

---

# WHO SAID WHAT?

A Report on Public Comments Submitted to the Joint  
Water and Wastewater Infrastructure, Supply & Planning  
Study,  
A City of Tucson and Pima County Cooperative Project

Submitted by

James T. Barry, M.A., PhD

June 23, 2011

---

---

James T. Barry, M.A., PhD  
4102 East Paseo Grande  
Tucson, Arizona 85711  
(520) 471-1365  
[Jbarry70@cox.net](mailto:Jbarry70@cox.net)

June 23, 2011

Ms. Nicole Ewing-Gavin  
City of Tucson Study Coordinator  
City Manager's Office  
P.O. Box 27210  
Tucson, Arizona 85726-7210

Ms. Melaney Seacat  
Pima County Study Coordinator  
Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department  
201 North Stone  
Tucson, Arizona 85701

RE: **Final Report on Public Comment Received during the Joint Study, Phase I and II**

Dear Nicole and Melaney:

At the February 9, 2010 Mayor and Council public hearing on the Phase II draft, I committed to preparing a report on the public comment submitted during Phases I and II of the joint water/wastewater study. I hereby transmit the final version of my report, **"WHO SAID WHAT?: A Report on Public Comments Submitted to the Joint Water and Wastewater Infrastructure, Supply & Planning Study, A City of Tucson and Pima County Cooperative Project."**

Between April 2008 and February 2010, one hundred and twenty-four people submitted three hundred and eleven comments to the Joint Study, making the effort to submit thoughtful comments on an issue central to the well-being of the community. The Joint Study created the opportunity for a vibrant and often passionate dialogue on water and wastewater. This report documents a rare community dialogue and functions as a companion document to the Phase I and II reports. More importantly, the report gives credit where credit is due: to one hundred and twenty-four people who went to the trouble to voice their opinions.

I began working on this report in April/May of 2010. In December 2010, you published a draft of this report on the study website, asking people to comment on the draft and correct mistakes in the draft. We extended the comment period through the end of January 2011. During that period, only six people submitted comments, most of which pointed out editorial errors that I corrected.

Clyde Stagner submitted documents that were additional to those he submitted to the Joint Study, continuing his argument that Tucson Water was not testing adequately for water quality. Since I was not re-opening the record of public comment during Phases I and II of the Joint Study, I am not including Mr. Stagner's new comments to the report.

---

Colette Altaffer commented that the section on Neighborhood stakeholders was missing “an important piece of dissent.” Ms. Altaffer wrote that, “Neighborhood and environmental representatives objected to the obvious push to promote sprawl and further development in the southeast region of the Tucson basin.” I reread all of the documented comments Neighborhood stakeholders submitted and did not find any comments that made this point in exactly the language used by Ms. Altaffer. I do not dispute that Neighborhood stakeholders share this point of view, but I also maintain that the particular comment is not part of the public record of the Joint Study.

Another individual, unidentified except for an e-mail address, wrote that he or she “did not see any discussion of the impact of allowing Rosemont Mining to start mining in the Santa Rita Mountains.” This observation is accurate. The scope of work for Phases I and II of the Joint Study focused on Tucson Water and Pima County Regional Wastewater Reclamation, of which neither directly or significantly pertain to the Rosemont mine. A few public comments mentioned the Rosemont mine, but only fleetingly.

## **The Final Report**

The report consists seven chapters.

### Chapter One: Overview

This chapter serves several purposes. It first provides a conceptual framework I used to distinguish between a “core study process” during Phases I and II of the Joint Study, a “public outreach” component staff and the committee implemented, and the “public input” component that is the focus of this report. Secondly, Chapter One discusses methodological choices I made in constructing the report. Finally, Chapter One provides a statistical profile of the “who” of the public input process.

### Chapters Two to Seven

Chapters Two to Seven document the three hundred and eleven public comments received during Phases I and II of the Joint Study. (Appendix 4 at the end of Chapter One provides an alphabetical index of where to find these comments in Chapters Two to Seven.) Each chapter is divided into three sections: profiles of the participants, summaries of the major themes, and reproductions of the comments made. These chapters are:

Chapter Two	Local Water Utilities and Jurisdictions
Chapter Three	Business Stakeholders
Chapter Four	Environmental Stakeholders
Chapter Five	Neighborhood Stakeholders
Chapter Six	Individual Stakeholders
Chapter Seven	Stakeholders with a Broader Geographic Perspective

---

### **Executive Summary**

I have also written, as a companion document, an Executive Summary. The executive summary serves three purposes. First, it provides a brief statistical overview of who made comments and when they made them. Second, it brings together in one document all of the “summaries of major themes” from Chapters Two to Seven. Third, it presents my analysis of three major issues that recur throughout the public comments: (1) how to evaluate growth; (2) competing paradigms for water resource management; and (3) “having a seat at the table” in discussions on a sustainable water future.

