic. It needs to be made clear that this is a tool and not encourage people to move here without enough water. Sam Hughes Place as an example of dense infill has insufficient parking and noise and is not a good example of mixed use to which we should aspire. We should not support the regional visioning process because SALC excludes and marginalizes neighbors.

Charles Cole wondered how many people will water support. We don't want to go beyond our means, need to go beneath our means to account for a climate change buffer. Where does the increased garbage go? Will it leech into water? We need the committee to interact with the landfill design folks.

Melissa Mosey stated that equity is missing. Higher density is not equitable. People in the foothills can use as much water as they want to water their lawns while others have to live in high density to make up for it. What about the increase in crime associated with high density?

John Carlson requested a new roster.

11. **ADJOURNMENT***

The meeting was adjourned by Jim Barry at 8:30 p.m.

Attendees:

Graciela Schneier
Wathalie Sevaux
Samuel Leplus
Melissa Mauzy
Donna Branch-Gilby
Corey Thompson
Michael Curmon
David Godleski
Fred Ronstadt
Sheila Bower
Colette Altaffer
Mary Hamilton
Cris Hamilton
Lilian Von Rago
Kristen Zimmerman
Charles Cole
Kerri Jean Ormond
Jan Gordley
Margot Garcia
Athena Garcia
Mac Hudson

Summary of June 25, 2009 Comments on the Population and Land-Use White Paper

By Bob Cook

1. The relevant scenario comparison is between Status Quo and Smart Growth. What would be very useful for regional infrastructure planning is to have a detailed cost-benefit comparison between business-as-usual and a smart growth strategy.

2. To compare business as usual to enhanced open space, increased density and transit-oriented development scenarios may be informative in order to learn about these separate impacts on where growth will likely occur but it does not inform us about how to plan infrastructure under emerging real-world conditions.

3. Adding an additional one million people to the region under the Status Quo scenario would appear to be closer to impossible rather than “Most Easy” since business-as-usual has shown to be the most expensive and least efficient urban form in terms of total costs and benefits.

4. We are facing absolutely critical sustainability challenges in this region. This white paper did not address any other population growth assumptions except for “doubling our population.” We are seriously unprepared for any slower growth scenarios playing out.

5. The committee has heard many presentations from the local scientific and academic community. These presentations show that population growth in the future could decline because of:
 - Water shortages
 - Increasingly higher energy and water costs/prices
 - Increasingly hotter and drier climate
 - Grassification of our local Sonoran Desert ecosystems
 - Higher fire danger in mountains and newly formed grasslands
 - Growing unemployment due to slowdown of development industry
 - The “herd dynamic” to join others escaping increasing hardship



COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE
130 WEST CONGRESS, 10TH FLOOR
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701



CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
P.O. Box 27210
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85726-7210

Legal Action Report City / County Water & Wastewater Study Oversight Committee

Thursday, June 25, 2009

5:00 P.M.

Randolph Golf Course Clubhouse, Copper Room
600 S Alvernon Way, 85730

1. Call to Order
Quorum was established
2. Announcements
Discussion held, no action taken
3. Approval of meeting summaries from April 23 and May 21, 2009*
Motion to approve the minutes passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0
4. Call to the Audience
Discussion held, no action taken
5. Phase 2 Schedule
Discussion held, no action taken
6. Follow up on Water Conservation, Stormwater and riparian Protection White Papers
Discussion held, no action taken
7. Presentation: Location of Growth, Urban form and Cost of Infrastructure White Paper*
Discussion held, no action taken
8. Agenda for Next Meeting*
Discussion held, no action taken
9. Call to the Audience
10. Adjournment * **8:30 a.m.**



COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE
130 WEST CONGRESS, 10TH FLOOR
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701



CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
P.O. Box 27210
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85726-7210

**CITY/COUNTY WATER AND WASTEWATER STUDY
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**

July 16, 2009

Meeting Summary

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Jim Barry called the July 16, 2009 meeting of the City/County Water and Wastewater Study Oversight Committee (Oversight Committee) to order at 5:00 p.m. at the Tucson Association of Realtors, 2445 N Tucson Blvd, Tucson, AZ 85716.

Members Present:

Jim Barry, Chairman
Vincent Vasquez
Bonnie Poulos
John Carlson
Rob Kulakofsky
Marcelino Flores
Christopher Brooks
Joseph Maher
Tina Lee

Representing:

Citizens Water Advisory Committee (CWAC)
CWAC
County Planning & Zoning (P&Z) Commission
Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Committee (RWRAC)
RWRAC
RWRAC
CWAC (to be confirmed July 7, 2009)
City Planning Commission (to be confirmed July 7, 2009)
CWAC

Alternate Present:

Bob Cook

Representing:

County P&Z Commission

Absent:

Thomas Saylor-Brown
Bruce Gungle
Mark Stratton

Representing:

City Planning Commission
County P&Z Commission
RWRAC

City/County Staff Present:

Nicole Ewing Gavin, City Manager's Office
Sabrina Cotta, City Manager's Office
Chris Avery, Tucson Water
Nicole Fyffe, Pima County Administrator's Office
Kathleen Chavez, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Melaney Seacat, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Eric Wieduwilt, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Arlan Colton, Pima County Planning
Albert Elias, City of Tucson Planning
Chris Kaselemis, City of Tucson Planning
Suzanne Shields, Pima County Flood Control
Carla Blackwell, Pima County Development Services
Greg Hitt, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department

A quorum of the Committee was established.

2. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Melaney Seacat announced that the committee was receiving an updated Committee roster.

Nicole Ewing Gavin announced that this is Sabrina Cotta's last meeting as her internship with the City is finished.

Jim Barry announced that the Committee has until the end of November to finish Phase 2 and the last effective day to vote on the Phase 2 report is November 20th. There will be presentations through September. Marcelino and Jim will be sending a proposal to the Committee for completing the Phase 2 report that can be discussed at the August meeting.

John Carlson asked what happens after November. Jim Barry answered that this Committee would go out of business but proposed that CWAC, RWRAC, P&Z and the City Planning Commission monitor progress on implementation of Phase 2 recommendations.

Marcelino Flores commented that CWAC and RWRAC has a cross pollination of Directors and maybe the Committee should propose that the P&Z Committees become involved with the other Committees.

3. **APPROVAL OF June 25, 2009 MEETING SUMMARY***

Bob Cook stated that the meeting summary had him as absent even though he was there and wanted the written summary of his comments that he provided at this meeting entered into the meeting summary.

Approval of the June 25th, 2009 meeting summary with suggested edits passed by a voice vote of 7-0.

4. **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE**

No one spoke.

5. **FOLLOW UP ON GROWTH AND URBAN FORM PAPER**

Nicole Ewing Gavin distributed the follow up document to the Growth and Urban Form paper and explained that these documents are intended to capture follow up items and the Committee's discussion themes. There are three levels of records for all the Committee meetings (with varying degrees of detail): the follow up document, the meeting summary, and the meeting transcript.

Nicole Fyffe provided the Committee with requested GIS maps that show the differences between the presented growth scenarios. These maps will be posted on the website. Marcelino Flores requested the number of acres assigned in each scenario. Nicole Fyffe answered that she would get him a spreadsheet of the data.

Bob Cook stated that the three scenarios are complementary and together they are one scenario called "smart growth". If we want more open space, density would need to increase. Balanced, sustainable infrastructure is part of the solution and we really need a cost benefit comparison between the status quo and the smart growth scenario.

6. **DYNAMICS OF POPULATION GROWTH AND PROJECTIONS**

Jim Barry reminded the Committee that they were presented population projection information in Phase 1. Jim suggests the Committee revisit the topic and sent out the memo to spark discussion. This is the beginning, not the end of the conversation.

Vince Vasquez stated that the charts skew the data because the time intervals on the x axis are not consistent.

Jim Barry stated that there is variability year to year but population has increased over time. There are two theoretical growth curves: the J curve and the S curve. Which curve represents Tucson?

Bonnie Poulos thanked Jim for the memo and stated it does a good job of framing a difficult discussion. Looking at figure 3 on the slides, the line follows the S curve more than a J. In the past Tucson had mines, there was work. When these go away, people leave. People move where there are jobs.

John Carlson stated that population projections give it their best shot but they need to be looked at from a water standpoint and revisited every 5 to 7 years. Water will severely limit increase in population.

Jim Barry asked if water was a limiting factor and will move Tucson from a J curve to an S curve. Bob Cook stated that an S curve is more typical of a biological model and with boom and bust cycles. Marcelino Flores responded that over the long term, it is an S curve with upper limits and in the short term is a J curve because of the factors affecting why people move. Low cost of living, weather, and recreation could drive bigger population increases in the near term.

Vince Vasquez said the best statistics are the ones we have available and are the ones we have been using. There are natural resource limits but in many cases we can overcome those through desalinization, acquiring more Colorado River water, groundwater acquisition and greater water use efficiency. The next 20-30 years there will be 3-4 more business cycles and we should assume a consistent growth pattern.

Rob Kulakofsky stated that growth will follow an S curve. Resources are limited and the quality of life can be affected. More CAP water used as irrigation equals more salinity which affects the quality of plant life in the desert. We need to start thinking smarter and the use of rainwater can help support vegetation

Tina Lee stated that eventually bio-systems will hit a carrying capacity and will flatten out, however when this happens is a question.

Arlan Colton stated that is important to update our projections regularly. How much we flatten and when are questions. We will not likely flatten due to water but more likely due to the inability to deliver infrastructure.

Albert Elias said looking nationally and internationally is important. Tucson is attractive in the short term but how long can it maintain that? There will continue to be challenges when dealing with growth, issues such as how to pay for things and we will probably run out of money before we run out of water.

Bonnie Poulos questioned if we are really an attractive place for people to move to. With the exception of cheap housing and land, many quality of life aspects are falling to the bottom of the list. We may be attractive in the short term, but not in the long.

Marcelino Flores suggested this may be why we have a lot of “churn” (in-migration and out-migration).

Arlan Colton responded that out-migration looms large because those are the people with no roots and see Tucson as a pit stop. This has been a challenge since the post war boom issue.

Chris Avery stated that from a water perspective that for the last 50 years water demand has been under-predicted and in the future Tucson may still be very attractive in a time of global warming because it will be easier to cool your house than to heat it in a place like Buffalo.

Jim Barry stated that he lived in Buffalo and it’s a nice place!

