

From: "Angie Gelsinon" <angie@kaneenpr.com>
To: "Nicole Ewing-Gavin" <Nicole.Ewing-Gavin@tucsonaz.gov>
Date: 11:23 AM 11/19/2009
Subject: FW: Draft, Phase II Staff Report

Comment Received.

From: Charles J. Cole [mailto:cole@amnh.org]
Sent: Thursday, November 19, 2009 11:19 AM
To: info@tucsonpimawaterstudy.com
Cc: judithdmeyer@msn.com
Subject: Draft, Phase II Staff Report

Hi, Folks:

This message is primarily for the citizens' committee, as they work with the draft staff report while drafting their own. Please ensure that this reaches members of the citizen's committee.

On the whole, I was quite pleased with the staff draft phase II report -- I applaud the contributors. I also agree that it is a good idea to try merging the advisory committee's report with this, in an analytical way that considers alternatives and can strengthen points of agreement but provide clear discussion of divergent views where necessary. I have only a few points to mention, and I suspect that some members of the committee have already thought about each point. So, I continue, although I feel superfluous.

You'll want an up-front Executive Summary with bullets for major points.

Two subjects I didn't see in the report are:

(1) recommendation to continue or make "permanent" Mayor and Council's restriction on expanding water service outside the City limits or obligated service area; with the huge obligated service area yet possibly to be developed, uncertainties of future supply, limits of present supply, and up-coming Phase III including other cities and towns with growth plans coming into the picture, the current restriction makes sense and the alternative does not;

(2) water quality -- testing and treatment; considering emerging contaminants, Tucson Water should have personnel responsible for staying abreast of the issues, new pollutants, especially locally (is atrazine used on golf courses here?), and ready to make recommendations; by the time the EPA regulates new pollutants, considerable damage can already be done; should Tucsonans should be exposed to lesser quality water than anybody else in the country?

Proposed Modification:

Under the section "Comprehensive, Integrated Planning," Goal #3, recommendation 3.2 on pp. 12-13. This recommendation is entirely biased toward extending the "obligated service area," as if there is no alternative. This is not an objective or scientific approach, because analyses of all relevant factors could result in the following

alternatives: (1) a recommendation that the "obligated service area" should not be extended; (2) it might be reduced; or (3) it might be modified with swaps, by trade-offs in location of the perimeter that could keep the total area the same or more or less, to keep the obligated service area most efficiently served.

Bottom Line Here: If it is advisable to have an "obligated service area" in the first place, objective analysis should prevail in deciding where and what size it should be, based on other criteria developed in the report.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment, and for your dedicated and generous hard work for Tucsonans.
Charles J. Cole, 6381 W. Sweetwater Dr., Tucson. 743-3402.