### **Personal Observations**

Three observations about the public outreach and public input during Phases I and II are warranted. First, **the public outreach was successful**. One hundred and twenty-four individuals offered three hundred and eleven comments. Two hundred and forty-nine people attend meetings.

Second, **participation was diverse**. A wide range of stakeholders participated through the public outreach opportunities. Stakeholders included people from business, environmental groups, neighborhood associations, and people from organizations with geographic perspectives on water and wastewater that were broader than scope of the City of Tucson and Pima County. Stakeholders also included individuals who participated in their own capacity and not as representatives of organizational interests. Business stakeholders, individuals, and stakeholders with a broader geographic perspective were the most active in attending meetings. Individuals were most active in submitting comments, followed equally by business, environmental and neighborhood stakeholders.

Third, **comments covered a wide range of topics**. Several people commented on water supply issues; about matching supplies to demand; water shortages; and organizing the acquisition of new water supplies. Several other people spoke to the environment’s need for water and the positive values derived from healthy riparian and aquatic systems.

Many people criticized the Joint Study for providing “seats at the table” only for the City of Tucson and Pima County, demanding that the process be opened up from the start. Other people accepted the city/county focus in Phases I and II, with the expectation that a regional dialogue would follow upon completion of Phase II. For these people, transparency and openness were critical; many expressed a real distrust of government or of others participating in the public outreach.

Business stakeholders stressed an economic foundation for water and wastewater resource management. Their economic concerns led many business stakeholders to oppose the Phase II report.

Many environmental, neighborhood, and individual stakeholders sought to expend the terms of discussion about water and wastewater resource management. In addition to prioritizing the environment’s need for water, these stakeholders stressed uncertainties (climate-related, follow the

---

---

Report on Public Comment Received during the Joint Study, Phase I and II  
Page Four  
June 23, 2011

precautionary principle) alternatives to new, probably imported, water supplies such as rainwater harvesting, stormwater management, and conservation.

A few stakeholders stressed water quality issues. One stakeholder discussed the “energy/water nexus.”

I am pleased to submit this report to you and hope you will see fit to post it on the Joint Study web site, notify Mayor and Council and the Board of Supervisors that it is available, and broadcast its availability through the web site. The report took much longer to complete than I expected, but maybe I was just having too much fun working on it. I hope that the report will provide benefits to the on-going discussions of water and wastewater.

I have attached to this transmittal an index of people whose comments are reported on and the chapter and section where they can be found. This index can also be found in Appendix 4 of Chapter One.

Sincerely,

James T. Barry

---

Name	Chapter	Section	Name	Chapter	Section
<b>A</b>					
Altaffer, Colette	5	5.3.1	Andrews, David	2	2.4.3
<b>B</b>					
Baker, Beryl	6	6.3.8	Black, Mary Ann	7	7.3.7
Basye, Richard	7	7.3.8	Braithwaite, Jim	3	3.3.18
Bate, Joanna	7	7.3.3	Branch-Gilby, Donna	5	5.3.3
Bauer, Carl	3	3.3.1	Brewer, Cindy	6	6.3.17
Betancourt, Julio	7	7.3.4	Bruckner, Jeanne	6	6.3.16
<b>C</b>					
Campbell, Carolyn	4	4.2.3	Cordy, Gail	6	6.3.26
Castelhano, Ed	3	3.3.13	Cotton, Christine	3	3.3.17
Cattani, Pat	6	6.3.29	Crockett, Dave	2	2.3.2
Cole, Charles J.	6	6.3.1	Crosby, William	4	4.2.2
Collazo, Debbie	6	6.3.10	Crouse, Bill	6	6.3.18
Conde, Hector	5	5.3.6			
<b>D</b>					
Davis, Leona	6	6.3.25	Dozier, Larry	7	7.3.2
DeSpain, Brad	2	2.4.1	DuPont, Bill	6	6.3.11
<b>E</b>					
Elers, Susan	7	7.3.3	English, Tres	4	4.2.1
Ellinor, Linda	4	4.2.1	Evans, Jane	6	6.3.14
Emerson, Melanie	4	4.2.7	Ewoldt, Dave	4	4.2.11