Vince Vasquez stated that there are many push-pull factors but that comparatively we are better than the rust belt and the mid west and we must consider Mexican immigration as well.

Margot Garcia stated that the J curve is theoretically impossible because the end result would be the entire population of the world in Tucson and the S curve still slightly grows and does not fully flatten out. Places like Detroit and Cleveland expected to be grand forever and way over built their infrastructure. It is dangerous to predict population. We need to think about the factors that could send this city into decline.

John Carlson stated that he hoped this was the last time he had to hear about the J and S curve and that we need to rely on capable experts to project maximums and minimums and adjust these over time.

Bonnie Poulos asked how you prepare a community for the ups and downs of growth so that you are not overly harmed by less growth or a decrease in population.

Jim Barry stated we can’t do much about births and deaths so we need to look at in-migration and out-migration in terms of how we can influence growth.

Bob Cook said that right now one of the reasons we don’t see a lot of in-migration and out-migrations is people can’t sell their house.

Bonnie Poulos stated it is important to find out why people stay here, not just why they move here or leave here - you need both sides of the equation.

Marcelino Flores asked about what migration looks like within the Sun Corridor. Jim Barry answered that that information was not in the census report.

Jim Barry asked what we think the Mayor and Council and Board of Supervisors can/should do about growth.

Bonnie Poulos stated this may not be the right question. The question should be if they take certain action, what affect could that have. Jim Barry asked for an example. Bonnie stated that not serving water outside the TW service area creates a growth boundary and could have an impact.

Vince Vasquez stated that the policy implication of not serving water outside the service area pushes people to outlying areas.

Marcelino Flores stated that planning at the watershed level makes sense and there is vulnerability with bringing water over the mountain.

Arlan Colton stated that there are things local government can do to influence growth such as no economic development or provide no services. We can direct location of growth and urban form. If you change pace of growth by limiting building permits, you drive up housing prices. Phoenix metro studies state that for every three people that move in, two move out. In the next 25 years there will be 100 million new Americans and if the theory of megapolitans is true some of those people will be drawn to Pima, Maricopa and Pinal counties and how should those people be divided. I estimate we will not take our share since we are more resource constrained but that doesn't mean we won't grow.

Bob Cook said that rate of growth is a critical factor in making decisions on investments.

Marcelino Flores stated we need to focus on diversity and quality of our jobs.

Jim Barry asked what the Committee thought about the various population projections.

Bob Cook answered that there is a disconnect. There is a water shortage, climate change, grassification of the desert, etc. and questioned the assumptions behind the population projections. Jim Barry asked Bob how far off he thought they were. Bob Cook answered that the real issue is how to sustain the existing population. Jim Barry asked what he thought we would see. Bob Cook answered not more than 1.2 -1.3 million.

Vince Vasquez stated while this discussion is intellectually interesting, the Committee is not going to change the numbers, and the purpose of the study is not to determine what population projections are correct and these numbers are what we have and what we have been using. We have spent a lot of time on these issues and they are beyond the scope and capability of the Committee. Jim Barry disagreed saying it was central to the scope and asked for staff's preference for population projections.

Albert Elias stated there is no agreement and the further out, the less dependable the numbers. Arlan Colton agreed saying the beyond a certain point the numbers are wrong but it is reasonable to assume that the line will keep going. Jim Barry asked if they were good until 2030. Arlan answered yes. Bonnie Poulos stated that these forecasts and projections work information they don't have and it is important to look at the model regularly. Marcelino Flores stated the population has bell curves with males and females in age ranges and it might be important to look at that.

Bob Cook said that we need to consider climate change and by 2050 we will need to reduce the carbon foot print which means no more coal burning, no fossil fuels.

Vince Vasquez estimated a population of 2.5 million.

John Carlson reminded the Committee that the numbers needed to be looked at again and again.

Marcelino Flores brought up the idea by Rob Kulakofsky that the Committee need to find areas of agreement and moved to revisit population numbers on an annual basis at CWAC and RWRAC.

Claire Zucker from PAG said that the population projections are done for the whole region and for broad time spans. These numbers do not tell you where the people are going to go. Marcelino Flores directed staff to see how much it would cost to look population projections bi-annually versus annually. Claire Zucker said that they have a model they will be bringing in land use information into which should be running in October.

Bob Cook questioned why there was not multiple scenario planning for growth projections.

Bonnie Poulos asked for Jim Barry's opinion. Jim Barry stated he was comfortable with the projections through 2025, disagrees with Bob and does not think that elected officials influence why people move in or out of this area. He agrees there is an inherent limit to how much the area can grow and that we will grow along an S curve. Marcelino Flores asked Jim Barry why he has stayed in the area. Jim answered that he was invested in the community and it had been very good to him.

7. **PRESENTATION: INTEGRATING LAND USE AND WATER RESOURCE PLANNING/ DISUSSION AND Q&A WITH COMMITTEE AND PUBLIC**

Albert Elias, Nicole Ewing Gavin, Suzanne Shields, and Arlan Colton made presentation on the technical paper.

Bonnie Poulos stated that the General and Comprehensive Plans are great if used but they are never taken seriously and doesn't see the point of redoing them if there is no commitment to implement them.

Jim Barry asked about Tucson Water's obligation to provide water service to new growth within the Obligated Service Area. Chris Avery responded that is uncertain since case law is 30 years old. The City's ability to control what development to serve is enhanced if it is referenced in the General Plan and approved by voters.

Bob Cook questioned where the obligation came from. Chris Avery answered that inside City limits they are obligated to provide on an equal basis as long as have the available resources and must serve the agreements that have been made in the past even in areas that have been annexed into another jurisdiction. Albert Elias stated that if have urban form goals linked to water service goals there is a stronger case. Jim Barry questioned that interim policy and it the boundary was fuzzy. Chris Avery answered that case by case decisions were being made on where to start and stop the obligated areas. Jim Barry questioned if CAP was a regional commodity. Chris Avery stated that the allocation was never sufficient to supply the entire area and not defined to a specific location or obligated area.

Marcelino Flores questioned where the City was in the jurisdictional hierarchy compared with ADWR? Chris Avery answered that as an Assured Water Provider, Tucson Water is required to follow ADWR regulations.

Jim Barry questioned if a drop in GPCD was happening to other water providers? Other local water providers in the audience answered yes. Chris Avery stated that it seems to be happening all over the western U.S. and there doesn't seem to be one single factor but maybe is a result of the cumulative effect of all factors that lead people to reduce consumption.

Jim Barry questioned the different water resource quantity numbers being used and asked for consistency. Chris Avery said that different numbers represented different views of the water supply or specific reporting requirements. Jim Barry restated that the committee needed one number. John Carlson said to pick a number and define it. Vince Vasquez gave the opinion that the number for AWS was the most firm and supported by a regulatory agency.

Marcelino Flores asked Chris Avery to explain the resources and GPCD in Maricopa County. Chris answered that the majority of Maricopa has the Salt River which is inexpensive and urban areas can receive agriculture water rights. Marcelino Flores questioned how this affects GPCD? Chris Avery answered that it is about 1/100th the cost per acre than what it costs a TW customer, so cheaper supply means more use.

Vince Vasquez stated that physical access to renewable supply in reference to CAGR basis to recharge in different areas is exploited by everyone in the state even Tucson Water. Well sites serve peak demand, even though they have a renewable source and the report comes across as we are the good guys and CAGR is not. Chris Avery responded that the CAGR is what it is. Some folks located near recharge, some not and one idea going forward may be to wheel water and wheel long term storage credits but this is a regional discussion.

Ken Seasholes from the CAGR stated that though the paper lays out a central issue, the paper loses site of what is happening in the TAMA as a whole and staff are working on comments. There is under-utilization of CAP sub-contracts, there are local resource impacts that are confined and need more attention. The physical supply is local groundwater and the answer to this is safe yield, but that is one part in a larger framework.

Bob Cook stated that part of the renewable supply includes storm water and rainwater to meet recharge needs and wonders why there is no enthusiasm for an apples-to-apples analysis. Vince Vasquez reminded Bob that there are legal constraints to this. Chris Avery replied that storm water and rainwater are something that customers can do, not something TW will provide for customers.

Bob Cook stated that he didn't hear how transportation affects and determines land use and there needs to be an integration of these three things.

Marcelino Flores requested that the energy connection be included.

Colette Altaffer reminded the committee that it is crucial to talk about cost of growth and growth paying for itself and that it is expensive to replace existing infrastructure when it comes to infill.

8. **AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING***

Jim Barry reminded the committee that Cost of Growth, Economic Needs for Water and a revisit of projected water resource availability will be on the next agenda.

9. **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE**

No one spoke.

11. **ADJOURNMENT***

The meeting was adjourned by Jim Barry at 8:40 p.m.

Attendees:

Dorothy O'Brien
Colette Altaffer
David Graham
Chuck Frietas
Bob Iannarino
Margot Garcia
Tamara Prime
Ken Seasholls
Mac Hudson
Michael Block
Charles Ester
David Godliewski
Paul Mackey
Charles Cole
Marilyn Robinson
Greg Hess
Alice Roe
Ted Seddon
Sheila Bowen



COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE
130 WEST CONGRESS, 10TH FLOOR
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701



CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
P.O. Box 27210
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85726-7210

Legal Action Report City / County Water & Wastewater Study Oversight Committee

Thursday, July 16, 2009

5:00 P.M.

Tucson Association of Realtors
2445 N. Tucson Blvd. Tucson, AZ 85716

1. Call to Order
Quorum was established
2. Announcements
Discussion held, no action taken
3. Approval of meeting summary from June 25, 2009*
Motion to approve the minutes with suggested edits passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0
4. Call to the Audience
Discussion held, no action taken
5. Follow up on Growth and Urban Form Paper
Discussion held, no action taken
6. Dynamics of Population Growth and Projections
Discussion held, no action taken
7. Presentation: Integrating Land Use and Water resources Planning/ Discussion and Q & A with Committee and Public
Discussion held, no action taken
8. Agenda for Next Meeting*
Discussion held, no action taken
9. Call to the Audience
10. Adjournment * **8:40 a.m.**



COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE
130 WEST CONGRESS, 10TH FLOOR
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701



CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
P.O. Box 27210
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85726-7210

**CITY/COUNTY WATER AND WASTEWATER STUDY
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**

**August 20, 2009
Meeting Summary**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Jim Barry called the August 20, 2009 meeting of the City/County Water and Wastewater Study Oversight Committee (Oversight Committee) to order at 5:07 p.m. at the Tucson Association of Realtors, 2445 N Tucson Blvd, Tucson, AZ 85716.

