

## RUTHRAUFF BASIN MANAGEMENT PLAN

### **ALTERNATIVES WORKGROUP MEETING MINUTES**

**LOCATION:** Ellie Towne Flowing Wells Community Center  
1660 W Ruthrauff Rd, Tucson, AZ 85705

**DATE:** Tuesday, June 9, 2015

**TIME:** 10 am – 2:30 pm

Attending:

Chuck Williams, Stantec, Meeting Facilitator

#### **Community Workgroup:**

Jan Gordley, Gordley Group, Facilitator

Evan Canfield, Pima County Regional Flood Control District (RFCD)

Kevin Daily, Flowing Wells Neighborhood Association

Sue Grant, Flowing Wells Neighborhood Association

Jeannie Davis, Chief of Staff, Pima County District 1

Matt Kopec, Council Aide, City of Tucson Ward 3

Louise Newman, Campus Farms Neighborhood Association

#### **Economic Vitality Workgroup:**

John Wise, Stantec, Facilitator

Akitsu Kimoto, Pima County RFCD

Fernando Molina, Tucson Water

Laith Alshami, Pima County Development Services

Kieran Sikdar, Watershed Management Group

#### **Environmental Sustainability Workgroup:**

Laura Mielcarek, Wheat Design Group, Facilitator

Ellen Alster, Pima County Department of Transportation (PCDOT)

Marie Light, Pima County RFCD

Irene Ogata, City of Tucson Office of Integrated Planning

Iylea Olson, Wheat Design Group

John Take, Stantec

#### **Implementation Workgroup:**

John Wallace, JE Fuller, Facilitator

Sam Credio, City of Tucson Department of Transportation (TDOT)

David Crockett, Flowing Wells Irrigation District

George Kuck, Pima County Natural Resources and Parks

Jim Vogelsberg, City of Tucson Development Services

## RUTHRAUFF BASIN MANAGEMENT PLAN

### **Public Safety Workgroup:**

Ian Sharp, JE Fuller, Facilitator  
Jason Bahe, PCDOT  
Jim Femling, TDOT  
Jason Green, City of Tucson Development Services  
Terry Hendricks, Pima County RFCD

### Other participants:

Yoga Korgaonkar, University of Arizona  
Jon Marenfeld, Stantec

1. **Introductions and Opening Comments** Evan Canfield, Pima County District Project Manager

The project purpose is to develop a comprehensive flood control program, develop drainage alternatives and provide a balanced multi-objective approach.

2. **Meeting Purpose** Chuck Williams, Facilitator

The meeting purpose is to provide a brief project status and update; initiate alternatives workgroup process; and, if time permits, review and augment the alternatives seedlist.

3. **Project Status** John Wise, Consultant Project Manager

The project background and overview were reviewed. The project started approximately one year ago and is about halfway through. The existing conditions report has been completed and alternatives analysis is starting. The group will be working on alternatives analysis criteria today.

4. **Alternatives Workgroup Involvement** Chuck Williams

Stakeholders were selected for today's workgroup to represent varied perspectives and interests, and to be included in developing and scoring alternatives.

## RUTHRAUFF BASIN MANAGEMENT PLAN

As part of the alternatives process, performance criteria have already been established by the Ruthrauff Basin Management Team in the following areas:

- i. Community
- ii. Economic Vitality
- iii. Environmental Sustainability
- iv. Implementation
- v. Public Safety

Chuck reviewed the process that the workgroup will utilize to develop performance criteria weighting values, as well as review of specific criteria spreadsheet.

### **5. Develop Specific Criteria and Specific Criteria Weighting Values**

The larger group divided up into five predetermined subgroups for the five categories of Community, Economic Vitality, Environmental Sustainability, Implementation, and Public Safety. Each group worked on reviewing, critiquing and revising specific criteria, then proceeded to develop specific criteria weighting values.

### **6. Review and Augment Seedlist of Alternatives**

While the subgroups were working on their criteria and weighting, one subgroup that completed these tasks was able to spend time reviewing and augmenting the seedlist of alternatives. This included review of typical problems, review of existing seedlist of alternatives and discussion of augmentation of the alternatives list.

### **7. Summary/Next Steps**

Chuck Williams

Each group leader was asked to give a brief summary of their findings.

#### **Implementation** – John Wallace

The six draft criteria were found to be good and well worded. A seventh was added for maintenance feasibility. When weighted, high scores were funding, stakeholders, minimizing and maintenance feasibility.

Q: Did they discuss utility conflicts?

A: No, except with stakeholders.

## RUTHRAUFF BASIN MANAGEMENT PLAN

### **Public Safety** – Ian Sharp

This group developed seven new values. High scorers were: identify maintenance needs and all-weather access.

Q: Did you address crime prevention and design?

A: Not specifically, more nuisance activity.

### **Economic Vitality** – John Wise

Five criteria were revamped and simplified. The highest ranked were: preserve historic habitat and biodiversity, and next was economic viability.

Q: Did you discuss increasing property values?

A: That could be part of quality of life.

### **Community** – Jan Gordley

Five existing criteria were revised and tweaked, and a sixth added: maximize community connectivity, access and multimodal transportation. High rankings on weightings were: maximize community connectivity, and optimize beneficial use of land.

Q: Did you address use of social media as a way to communicate with community?

A: Not specifically.

### **Environmental Sustainability** – Laura Mielcarek

This group had nine criteria and added two more. Highest weighted were: maximize use of renewable water, mitigate heat island effect, maintenance, and adaptability and resilience.

Chuck reviewed final weighting values compiled for the five groups, as follows:

A.	Community	1.5
B.	Economic Vitality	2.5
C.	Implementation	3.5
D.	Public Safety	4.5
E.	Environmental Sustainability	3.0

### **Next Steps**

The project team will pull together and start scoring alternatives, then draft recommended alternatives. Next will be the implementation plan, then one more public meeting about one year from now.

## RUTHRAUFF BASIN MANAGEMENT PLAN

### **8. Adjourn**

Evan Canfield

The participants were thanked for sharing their expertise and specialized knowledge, and contributions to the process. Those who are interested in looking further at specific areas for the alternative seed list should contact Evan. Revised criteria will be sent out to committee members for their review and comment.

The meeting was adjourned at 2 p.m.