Name	Chapter	Section	Name	Chapter	Section
<b>F</b>					
Finefrock, Terry	6	6.3.21	Freeman, Nancy	6	6.3.2
Fonseca, Julia	4	4.2.5	Freitas, Chuck	3	3.3.11
France, Vicki	7	7.3.7	Frisvold, George	3	3.3.1
<b>G</b>					
Gabaldon, Arturo	2	2.3.2	Green, Paul	4	4.2.9
Ganderse, Ramon	3	3.3.4	Grignano, Laura	7	7.3.1
Garcia, Margot	6	6.3.4	Grinnell, Rick	3	3.3.12
Godlewski, David	3	3.3.2	Guymon, Michael	3	3.3.4
Goodwillie, Kai	4	4.2.1			
<b>H</b>					
Harbour, Tom	7	7.3.2	Heller, Carol	4	4.2.1
Hare, Trevor	4	4.2.7	Hubbard, George	5	5.3.5
<b>J</b>					
Jacobs, Kathy	7	7.3.5	Johnson, Barbara	2	2.4.1
Jacome, Alex	3	3.3.2			
<b>K</b>					
Keyes, Dale	6	6.3.5	Kroesen, Kendall	4	4.2.9
Kiser, Jim	3	3.3.3	Kromko, John	6	6.3.15
Kiser, Madeline	4	4.2.1	Kuliesh, James	3	3.3.8

Name	Chapter	Section	Name	Chapter	Section
<b>L</b>					
Lett, Diana	5	5.3.4	Luety, Diane	6	6.3.19
Little, Val	2	2.3.5			
<b>M</b>					
Magruder, Marshall	6	6.3.23	McNulty, Michael	3	3.3.1
Marikos, Mark	7	7.3.3	McVie, Christine	4	4.2.9
Marshall, Rob	4	4.2.5	Medler, Robert	3	3.3.6
Mauzy, Melissa	7	7.3.3	Megdal, Sharon	7	7.3.3
Mays, Laura	5	5.3.4	Mehochko, Anne	3	3.3.5
McCoy, Amy	4	4.2.8	Meyer, Judith	5	5.3.2
McGibbon, Andrew	7	7.3.7			
<b>N</b>					
Neal, Cliff	7	7.3.2	Newman, Michael	6	6.3.13
Neeley, Jenny	4	4.2.6	Neighborhood Infill Coalition	5	5.3.1
Netzer, Jodi	7	7.3.9	Nicksic, Mike	6	6.3.12
<b>O</b>					
O'Brien, Dorothy	2	2.4.1			
<b>P</b>					
Pepper, Ian	7	7.3.3	Proctor, Ron	4	4.2.1
Pittman, David	3	3.3.7			
<b>R</b>					
Reuwsaat, Michael	2	2.4.1	Roe, Alice	6	6.3.7
Robinson, Priscilla	6	6.3.9	Romero, Wavalene	2	2.4.4

Name	Chapter	Section	Name	Chapter	Section
<b>S</b>					
Saletta, Philip	2	2.3.3	Simpson, Hyatt	6	6.3.27
Scadron, Arlene	6	6.3.24	Skelton, Lynne	2	2.4.2
Seasholes, Ken	7	7.3.1; 7.3.2	Stagner, Clyde	6	6.3.3
Serraglio, Randy	4	4.2.4	Stahle, Jim	2	2.4.2
Sheafe, Chris	3	3.3.10	Steklis, Netzin	4	4.2.10
Shoopman, Ron	3	3.3.1; 3.3.3	Stolmaker, Ed	3	3.3.9
<b>T</b>					
Taczanowsky, Edward	3	3.3.2	Tofel, S.L.	3	3.3.15
Tannler, Jeff	7	7.3.1	Toney, Michael	6	6.3.20
Taylor, Ken	2	2.3.4	Tucson Regional Water Coalition	3	3.3.1
<b>U</b>					
Unnamed #1	6	6.3.30	Unnamed #4	6	6.3.33
Unnamed #2	6	6.3.31	Unnamed #5	6	6.3.34
Unnamed #3	6	6.3.32	Unnamed #6	6	6.3.35
<b>V</b>					
Vasquez, Vince	3	3.3.16	Volpe, Kip	2	2.3.1
Verburg, Edward	5	5.3.2			
<b>W</b>					
West, Carol	6	6.3.6	Wolf, Les	3	3.3.14
Williams, Tracy	5	5.3.1	Wronko, S.M.	6	6.3.22
<b>Z</b>					
Ziegweid, Katrina	6	6.3.28	Zimmerman, Carol	7	7.3.2
Zimmerman, Colin	3	3.3.5	Zucker, Claire	7	7.3.6