Members Present:

Jim Barry, Chairman
Vincent Vasquez
Bonnie Poulos
John Carlson
Rob Kulakofsky
Marcelino Flores
Christopher Brooks
Joseph Maher
Tina Lee
Mark Stratton

Representing:

Citizens Water Advisory Committee (CWAC)
CWAC
County Planning & Zoning (P&Z) Commission
Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Committee (RWRAC)
RWRAC
RWRAC
CWAC (to be confirmed July 7, 2009)
City Planning Commission (to be confirmed July 7, 2009)
CWAC
RWRAC

Alternate Present:

Bob Cook

Representing:

County P&Z Commission

Absent:

Thomas Sayler-Brown
Bruce Gungle

Representing:

City Planning Commission
County P&Z Commission

City/County Staff Present:

Nicole Ewing Gavin, City Manager's Office
Chris Avery, Tucson Water
Sandy Elder, Tucson Water
Tom Arnold, Tucson Water
Nicole Fyffe, Pima County Administrator's Office
Kathleen Chavez, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Melaney Seacat, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Eric Wieduwilt, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Ed Curley, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Jeff Nichols, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department

A quorum of the Committee was established.

2. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Thomas Saylor-Brown representing the City Planning Commission has resigned from the Oversight Committee.

3. **APPROVAL OF July 16, 2009 MEETING SUMMARY***

Approval of the July 16, 2009 meeting summary with edits was passed.

4. **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE**

Margot Garcia requested a change in the time and location of the Oversight Committee meetings to 5:30 p.m. and to a neutral location such as schools or parks and recreation facilities. Margot Garcia stated an objection to meeting at Tucson Association of Realtors as not a value neutral location as the position the realtors have taken is problematic.

5. **FOLLOW UP ON INTEGRATING LAND USE AND WATER RESOURCES PLANNING PAPER**

Nicole Ewing Gavin distributed the follow up document to the Integrating Land Use and Water Resources Planning paper and explained that these documents are intended to capture follow up items and the Committee's discussion themes. There are three levels of records for all the Committee meetings (with varying degrees of detail): the follow up document, the meeting summary, and the meeting transcript.

Marcelino Flores mentioned that the Growth Technical paper was presented at the Pima Association of Governments Planning Directors Meeting and will be presented to the Pima Association of Government Management Team Meeting the second Wednesday in September.

Bob Cook stated the need to do a full cost of growth study as called for in the General Plan.

6. **PHASE 2 REPORT WRITING DISCUSSION**

Jim Barry described the need to be done by Thanksgiving. The committee needs to write the report not the staff. Discussion followed of the outline and process for the Phase 2 Report.

Bonnie Poulos agrees with the need to consolidate but does not like the grading system, however the outline is workable.

Joseph Maher asked what is in the body of these categories. Jim Barry responded that would be discussed later.

Vince Vasquez questioned Section 3, is it issue identification and policy recommendations. Jim Barry responded first analysis of what we got from the papers and then our hierarchy of what we need to do.

Bob Cook stated that we are missing an opportunity to develop key responses related to different scenarios that may unfold. Need to identify various scenarios given various assumptions. We are highly constrained by economic realities. Jim Barry responded that will be done.

John Carlson stated that he is glad that this is being done and that darts can be shot at it. Blurbs of dissenting opinions can be added. Growth cannot continue in this area as it has in the past. It is necessary to continually reexamine if this is sustainable. In 50 years we could look at desalination. He is overwhelmed by the amount of information we have. "I'm overwhelmed."

Marcelino Flores stated that there is a great amount of information from the Phase 1 sustainability statements and he proposed to show how the statements connect and would welcome anyone who would like to help.

Mark Stratton commented that what is being proposed is setting the right tone and how the committee is making recommendations is going in the right direction.

Joseph Maher questioned if the issues will be prioritized. RTA took 40 years. Are there priorities for water? Desalination could be a reality looking at Florida. Which issues take the lead? Jim Barry responded this can be done in how we describe these.

Vince Vasquez suggested 2 or 3 take-aways from each paper to start. Begin with this to hammer out policy language. If it is too conceptual it may not be able to be implemented. In Phase 1 there was a ranking system that was not used but the conversation was helpful, listing themes and then having fluid conversation.

Bonnie Poulos agreed with Vince Vasquez. Make column titles more specific. Papers she agreed with ranked higher. This is not as easy as it looks on a spreadsheet.

Jim Barry stated that it will take work. Work needs to proceed quickly and this could be a starting point to lead to conversation in the October and November meetings. We can see how far apart we are.

Tina Lee agreed with Vince there should be a broader discussion. She stated she was unsure how to grade it.

Vince Vasquez suggested consulting the Arizona Town Hall process for report writing. Jim Barry stated there was not enough time to do town hall process.

Marcelino Flores stated that open ended questions would be helpful but grading could also help.

Melaney Seacat described the schedule with four additional meetings.

Jim Barry asked for additional thoughts? It will need to come back for approval.

7. **PRESENTATION: ECONOMIC NEEDS FOR WATER**

Ron Shoopman, President of the Southern Arizona Leadership Council and member of the Tucson Regional Water Coalition (with 12 member organizations) introduced the technical paper on *Water as an Economic Resource*. Looking through an economic lens we have a way to evaluate decisions we make in a productive way. Valuing water as an economic good and use economics as a model to make sound decisions on water.

A panel discussion of the paper took place with George Frisvold, Professor, Agricultural and Resource Economics, University of Arizona, Carl Bauer, Professor, School of Geography and Development, University of Arizona, and Tom Arnold, Tucson Water.

Carl Bauer made the following points: Need to be careful about economics and water markets; Spain faces similar water situation as the United States, Latin America less so. What

does it mean that water is an economic good? It means that water is scarce. He does not agree that the economic effect should be the main standard for future water policy.

George Frisvold made the following points: How can we maximize competing benefits to make the pie as big as possible? Using price to signal scarcity is important. Pricing also relates to distribution and how do you fund water now. Who pays how much? Opportunity cost of water is important. Block pricing structure tries to get at the issue of efficiency and equity. Average versus marginal cost distinction is important. This paper is asking all the right questions.

Tom Arnold made the following points: The creation of markets is not always realistic. The Community Conservation Task Force looked at this issue. Do you reduce demand or purchase new water? Toilet rebates versus water harvesting. You can buy new water and delay delivery to delay cost. Tucson Water has incorporated these economic principles into water policy analysis.

Bonnie Poulos asked what the panelists thought of the recommendations.

Tom Arnold agreed that the full set of costs and benefits of water decisions should be considered.

George Frisvold stated there should be a full cost / benefit analysis as this tries to put a dollar value on environmental benefits.

Carl Bauer stated that water is scarce, trade offs have to be made and competing uses need to be recognized. Carl disagrees with #2. The political and legal systems will resolve conflicts not economics.

George Frisvold stated that regarding point #2 it is important but it is not the only consideration. Distribution is important also.

Rob Kulakofsky commented that this was not on the topic he thought it would be and would like the paper stricken from the record. Rob stated the TRWC is a business front group and this paper was a self serving paper and everything in this paper is outrageous. This paper wants existing users to pay for new water.

Bonnie Poulos questioned if a value is going to be placed on competing uses – who and how? Consolidation of water and wastewater seems to be pushed in this paper.

Tom Arnold stated that the CEP is a mitigation of past abuses. When you bump up against your portfolio, the value becomes an issue.

Carl Bauer stated that water gets valued through law and politics. He stated a natural monopoly would need to be seriously regulated to be efficient. Energy needs to be factored into this in the future.

George Frisvold stated that 20 percent of California energy is used to transport water.

Marcelino Flores commented referring to Figure 1 that full cost would constrain growth and be unaffordable. Restricted use would lower cost of agricultural water. Marginal value of urban uses is higher than agricultural uses.

Chris Brooks stated that science, economics and law should definitely be part of the analysis. Economic analysis should not be the central criterion though.

Jim Barry stated that he felt that comments made by Rob Kulakofsky were insulting to the guests present at the meeting. He felt the paper was valuable and helpful.

Rob Kulakofsky stated the supposition was made that conservation has a cost to the provider. Conservation can be taken care of by ordinances, i.e. require low flow toilets with building permits. He questioned how to determine the value of open spaces or locally grown food. Stated that it is difficult to quantify all the externalities.

John Carlson questioned potable water flush with low flow toilet? Suggested to control growth by focusing on birth control.

Colette Altaffer commented that it is easy to get distracted when talking economics. What about salt? The environment makes everything possible.

Chris Avery stated that 1 acre foot of water supports \$166K of economic activity versus lesser in other sectors. George Frisvold commented that care must be taken with this statistic because you want a mix of all uses. At the end of the day people want to live in houses, eat food and have an ecosystem too. Some urban activities have very low value, i.e. washing your sidewalk.

Ron Shoopman stated that the discussion was very helpful. It introduced a topic that is important. Let's not vilify a group, less than 10% of Southern Arizona Leadership Council members are developers. Opinions of others should be respected.

8. **PRESENTATION: UTILITY COST OF GROWTH**

Ed Curley and Jeff Nichols of Pima County Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department and Chris Avery of Tucson Water presented the paper as a supplement to the Phase 1 presentation. The paper and presentation are posted to the study website.

John Carlson asked whether developer contributed assets were included in the CIP. The answer is no. He asked about ROMP vs. rehabilitating the existing plants.

Rob Kulakofsky stated that looking at contributed assets for water versus sewer can represent where growth occurs (in which water jurisdiction). Diamond Bell, Corona de Tucson, Santa Rita fees for example. These were calculated specifically because of a small defined area.

Joseph Maher inquired if there is a plant being planned for the Vail area. The answer is affirmative, it is in planning.

John Carlson stated that it is important to locate the plant on the southeast side.

Bob Cook asked if user fees are proportional to water consumption. The answer was yes for residential use. Commercial users also get charged for quality of discharge or what they put in the system.

Charles Cole asked if the new systems will be eliminating pharmaceuticals and herbicides. The answer is no at this time however processes are being put into place that can accommodate this in the future.

Marcelino Flores asked if Tucson Water is getting back the full supply cost. The answer was rates are set by adding up all costs.

9. **AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING**

10. **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE**

11. **ADJOURNMENT***

The meeting was adjourned by Jim Barry at 8:50

Attendees:

George Frisvold
David Graham
Arlene Scadron
Ron Shoopman
Margot Garcia
Madeline Kiser
Charles Cole
Shelia Bowen
Chuck Freitas
Alice Roe
Bob Iannarino
David Godlewski
Natanya Siegel
Mary Hamilton
Ralph Marra
David Pittman
Rebecca Kunsberg
Holly Lachowicz
Mitch Basefsky
Colette Altaffer



COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE
130 WEST CONGRESS, 10TH FLOOR
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701



CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
P.O. Box 27210
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85726-7210

**CITY/COUNTY WATER AND WASTEWATER STUDY
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**

**September 17, 2009
Meeting Summary**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Jim Barry called the September 17, 2009 meeting of the City/County Water and Wastewater Study Oversight Committee (Oversight Committee) to order at 5:10 p.m. at the Tucson Association of Realtors, 2445 N Tucson Blvd, Tucson, AZ 85716.

Members Present:

Jim Barry, Chairman
Vincent Vasquez
John Carlson
Rob Kulakofsky
Marcelino Flores
Christopher Brooks
Tina Lee
Mark Stratton

Representing:

Citizens Water Advisory Committee (CWAC)
CWAC
Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Committee (RWRAC)
RWRAC
RWRAC
RWRAC
CWAC
CWAC
RWRAC

Alternate Present:

Bob Cook

Representing:

County P&Z Commission

Absent:

Bonnie Poulos
Joseph Maher
Bruce Gungle

Representing:

County Planning & Zoning (P&Z) Commission
City Planning Commission
County P&Z Commission

City/County Staff Present:

Nicole Ewing Gavin, City Manager's Office
Chris Avery, Tucson Water
Sandy Elder, Tucson Water
Jeff Biggs, Tucson Water
Ralph Marra, Tucson Water
Fernando Molina, Tucson Water
John Thomas, Tucson Water
Steve Dean, Tucson Water
Remy Sawyer, Tucson Water
Leslie Liberti, Office of Conservation and Sustainable Development
Melaney Seacat, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Kathleen Chavez, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Ed Curley, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Jim Dubois, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Suzanne Shields, Pima County Flood Control

Jeff Prevatt, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department

A quorum of the Committee was established.

2. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Melaney Seacat handed out the paper, Tucson Environmental Water Banking through Conservation Program on behalf of the Water Resources Research Center to the committee members. The agenda was too full to accommodate a presentation. The information is related to the paper on water needs for the environment.

Melaney announced, on behalf of Madeline Kiser, a Southwest Summit on the Environment to be held Thursday, October 8, 2009 from 8:00 am to 4:00 pm at the Walter Cronkite School of Journalism at Arizona State University.

The next four meetings of the City/County Water and Wastewater Oversight Committee will be held at the City of Tucson's IT Building on Paseo Redondo. The dates of the meetings are: October 1, 2009, October 15, 2009, November 12, 2009 and November 19, 2009.

Jim Barry stated staff has drafted a response to the letter received from Cliff Neal of the Central Arizona Water Conservation District. The letter will be sent out with a copy to the committee.

3. **APPROVAL OF AUGUST 20, 2009 MEETING SUMMARY***

Rob Kulakofsky asked to amend the minutes to reflect that he asked that the Economic Needs for Water paper be stricken from the record. Approval of the August 20, 2009 meeting summary with the above amendment was passed.

4. **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE**

No comments.

5. **FOLLOW UP ON COST OF GROWTH AND WATER AS AN ECONOMIC RESOURCE PAPERS**

Nicole Ewing Gavin distributed the follow up document to the Cost of Growth and Water as an Economic Resource paper. Only the following comment/recommendation was listed: It is important to locate a wastewater treatment plant on the southeast side as growth occurs in this area. All other committee questions were responded to during the meeting.

6. **PHASE 2 REPORT WRITING FOLLOW UP DISCUSSION**

Nicole Ewing Gavin handed out copies of a Draft Outline – Staff Phase 2 Report.

Jim Barry and Marcelino Flores sent an email suggesting that the final report be written in two parts. The staff will write a report analyzing and prioritizing the information from the presentations made to the committee. The committee will write it's own report based on the presented material.

Rob Kulakofsky suggested that the papers submitted by staff or outside experts be classified as white papers. Papers submitted by non-experts, i.e. the S Curve paper by Jim Barry and the Economic Needs for Water by Ron Shoopman, should be included and considered but not classified as white papers.

Jim Barry responded that the papers could be separated or reclassified but should not be stricken from the record as the papers are already part of the audio record and meeting summary from the previous meetings.

Bob Cook raised the concern that there had been no consultation with the committee of the scope of the papers or the key issues to be addressed. Jim responded that he and Marcelino brought ideas for phase 2 to the committee in November and December. Those issues brought forth were approved.

Jim Barry asked the committee if they agreed that the papers should be reclassified based on the expertise of the authors.

John Carlson responded that to reclassify the papers is fine as long as there is some definition of what a white paper is versus a non-white paper.

Mark Stratton stated the papers need to be identified by the authors to allow committee members to judge the level of expertise.

Vince Vasquez stated that he believes the papers should be taken as a whole body of information and not differentiated as submitted by experts versus not as that may defeat the committee process. If any one questions the validity of the information, it is left to them to research the data and bring it to the committee.

Rob Kulakofsky restated that he feels papers should not be categorized as submitted by experts if they were not. Jim responded that it is too late in the process now to reclassify the papers.

Mark Stratton stated that since all papers were presented and discussed in the same way, they are part of the process and part of the record.

Melaney Seacat handed out the Schedule of Activities: Phase 2 noting that there will be four meetings to be held at the City's IT building on October 1, October 15, November 12, and November 19 from 5:00 pm to 9:00 pm and there must be a quorum for each meeting.

Jim Barry made a motion to accept the meetings on the given dates, time and location. Rob Kulakofsky seconded the motion. Motion was passed.

Melaney Seacat outlined the facilitator procurement process. The Request for Qualifications (RFQ) was sent out. A ranking criterion must be set up to evaluate facilitators. Six RFQ's were sent out. A ranking sub-committee must be formed to evaluate the RFQ's submitted. The sub-committee is to be made up of one City staff member, one County staff member, three oversight committee members. The committee will meet on Friday, September 18, 2009 to review the 3 returned submissions. Jim Barry moved to nominate Bob Cook and Vince Vasquez to join the sub-committee. Rob Kulakofsky seconded the motion. Motion was passed.

Melaney Seacat handed out the Facilitator Proposal Evaluation Form for committee discussion.

Mark Stratton questioned the legality of having price as part of the evaluation process. Melaney responded that she was told that price had to be considered in the evaluation process.

Mark Stratton believes that qualifications of facilitator are more important than price and would like to see the category of experience in facilitating groups weighted higher than the form currently states.

Vince Vasquez would like to see additional weight be added to the category of ability to understand the specifics of water and wastewater rated higher also.

John Carlson suggested that the committee secure a legal opinion as to the inclusion of price in the evaluation process to protect the process as it moves forward.

Suzanne Shields explained the Pima County Procurement Process for professional services as a two-step process. First a selection is made based on qualifications; secondly, the professional service is requested to provide costs for the services. As this process normally takes 3 to 6 months, it was suggested to include cost in the first step to expedite the process. The committee can set parameters to determine how much cost is factored into the decision as well as setting an upper limit for the cost.

Mark Stratton made a motion to adjust rating points of the evaluation form to increase importance of experience facilitating groups and understanding of water and wastewater issues and decrease the rating points for price. Jim Barry suggested that the sub-committee be entrusted to change the points so the evaluation points totaled to 100. Tina Lee seconded the motion. Motion was passed.

Jim Barry stated his personal opinion of what the scope of Phase 2 should be. The facilitator should not be looking only for consensus and unanimity. The differing opinions of the group should be flushed out during discussions. Rob agreed saying that the committee could use assistance in articulating its thoughts and ideas and putting those thoughts on paper.

Jim Barry stated that he feels the committee should accomplish two things. First, all the recommendations should be looked at, evaluated and prioritized. Secondly, there should be a general theme of how things tie together, perhaps even a strategic plan for sustainability.

Marcelino Flores emphasized the importance of the committee stating their expectation of the upcoming phases and how those expectations may be implemented. Jim agreed that the committee should articulate to the facilitator what the expectations are from the process.

Bob Cook commented there should be a way the committee can bring up important questions that the technical papers did not address. Jim answered that the committee can respond to the staff report in just that manner.

7. WATER RESOURCE ANALYSIS (MEGDAL/TUCSON WATER 2050 PLAN) FOLLOW-UP DISCUSSION

Jim Barry briefly reviewed the information on water resources from the Phase 1 Executive Summary. The information was what renewable water resources are available and what the population carrying capacities of these resources are. The basic sources of water are CAP water and three types of ground water. Tucson Water's Assured Water Supply report and the Sharon Megdal report addressed these issues also. Although the findings of each report were somewhat different, the results are not an order of magnitude different, indicating that the numbers reached are reasonable. The Tucson Water 2050 Plan took these numbers to

determine when new renewable water supplies will be needed. The conclusion was a range from the year 2017 to 2032.

Vince Vasquez asked for clarification of how Tucson Water arrived at the figures they did and asked for more discussion in the future of the cost component of the entitlement as it may be relevant to the cost of new water coming into the portfolio.

Ralph Marra (chief hydrologist TW) responded the figures were based on the renewable water available minus amount of effluent and at what point in time does demand exceed that available amount. Chris Avery added that part of the difference is due to how effluent is considered and that the city now has more CAP water available than it had when the calculations were made.

Vince Vasquez stated that he feels it is important to distinguish the difference of what the entitlement portfolio is versus what we have already proven to the state for our designation of AWS and what the cost component of that is.

Bob Cook suggested that all components of water supply be listed with the different alternatives lined up for comparison. Jim suggested that only the AWS numbers be used for discussion. John added that these different scenarios be revisited periodically over time.

Chris Brooks asked if the TW numbers meet the constraints of the AMA management objective. Ralph responded that TW had to meet the constraints of the AMA management plan to get AWS.

8. **PRESENTATION: ADDITIONAL WATER**

Ralph Marra and Chris Avery of Tucson Water presented a paper on Additional Water Resources. The paper is posted to the study website.

Clarification was made of main stem Colorado River water, this is water that has already been diverted from the river for agricultural uses and for Indian tribes. Water shortages may require this diverted water to be reallocated away from agriculture use to different uses.

Chris Brooks asked if ground water credits can be recovered – are there physical limitations and or legal limitations for GW credits. Ralph answered that ground water credits should be reserved for times of shortage and other sources of water should be utilized before tapping into the GW credits.

Bob Cook asked why the year 2032 for the water shortage? Ralph answered when a shortage is declared on the Colorado River, the lower priority CAP water users are shorted first. The large municipal water users, such as Tucson, will not feel any effects unless there is a very serious shortage declared on the Colorado River. Most likely this will happen at some time in the future.

Mark Stratton expressed concern that the cost of additional water supplies in the future will be much higher than the cost at present and how will those costs be handled. Ralph responded that a variety of solutions must be done to mediate the cost knowing that the cost could be significantly higher for new resources in the future. The willingness of people to pay for this supply must be considered. However, if the increased cost of water is spread out over a larger number of users then the cost to any one individual is lessened. It will be the small water supplier with a small customer base that will be affected most.

Bob Cook stated that the cost per volume of water is a very important point and it needs to be emphasized more to compare the different costs per acre-foot of each supply over time. Ralph responded that ground water is still the least expensive source of supply but it is a short term solution. The decision has been made to use alternate renewable water sources that are sustainable over time.

Rob Kulakofsky asked if water was going to be taken from the three groundwater basins it travels through, would it be done as safe yield practice or would the basins be sucked dry and what would be the environmental and economic consequences of that? Chris responded that the consequences of draining those basins would be very severe and the cost of mitigating those consequences would be very high so draining the ground water from those basins would be avoided.

John Cook questioned if CAP had considered the desalinization of sea water as an optional source of water? Chris responded that CAP has presented desal options but the consensus of water providers is that the process is still cost prohibitive and the technology is still lacking. Mark Stratton commented that the permitting process is monumental.

Mark Stratton asked about the desal of brackish water? Ralph responded that there is a large supply of brackish water in the Phoenix area and that there is no other good use for that water. Phoenix is looking at that water as a potential source for the ADD water process but there has been no quantification of amount available or the cost of that yet.

Marcelino Flores asked what is the role of the Water Banking Authority? Ralph responded that the Water Banking Authority is firming our water supply as it firms supply for the cities. Water is being banked in Tucson's AMA account. It is being stored at the SAVSARP facility. This firming process was developed to bolster the water supply in a drought situation, which is a temporary situation. The firming process did not take into account climate change, which is not temporary.

Marcelino Flores asked if an entity has the ability to pay for the water are they able to take all of it? Chris responded that the water supply must be paid for up front and that the cost should be a deterrent to monopolizing the supply. CAP supplies a three county area at this time so interested parties outside of Arizona are not eligible for any allocation of the water.

Bob Cook stated that rainwater harvesting should be studied and planned for as an additional water source. Chris responded that Tucson Water does have rain water harvesting studies underway but there are several legal issues that need to be resolved before considering rain water harvesting as a policy issue. Vince added that as the cost of water increases the population would look for alternative ways to get water and rainwater harvesting would most likely become more common.

Jim Barry attended an Arizona Investment Council (the council lobbies for utilities) conference recently and the topic was Arizona's water supply. Two points to share with the committee: First – many rural areas do not have a sustainable water supply to meet the existing population. These areas are looking for new sources of water and have potential to become additional competitors for CAP water. Second – some of the Indian tribes that currently receive a portion of main stem Colorado River water will not want to sell their allocations to other areas needing additional water. Ralph responded that re-allocating water would most likely come from agricultural areas not from the Indian tribes.

Jim Barry stated that the committee should keep the following points in mind. The ADD water process is a done deal and the committee will have to accept this process. The ADD water process calls for importing water and that is a done deal. Southern Arizona Water Uses Association (SAWUA) is coordinating activities for our region in the ADD water process. What is the public outreach plan from SAWUA?

Dorothy O'Brien from Marana responded that the ADD water process is discussed at the SAWUA meetings. Several members of SAWRA are on the Hammer It Out (HIO) group for the ADD water process to equate representation from Tucson to that of Phoenix as the needs of Tucson are very different from Phoenix. People from outside the 3 county area have also begun attending the HIO group meetings. The goal is to present the ADD water process to the CAP board in January 2010.

Jim Barry questioned the second recommendation of the paper – what does water on hand mean? Ralph responded that means water we have entitlement to and the infrastructure to make that entitlement into wet water. Jim stated that although he agrees there is not a dire water shortage here now he feels the community should be given a sense of awareness and urgency to plan for the future.

Bob Cook stated that he feels that sustainability should be the central theme to the Phase 2 discussions with the most important aspect being the financial sustainability and the economic sustainability of water resources.

Rob Kulakofsky requested that all documents submitted in the future have page numbers.

9. **PRESENTATION: WATER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

Suzanne Shields, Pima County Flood Control, and Leslie Liberti, City of Tucson Office of Conservation and Sustainable Development, presented the paper Water for the Environment. The paper is posted to the study website.

Vince Vasquez asked for a definition of a hydro riparian environment. Suzanne responded that it is an environment that requires a long term dedicated water supply, either natural or artificial.

Bob Cook asked if monies from carbon tax could be considered as a funding source? Leslie responded that it is still too early in the process for considering that type of funding as the city is in the beginning stages of its climate change mitigation process. Future federal decisions concerning climate change mitigation may have a bearing on the carbon tax as a funding source.

Chris Brooks asked why water rights were needed in certain restoration projects and not in others? Suzanne answered that water can be detained and let out for flood control without obtaining water rights and if the surrounding environment benefits from that it is okay as that was not the primary reason for detaining the water.

Jim Barry reminded the committee as it writes it's report to bear in mind the scope set forth by Mayor and Council that water reservations for the environment must be clearly stated and be able to be translated into action.

10. **PRESENTATION: WATER QUALITY**

Jim Dubois, Ed Curley and Jeff Prevatt of PCRWRD and Steve Dean of Tucson Water presented the paper on Water Quality. The paper is posted to the study website

John Carlson asked for a definition of endocrine disruptive compound. Jim Dubois answered that it is a compound that disrupts the hormonal activity of an organism.

John Carlson asked what the current situation is at TARP with the 1,4 dioxane plume. The response was that the technology is not available to remove the compound. The process is to mitigate the effects of the compound by blending it with additional water at the treatment facility.

11. **AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING**

The agenda will for the next meeting will include the Staff Report and the beginnings of the facilitated discussions.

12. **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE**

None

13. **ADJOURNMENT***

The meeting was adjourned by Jim Barry at 9:00 p.m.

Attendees:

Kendall Kroesen
Madeline Kiser
Dorothy O'Brien
Sheila Bowen
John Kmiec
Mac Hudson
Dave Devine
Holly Lachowicz
David Graham
Malini Banerjee
Colette Altafer
Joanna Bate
David Godlewski
Charles Cole



COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE
130 WEST CONGRESS, 10TH FLOOR
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701



CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
P.O. Box 27210
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85726-7210

Legal Action Report City / County Water & Wastewater Study Oversight Committee

Thursday, September 17 2009

5:00 P.M.

Tucson Association of Realtors
2445 N. Tucson Blvd. Tucson, AZ 85716

1. Call to Order
Quorum was established
2. Announcements
Discussion held, no action taken
3. Approval of meeting summary from August June 25, 2009*
Motion to approve the minutes with suggested edits passed by a voice vote of 8 to 0
4. Call to the Audience
5. Follow up on Technical Papers
Discussion held, no action taken
6. Phase 2 Report Writing Follow-up Discussion*
Motion to approve additional committee meetings and use of a neutral facilitator passed by a voice vote of 8 to 0
7. Water Resource Analysis Follow-up Discussion
Discussion held, no action taken
8. Presentation: Additional Water
Discussion held, no action taken
9. Presentation: Water for the Environment
Discussion held, no action taken
10. Presentation: Water Quality
Discussion held, no action taken
9. Call to the Audience
10. Adjournment * **9:00 p.m.**



COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE
130 WEST CONGRESS, 10TH FLOOR
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701



CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
P.O. Box 27210
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85726-7210

**CITY/COUNTY WATER AND WASTEWATER STUDY
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**

**October 1, 2009
Meeting Summary**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Jim Barry called the October 1, 2009 meeting of the City/County Water and Wastewater Study Oversight Committee (Oversight Committee) to order at 5:06 p.m. at the City of Tucson Pueblo Conference Room, 481 W. Paseo Redondo, Tucson, AZ 85701.

Members Present:

Jim Barry, Chairman
Vincent Vasquez
John Carlson
Rob Kulakofsky
Marcelino Flores
Christopher Brooks
Tina Lee
Mark Stratton
Bonnie Poulos
Joseph Maher
Bruce Gungle

Representing:

Citizens Water Advisory Committee (CWAC)
CWAC
Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Committee (RWRAC)
RWRAC
RWRAC
CWAC
CWAC
RWRAC
County Planning & Zoning (P&Z) Commission
City Planning Commission
County P&Z Commission

City/County Staff Present:

Nicole Ewing Gavin, City Manager's Office
Chris Avery, Tucson Water
Fernando Molina, Tucson Water
Melaney Seacat, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Ed Curley, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Arlan Colton, Pima County Planning
Albert Elias, City of Tucson Housing and Community Development
Suzanne Shields, Pima County Flood Control
Carla Blackwell, Pima County Development Services
Rich Franz, Pima County Development Services
Kathy Chavez, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department

A quorum of the Committee was established.

2. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Marcelino Flores introduced Mette Brogden, the facilitator chosen by the sub-committee based on the results of the facilitator evaluation process. Mette will facilitate the process of writing the committee report during the remaining meetings.

Melaney Seacat formally acknowledged the expedient work of the procurement staff in pushing through the facilitator request proposal in just over 2 weeks. Melaney announced a brown bag lunch sponsored by the Water Resources Research Center on Friday, October 2, 2009. The speaker will be discussing Chino Valley in Prescott.

The entire water and wastewater study will be featured in the upcoming WESTCAS Fall Conference (Western Coalition of Arid States) October 28-30, 2009, at the Westward Look Resort, Tucson, AZ.

3. **APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 17, 2009 MEETING SUMMARY***

Rob Kulakofsky asked for the following amendments to the September 17 minutes: He asked if water was going to be taken from the three groundwater basins the CAP canal travels through not if CAP water was going to be taken as recorded in the minutes. Vince Vasquez should be added to the subcommittee evaluating and selecting the facilitator. Approval of the September 17, 2009 meeting summary with the above amendments was passed.

4. **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE**

No comments.

5. **FOLLOW UP ON ADDITIONAL WATER, WATER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT AND WATER QUALITY PAPERS**

A list of themes the committee stated during the discussion of the ADD Water paper was the only follow up information. Committee questions of the other papers were responded to during the meeting.

6. **PRESENTATION OF DRAFT PHASE 2 STAFF REPORT AND COMMITTEE FEEDBACK**

Jim Barry turned over control of the meeting to Mette Brogden and the staff to allow him to be able to comment on the report as a committee member not the committee chair.

Mette Brogden introduced herself to the committee. She presented an agenda for the meeting: the committee would hear the key points, goals and recommendations of the staff report, time would be allowed for questions or requests of clarifications from the committee after each section, and finally, staff would be looking for comments and feedback on their report from the committee. The committee would then discuss how their report should differ in focus from the staff report and a preliminary draft outline of the committee report would be developed.

Nicole Ewing Gavin and Melaney Seacat distributed copies of the power point presentation Update on Development of Phase 2 Staff Report to all committee members and made a presentation of the report together.

QUESTIONS / CLARIFICATIONS:

Shared Goals – Water Supply

Marcelino Flores questioned if the shared goals of water supply were prioritized. Nicole responded that the order was random in the draft report but will be prioritized in the final report. He also asked for clarification of working collaboratively, city, county, regional? Nicole responded in the final report the recommendations for each goal will be more specifically tied to city, county or other entity.

Chris Brooks asked where conservation fit into the water supply goal? Nicole responded this issue was placed in the demand management bucket for discussion.

Jim Barry asked if staff was going to address the issue of how much water we actually have and how much we don't know if we have? Nicole responded that the final report would contain more specific information taken from the technical papers to support each recommendation.

Goal 1.3 - Jim Barry asked for clarification of shared system efficiencies mentioned in this recommendation. Ed Curley responded that meant trying to maintain a balance of potable water goals as well as wastewater goals when servicing needs.

Marcelino Flores asked if there was a shared definition of sustainability? The response was no, there is not a shared definition but staff will consider this as a comment.

Jim Barry questioned by focusing so heavily on the ADD Water process to acquire new water supplies, are other sources being dismissed or not given due consideration? Ed answered that all sources are being considered but prioritizing leads to focus on the ADD Water process.

Marcelino Flores questioned if recommendations were prioritized. The response was no.

Bruce Gungle asked if storm water/water harvesting, either at a local or municipal level, had been removed from the potential supply discussion? The response was that it is still being considered and studied.

Jim Barry questioned if there will be a specific action plan proposed to meet the recommendations put forth in report? Nicole responded that staff needs the governing body endorsement at the recommendation level before proposing an action plan.

Goal 2.3 - Bonnie Poulos asked for clarification of item 2.3. In studying the use of gray water it was found that the engineering of some areas did not allow for the reduced flow of gray water and the buildup of solids requiring additional flushing of lines. The county is in full support of the use of gray water in situations where the benefits outweigh the problems of using it. Carla explained that the County offers developers an array of options to mitigate water use including the use of gray water, however this pertains mostly to new developments. The City faces the challenge of existing infrastructure that is not designed for the lower flow of gray water.

Marcelino Flores asked if the options presented to developers needed to make engineering sense? Carla responded yes, there is actually more opportunity in new construction and new development to coincide with engineering at the subdivision plat design level and the individual lot level.

Nicole acknowledged that there is considerable overlap between the bucket of water supply and demand management. The staff tried to separate recommendations to the individual buckets rather than duplicating the recommendations.

Goal 4.1 - Regarding 4.1, Jim asked if the option of getting Pima County voter authorization for Geo Bonds for extending effluent lines is still being considered? Chris Avery answered yes and that it also relates to financing options. Jim asked what the cost was of extending the effluent lines? Chris responded it could be very costly.

John Carlson asked about building a treatment plan on the southeast side of Tucson to service the Vail area. Chris responded that areas of most development on the southeast side drain into the Santa Cruz River not the Pantano Wash. Building a treatment plant slightly west of Pantano Wash in the I-10 corridor makes sense, as there is an immediate demand for service there and a positive demand in the foreseeable future.

Marcelino Flores asked if there is a precedent for a tax-supported system and what type of entity is responsible for carrying out those government obligation bonds? Chris did not know of a precedence but Tucson is unique in that it operates its reclaim system as a separate entity from the waste water treatment system.

Bonnie Poulos asked if it is desirable to feed effluent to plants by gravity doesn't that require sewage to be pumped uphill thereby switching the cost from the effluent user to the sewage provider? Chris answered that by locating scalping plants throughout the system liquids can be removed from the wastewater stream while sending the solids to the treatment plant and the weight of pumping is in the liquid portion.

Mark Stratton asked if opportunities were reviewed for new master planned communities where reclaim lines are in close proximity to require the new development to have dual piping systems so their outdoor usage can be put on reclaim system? Chris responded that Civano is an example of just this. A substantial amount of money was invested to bring reclaim lines out to the Houghton corridor. Viewed in isolation this may not make sense but viewed as a step in a reclaim system it does as this area is most likely where the next set of real opportunities will be.

Shared Goals - Comprehensive Integrated Planning

Goal 1.1 - Jim Barry asked what other legislative actions might entail? Arlan responded that this may include state legislative changes or state land reforms.

Marcelino Flores asked how the city and county are represented in this process? Arlan and Albert are involved in leading this process. Attendance for these meetings has been very consistent and regionally well represented.

Marcelino Flores asked if existing infrastructure should be improved before it is actually needed for infill development? Nicole responded that recommendation 2.2 addresses this issue and the need to be proactive with planning for infrastructure improvements.

Marcelino Flores asked if eminent domain has been considered for the acquisition of "Z status" properties so the city will not be overcharged for these properties when it comes to infill development? Arlan responded that it would be looked in to.

Goal 3.1 - Chris Brooks questioned who has the staff in these economic times to do the long range planning suggested in this recommendation? Nicole and Arlan responded that issues facing City and County will need to be prioritized in order to be addressed in these times of short staffing. The importance of this issue must be emphasized to elected officials.

Goal 3.5 - Marcelino Flores asked if there are regional solutions to address the disconnect between where water is being pumped and where it is being replenished? Suzanne responded that a new regional perspective (city, county and private water companies) is required to look at areas beyond just who has jurisdiction for that area to more efficiently manage the water uses and needs.

Shared Goals - Demand Management

Goal 1.1 - John Barry asked if staff was going to recommend a time frame for establishing these goals? The response was that endorsement from elected officials that this is the direction to go in must be received before staff will provide a time specific action plan.

Jim Barry questioned asterisk on the word efficiency in section 1.1. Melaney responded the asterisk will relate to a definition of the word in the actual report.

Goal 2.1 - Bonnie Poulos suggested that waterless urinals be considered along with high efficiency toilets as a water usage savings option. She questioned why redevelopment is not mentioned in this goal? The response was that the County building code does require waterless urinals in new construction for commercial buildings but it is not in the City code at this time. Most redevelopment construction avoids redoing bathrooms/plumbing as developers try to save money by not having to bring plumbing up to new building codes.

Jim Barry asked if staff looked at the Water CASA recommendation to eliminate the use of potable water for landscape requirements? The response was to recommend the reduction of using potable water for landscape requirements, not eliminating it and encourage the use of other sources.

Joseph Maher asked what a branch twig piping system was? The response is that it is a recirculation plumbing system.

Goal 4.1 - John Carlson asked what are the current regulations for retention/detention basins? Suzanne responded that city and county adopted regulations around 1986 for retention/detention basins. Currently these regulations are being refined as work is done to quantify water that is held in depressed medians, etc. that can be added to mix.

Jim Barry asked if this demand management goal is linked to the comprehensive management planning goals? Arman responded that there are parts of the demand management goal that could become policy or part of the comprehensive plan. Suzanne stated there are two areas where this could be incorporated. Stormwater harvesting supports the Pima County water policy. Stormwater and flood control plans support the water quality goals that the city, county and other jurisdictions must meet.

Goal 5.1 - John Carlson asked if ADWR had any conservation programming going? Fernando said an extensive audit of the large water users was conducted a few years ago. This provided a fairly detailed picture of who was using the water and how much. Big users do not necessarily mean big opportunity for conservation. There is need to identify regionally where conservation programming has the most potential.

Shared Goals - Respect for the Environment

Goal 5.1 - John Carlson asked if hydriparian areas are to be restored shouldn't the cost of that restoration be included in the report? Suzanne responded that the focus is to prevent the future loss of hydriparian habitat in groundwater areas. This goal is about the preservation of the existing to the best of ability.

Rob Kulakofsky asked if staff purposely stayed away from 3rd rail of progress in AZ legislature by not mentioning trying to affect legislation to allow municipalities or counties to have some say over what wells can be turned off or slowed down. Chris responded that City and County asked and received legislation that can prevent the drilling of new exempt wells in the service area. When dealing with existing wells it is more a matter of judicial 3rd rail issues not a legislative issue.

Goal 2.3 – Jim Barry asked what areas are being considered for preservation and or restoration? Suzanne responded for the purposes of this report the metropolitan area is what is being considered, focusing on preservation where new development is occurring and where

can restoration be done that would add value to the area keeping in mind that some restoration work may be required to maintain compliance with the endangered species act.

Goal 3.2 – Bruce Gungle asked what is the focus of recommendation 3.2? Melaney responded that by utilizing areas of impervious surfaces there might be opportunities to do mini-restorations with very little additional water needs.

Goal 5.1 – John Carlson asked how was the figure of 10,000 AF of effluent arrived at? Chris responded that it was the result of negotiations between Tucson Water and Pima County and the number is an estimate that can be used for calculation purposes.

Jim Barry asked how soon this could this be presented to Mayor and Council or Board of Supervisors? Chris answered very soon from the city side.

GENERAL QUESTIONS

Jim Barry asked if staff said anything in the report about a sustainable water future? Nicole responded this would be mentioned in the introductory comments that elements of a sustainable water future tie together the important issues of the report.

Is staff going to talk about population estimates of the future and tie that into the comprehensive planning section? Nicole stated population will be discussed in build out scenarios and population modeling will be referenced but there will be no population predictions as such.

Is staff going to prioritize among the buckets? Melaney responded that prioritization will take place at the recommendation level not at the bucket level.

Jim Barry asked if the staff was going to do any reporting on the conservation effluent pool? Melaney responded this topic was inadvertently omitted from the draft report but it will be in the final report.

COMMENTS:

Marcelino Flores suggested the report include an acknowledgement page for the dedication of staff members participating in the technical team.

Bruce Gungle suggested a change in verbiage of bullet point 3 of the Comprehensive Integrated Planning Guiding Principles slide – item should read ‘New growth must be located where it is the *least detrimental* to the environment.... Melaney responded this was taken directly from the scope of work. Jim Barry suggested this might be a point of importance for the committee report.

John Carlson stressed the importance of developing a regional approach for the study to include city, county and other water utilities.

Tina Lee agreed that the uncertainties for a sustainable water future are a very prevalent theme. The report should be more inclusive to examine population estimates, regulatory issues and environmental conditions.

Goal 1 - Vince Vasquez suggested that sections 1.1 and 1.5 should both carry a regional tone rather than separate city and county from local water providers using same wording for SAWRSA as for ADD Water. Ed agreed this could be changed.

Goal 2 – Jim Barry commented that native landscaping should also be considered as a way to reduce water usage and perhaps this should be a requirement for new developments.

Goal 5 – Bonnie Poulos noted that mention was not made about policies that are in place as water becomes scarce. Who is going to control the water and who is going to decide what the most important uses of the water are? Chris Avery responded that the scenario planning that was suggested is an adaptive management process that looks at options on a continuous basis as conditions change.

Marcelino Flores suggested that all goals should be SMART goals: Specific, Measurable, Action oriented, Realistic, Time frame.

Shared Goals – Comprehensive Integrated Planning

Goal 1.1 - Jim Barry suggested moving the bullet point of 'Reduced water and energy consumption' higher up in the list as this is the real focus of the study.

Goal 2.1- John Carlson suggested that incentives could be for not doing something wrong or detrimental.

Rob Kulakofsky commented that it is important to consider infill development with design meaning there needs to be a mechanism in place to build/rebuild infrastructure to attract infill development.

Goal 3 – Bonnie Poulos stated that regulatory issues often become a barrier when determining who is going to pay for what as growth develops.

Jim Barry suggests that Goal 3.2 be directly related to Goal 2.1.

Goal 3.5 – Vince Vasquez suggested that verbiage be changed from other jurisdictions to all municipal water providers.

Goal 4 – Committee may want to define methods of encouragement to ensure that growth will pay for itself.

Vince Vasquez noted that the staff report seems devoid of economic instruments or analysis.

Shared Goals – Respect for the Environment

Goal 4.2 – John Carlson suggested a cautionary note that there may not be enough money to do restoration along the Santa Cruz River and that the report should not suggest restoration plans that might not happen. The idea is to change legislation so the secretary's of the interior get 100% recharge credits so they have incentive not to take it out of the Santa Cruz River. Restoration along the river may take many forms including several smaller areas of restoration and oases instead of a narrow band of along the river itself.

7. DISCUSSION OF COMMITTEE PHASE 2 REPORT WRITING PROCESS AND NEXT MEETING AGENDA

Mette Brogden began discussion by reviewing the Staff Report Outline. Clarification of what Item II Overarching Issues included was requested. Melaney responded this would include the key issues, outcomes, 'the elephants in the room' and elements of a sustainable water future.

Discussion followed of how the committee report should differ from staff report, what should the focus/key points/purpose of the committee report be.

- Sustainability
- Carrying capacity
- Economic feasibility
- Reaction to the staff report recommendations and how would the committee prioritize those
- Additional themes that are important to committee members not addressed by staff report

Mette requested that each member submit his or her top three contributions on each line item of the staff report outline to her by October 9, 2009. She will compile the responses, eliminating the overlap, and bring that to the next meeting to begin development of the committee report. She will add the following statement under overarching issues: What are the elements of a sustainable water future.

Tina Lee requested that committee members receive a list of all original recommendations that the staff had initially before condensing them into their report. Jim Barry suggested that staff document how they reduced the 126 recommendations to 50 recommendations.

11. **AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING**

Mette distributed a draft timeline for the Phase 2 Report development. The focus of the next meeting will be to expand on the draft outline for the committee report.

12. **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE**

None

13. **ADJOURNMENT***

Jim Barry adjourned the meeting at 8:52 p.m.

Attendees:

Alan O'Brien

Judith S. Meyer



COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE
130 WEST CONGRESS, 10TH FLOOR
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701



CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
P.O. Box 27210
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85726-7210

**CITY/COUNTY WATER AND WASTEWATER STUDY
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**

**October 15, 2009
Meeting Summary**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Jim Barry called the October 15, 2009 meeting of the City/County Water and Wastewater Study Oversight Committee (Oversight Committee) to order at 5:15 p.m. at the Pima County Public Works Building, B-Level Conference Room C, 201 N. Stone Ave., Tucson, AZ 85701.

Members Present:

Jim Barry, Chairman
Vincent Vasquez
John Carlson
Rob Kulakofsky
Marcelino Flores
Tina Lee
Christopher Brooks
Bonnie Poulos
Bruce Gungle

Representing:

Citizens Water Advisory Committee (CWAC)
CWAC
Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Committee (RWRAC)
RWRAC
RWRAC
CWAC
CWAC
County P&Z Commission
County P&Z Commission

Absent

Joseph Maher City Planning Commission
Mark Stratton RWRAC
Bob Cook County P&Z Commission

City/County Staff Present:

Melaney Seacat, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Ed Curley, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department

A quorum of the Committee was established.

2. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

John Carlson stated his appreciation for the sub-committee's selection of Mette Brogden as the facilitator for the remaining Oversight Committee meetings.

3. **APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 1, 2009 MEETING SUMMARY***

The October 1, 2009 meeting summary was approved as submitted.

4. **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE**

No comments.

5. **FACILITATED DISCUSSION OF COMMITTEE PHASE 2 REPORT AND COMMITTEE FEEDBACK**

Mette Brogden distributed several handouts including a rough draft outline to committee members to begin the discussion for the committee report. Committee members had been requested to submit to Mette their individual top three contributions/comments for each section of the Staff Report, their individual view of what the focus of the committee report should be and how it should differ from the Staff Report. Information on the handouts was a compilation of these comments.

Committee members began discussion of the rough draft outline. It was agreed that when consensus could not be reached on an issue, the range of committee opinion would be reflected in the report. Committee members were requested to write down specific edits and comments on the rough draft outline and return the hard copy to Mette at the end of the meeting.

6. **DISCUSSION OF MEETING AGENDAS**

Mette reviewed the timeline of the Oversight Committee Phase 2 Report development. Comments and feedback on the rough draft outline should be submitted via email to Mette by October 20, 2009. Mette will circulate a draft summary report by October 22, 2009 based on notes, comments and opinions voiced at this meeting and other comments and edits submitted to her via email. Subsequent comments and revisions from the committee members on the draft summary report should then be returned to Mette. By November 5, 2009, committee members should receive a full draft committee report. This full draft will be the topic of discussion and revision at the November 12, 2009 committee meeting.

Bruce Gungle suggested the committee consider an additional meeting on December 3, 2009 to allow for the full development of a quality report. Committee members agreed that a quality report is the final objective from this process. The consideration of an additional committee meeting will be revisited at the November 12, 2009 meeting.

7. **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE**

William Crosby addressed the committee with the following points.

- Challenged the idea that Tucson has plenty of water – only at present and only for the very near future. Cited the absence of water in the Agua Caliente Wash as an example.
- Southwest Arizona and the Colorado River basin are generally regarded as a global hot spot for drought and climate change. The solution to this will not come from the CAP or a desalination facility in Yuma.
- There is existing technology to use solar power and/or methane gas from landfills to provide power to pump water. This technology should be pursued.
- Would like information from hydrologists as to what our water resources currently are so we can plan for the present population.

8. **ADJOURNMENT***

Jim Barry adjourned the meeting at 8:50 p.m.

Attendees:

Mette Brogden
Andrea Sommer
William Crosby



COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE
130 WEST CONGRESS, 10TH FLOOR
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701



CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
P.O. Box 27210
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85726-7210

Legal Action Report City / County Water & Wastewater Study Oversight Committee

Thursday, October 15 2009

5:00 P.M.

Pima County Public Works Bldg
201 N. Stone Tucson, AZ 85701

1. Call to Order
Quorum was established
2. Announcements
Discussion held, no action taken
3. Approval of meeting summary from October 1, 2009*
Motion to approve the minutes with suggested edits passed by a voice vote of 9 to 0
4. Call to the Audience
5. Facilitated Discussion of Committee Phase 2 Report and Committee Feedback
There was apparent Committee consensus on adding an additional Committee meeting on December 3rd
6. Discussion of Meeting Agenda(s)
Discussion held, no action taken
7. Call to the Audience
8. Adjournment * **9:00 p.m.**



COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE
130 WEST CONGRESS, 10TH FLOOR
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701



CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
P.O. Box 27210
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85726-7210

**CITY/COUNTY WATER AND WASTEWATER STUDY
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**

**November 12, 2009
Meeting Summary**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Jim Barry called the November 12, 2009 meeting of the City/County Water and Wastewater Study Oversight Committee (Oversight Committee) to order at 5:09 p.m. at the City of Tucson Pueblo Conference Room, 481 W. Paseo Redondo, Tucson, AZ 85701.

Members Present:

Jim Barry, Chairman
Vincent Vasquez
John Carlson
Rob Kulakofsky
Marcelino Flores
Tina Lee
Christopher Brooks
Mark Stratton
Bonnie Poulos
Joseph Maher

Representing:

Citizens Water Advisory Committee (CWAC)
CWAC
Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Committee (RWRAC)
RWRAC
RWRAC
CWAC
CWAC
RWRAC
County P&Z Commission
City Planning Commission

Absent

Bob Cook County P&Z Commission
Bruce Gungle County P&Z Commission

City/County Staff Present:

Melaney Seacat, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Nicole Ewing-Gavin, City Manager's Office
Ed Curley, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Eric Weidewilt, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department

Mette Brogden Facilitator

A quorum of the Committee was established.

2. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

None

3. **APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 15, 2009 MEETING SUMMARY***

The October 15, 2009 meeting summary was approved as submitted.

4. **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE**

Member of the Tucson Mountains Association addressed the committee with the following points:

- Expressed her appreciation of the Staff's and Committee members hard work and dedication to this study.
- Dunn Adventures sent a letter to the Mayor and City Council of Tucson asking them to change the obligated service area and to expand it or to allow water to be delivered beyond the obligated service area and to amend the commercial rainwater-harvesting ordinance to postpone its implementation or do away with it.
- Pressure from developers will be constant and ongoing asking to increase their opportunities for financial gain and override common sense as to what the city can really deliver.
- The City of Tucson will have to consider this letter at the study session early next week.
- Tucson Mountains Association is asking this joint committee to consider the impact if the committee does not describe in a straightforward, direct and honest manner how severe our restrictions really are.
- According to information stated in the Staff report, Phase 1 reports that resources are available to serve approximately 1.1 million people which is about 360,000 more people than are currently being served within the obligated service area.
- Considering the uncertainties that this data is based upon, the Tucson Mountains Association asks that the report does not even remotely suggest that resources are available to provide service beyond the current obligated service area.
- Committee should consider the impact of an agency of the city and county saying that water resources are available and the city or county ends up in litigation because a developer sues because it doesn't like the planning necessary to protect existing resources.
- Complemented staff on depth of coverage of environmental issues in draft report.
- Stated that Tucson Mountains Association will be submitting a letter to the committee regarding certain environmental concerns that were not addressed in the draft report.
- Asked that the committee address the issue of water cleansing, before it goes into riparian areas or river systems, citing examples of expanded intersections south of the University.
- Stressed the need for greater balance when considering effluent in addressing environmental issues.
- Complemented staff and committee on coverage of environmental issues in draft report.
- Asked committee to address methods of quantifying the amount of water really needed to preserve and repair environmental areas.
- Asked the committee to consider and include other best practices and case studies from both national and international water jurisdictions as applied to water issues as a means to broaden thinking and educate the community, policy makers and elected officials.

5. **UPDATE ON STAFF REPORT AND OPEN HOUSE**

Nicole Ewing Gavin updated the committee on the Staff Report presentation. The public comment period is open until November 20, 2009. An Open House was held on Monday, November 9, at the Randolph Golf Course Clubhouse. The Open House was structured as a presentation followed by public question and answer period. Approximately 20 people attended, including Chris Brooks and Tina Lee. The public brought forth the following concerns:

- Pricing – the Staff Report does not really address the issue of pricing and how demand can be managed by pricing.
- Satellite treatment plants versus centralized treatment plants – using effluent closer to the source.
- Infill development – need to upgrade built environment and existing infrastructure and assess the costs associated with that.

- General questions concerning the amount of water resources actually available and how many people are being served.
- Climate change – concerns of CAP delivery issues related to energy use and how that relates to climate change.

Tina Lee commented on the growth issue that even if the decision were made not to change the obligated service area in any way, this would not prevent growth from occurring. Developers have other mechanisms at their disposal to continue development, an example being pumping water to development.

Marcelino Flores asked if Malaney Secat would share the comments from the presentation to the Environmental Planning Committee at PAG from Friday, November 6, with the committee. Melaney agreed to document the comments and email the comments to the committee members.

6. **FACILITATED DISCUSSION OF COMMITTEE PHASE 2 REPORT AND COMMITTEE FEEDBACK**

Mette Brogden began the discussion by summarizing the objectives for the meeting. She will take information from this night's meeting discussion and comments submitted via email, write a revised draft of the committee report and send it to committee members on Monday, November 16 with instructions for the next step. Committee members will do a line-by-line edit of this revised draft at the November 19 meeting.

7. **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE**

Jodi Netzer from the Conscious Collective, a program of the Tucson Arts Brigade, addressed the committee with the following:

- Jodi expressed her appreciation for the holistic approach the committee has exhibited by addressing the intrinsic value of water as well as the quality of life while considering the realities of supplying water to the community.
- She informed the committee of a Community Brainstorm Gathering on Thursday, November 19th from 6:30 to 8:30 pm at the Armory Park Center. The purpose of this gathering is to generate ideas for The Water Project festival to be held March 26 through 28, 2010. Flyers for this gathering were distributed to the committee members.

8. **ADJOURNMENT***

Jim Barry adjourned the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

Attendees:

Judith Meyer
 Joanna Bate
 Jodi Netzer
 Ivy Schwartz
 C.J. Cole
 Arlene Sondra
 Margot Garcia



COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE
130 WEST CONGRESS, 10TH FLOOR
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701



CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
P.O. Box 27210
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85726-7210

**CITY/COUNTY WATER AND WASTEWATER STUDY
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**

**November 19, 2009
Meeting Summary**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Jim Barry called the November 19, 2009 meeting of the City/County Water and Wastewater Study Oversight Committee (Oversight Committee) to order at 5:10 p.m. at the City of Tucson Pueblo Conference Room, 481 W. Paseo Redondo, Tucson, AZ 85701.

Members Present:

Jim Barry, Chairman
Vincent Vasquez
John Carlson
Rob Kulakofsky
Marcelino Flores
Tina Lee
Christopher Brooks
Mark Stratton
Bonnie Poulos
Joseph Maher
Bob Cook
Bruce Gungle

Representing:

Citizens Water Advisory Committee (CWAC)
CWAC
Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Committee (RWRAC)
RWRAC
RWRAC
CWAC
CWAC
RWRAC
County P&Z Commission
City Planning Commission
County P&Z Commission
County P&Z Commission

City/County Staff Present:

Melaney Seacat, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Nicole Ewing-Gavin, City Manager's Office
Ed Curley, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Eric Wieduwilt, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Chris Avery, Tucson Water

Mette Brogden Facilitator

A quorum of the Committee was established.

2. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Marcelino Flores – Meeting announcement of the Ground Water Users Advisory Council on Monday, December 7, 2009. Topics covered will include water quality, the Water Banking Authority plan of operation, water resource assessment. There will be a presentation. The Ground Water Users Advisory Council has a technical team that is proposing a meeting to be held December 24, 2009. The agenda is to include development of recommendations for the fourth active management area plan update.

Mark Stratton stated due to budgetary issues, there is discussion for closing the Tucson office of the ADWR.

Marcelino Flores read, for announcement purposes, an email from Claire Zucker, watershed manager, concerning an effort going on within Pima Associations of Government (PAG). PAG is developing a land use model, SAMIM, which will project job and housing unit growth at a sub-county geography for eastern Pima County excluding Indian land. This model will only look at residential growth potential.

Marcelino brought to the attention of the committee a group called Imagine Greater Tucson. Members come from a diverse background including representation from the City and County. The group is unique in that it is a value-based discussion. Meetings are held the last Thursday of the month. Bob Cook added this group has been inspired by activities by another group, Envision Utah. As a means to follow one of the Staff Report's recommendations for comprehensive planning to support the visioning efforts of other groups, Marcelino reiterated the need to discover what other groups are doing. Joseph Maher agreed.

Jim Barry asked staff if Agenda Item 5 was the start of the Phase 3 regional dialogues? Melaney Secat responded the staff was looking for committee input of what the pressing action items are from the report that could be incorporated into the resolutions submitted to Mayor and Council.

Nicole Ewing Gavin stated the date for the joint Mayor and Council and Board of Supervisors meeting is set for January 12, 2010 at 9:00 am at the County Board chambers. There will be a presentation of the final reports, comments from the committee and proposal of a joint resolution asking both governing bodies to adopt. Attendance of committee members would be appreciated.

3. **APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 12, 2009 MEETING SUMMARY***

The November 12, 2009 meeting summary was unavailable at the time of the meeting for submission for approval. Action will be taken on this at the December 3, 2009 meeting.

4. **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE**

None

5. **DISCUSS CONCEPTS FOR PHASE 3**

Melaney Secat stated that in preparation of developing the joint resolution which will have a recital section celebrating the accomplishments, an action section which says Mayor and Council and Board of Supervisors directs staff to proceed with these actions, staff would like the committee's input on the most pressing action items staff should address – this would be a staff effort not a regional effort. Staff would like the committee to submit the top 5 pressing issues of the shared goals and recommendations.

6. **FACILITATED DISCUSSION OF COMMITTEE PHASE 2 REPORT AND COMMITTEE FEEDBACK**

Mette Brogden summarized the charge for the committee as follows: Envision a sustainable water future in the area in which we live, determine what would help us get there and assure this is captured in the report. Additionally, the committee was appointed as a public oversight committee to assure that the concerns and issues of the public are placed in the conversation.

Marcelino Flores stated that he felt he was more representative of the affiliation that he was appointed from rather than a representative of the public.

Jim Barry clarified this committee was appointed from members of other citizens advisory committees to work with staff to complete Phase 1 and 2 of this study.

Due to time constraints, Mette Brogden had the committee focus on very specific issues as topics for discussion for the nights meeting.

- How does the Tucson Water's obligated service area impact a sustainable water future in Tucson?
- An Overview written by James Barry to be inserted in the staff report in the introduction was distributed to committee members. This will also be sent via email to members for review. Comments on the Overview will be discussed at the December 3, 2009 meeting.
- Committee members submitted several comments on the Guiding Principles from Phase 2 as detailed in the scope. Vince Vasquez questioned if the language had been copied verbatim? Melaney Secat responded that it was verbatim but would review the language to verify.
- General content comments were solicited for each section of the report.

Staff will address two issues the committee members feel are as yet unresolved and review the issues at the December 3, 2009 meeting:

- Wastewater systems
- Unanswered health issues

7. **DISCUSSION OF MEETING AGENDA**

During the December 3, 2009 meeting, committee members will discuss:

- the final section of the report
- the staff recommendations
- the prioritization of the top five pressing issues from the staff report recommendations that the committee feels should be carried forward

8. **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE**

None

9. **ADJOURNMENT***

Jim Barry adjourned the meeting at 8:55 pm.

Attendees:

Charlie Ester
Charles J. Cole
Colby Bowser
Shelia Bowen
David Godlewski
Tedra Fox
Andrea Sommer