

## TRANSCRIPT OF OCTOBER 22, 2008

*List of Presenters:*

1. *Ron Proctor representing Sustainable Tucson*
2. *Madeline Kiser representing Sustainable Tucson*
3. *Colette Altaffer representing the Neighborhood Infill Coalition*
4. *Kendall Kroesen representing Tucson Audubon Society*
5. *Tres English representing Sustainable Tucson*
6. *Linda Ellinor representing Sustainable Tucson*

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: All right. I'm going to call the October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2008, meeting of the Oversight Committee to order. We have a Meeting Summary from the October 15<sup>th</sup> meeting. Do I hear a motion to approve it?

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER: Second.

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Any objection?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Done. Announcements. Does anybody on the Committee have an announcement they want to make?

By the way, Bob? Bruce is not - Bob? You're at the table - Bruce is not coming tonight I heard. Nobody from the - from the Committee has a - any announcements? All right.

Brenda Garcia sent you all a copy of the Questionnaire that - that Marcelino has sent out as a way of organizing our thoughts for the - for the writing process, and I would just ask you to, again, look at it and start thinking about that; it's going to - to - hi, Rob - it's going to greatly facilitate our writing process if we have been thinking about those things and - and, even submitting 'em and giving us a chance to look at 'em in advance.

Nicole Fyffe gave me this. Nancy Freeman gave her presentation on storm water last time, and Nicole wanted to - to call the Committee's attention and the public's attention to a dedication ceremony November 1<sup>st</sup> - 1<sup>st</sup>, 2008, to the Arroyo Chico Cherry Field Retention Basin. You may have seen that under construction; it's a huge hole in the ground that was built - as I remember it - to - to make TUSD a hole after they had to give up properties to allow for that detention process to be done. So, it's - it's - it's a - it's a major storm water detention basin, and -

MEMBER JOHN CARLSON: It's off Tucson Boulevard?

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: It's off of -

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER: Campbell, isn't it?

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: - it's off Kino.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER: You know, Campbell . . .

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER: Where the baseball -

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Yeah -

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER: - it's just south -

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: - it's right at - it's where Father Kino Statue is, isn't it? Yeah. Okay.

We - just to remind the Committee, November 15<sup>th</sup>, we have a meeting; it's - it's currently scheduled for the Doubletree from 9:00 until 3:00; that's going to be our first writing session. So, I just wanted to remind you of that; that's the 15<sup>th</sup>.

MEMBER JOHN CARLSON: Which Doubletree?

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Right over here.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER: Across the street there.

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Yeah, I like to keep things in my neighborhood. I can walk - I can walk here. I don't, but I could, if I wanted to.

Okay. We are now at a new phase in this process. From - and I'm - I made some notes - and if you'll excuse me, I'm just going to kind of read from them. From June 11<sup>th</sup> until last week, the Committee received presentations from Staff, and from various outside experts, on a variety of topics that were - were germane to the scope that the Board and the Mayor and Council gave us. And tonight and next Wednesday, we want to get presentations from the public and - on an issue that is really central to what the Committee believes is the concept that the Mayor and Council and the Board had in undertaking this five-phase process, and that is: What is a sustainable water future for us? Meaning, Tucson, for Pima County, for the Tucson Active Management Area, and - and, eventually, it's going - it's going to be larger than that.

Now, we're going to talk about sustainability tonight and next week; those are the last two planned presentation sessions. So, sustainability temporally is coming last; but, conceptually, it is really of the first order; it is - it is central to how we will understand what are the common facts that we're unearthing? What is the common understanding to the context that - that we wish to - to be able to capture in - in our reports? Sustainability is - is going to be the - the first principle, really.

So, we want to hear from the community on how you define sustainability and what your concerns would be for sustainability. And we've issued an open-ended invitation for you to present your views on sustainability in whatever structure and words are most appropriate to you. These presentations will help us as we transition - the Committee transitions into Phase II.

In - Marcelino, hi - in - in opening up the - the microphone to the Committee (sic), we expect to hear a diversity of viewpoints, and that's good. But, to help us, the Committee, to process what we're hearing, what - what you're saying to us, to help us listen and hear, we've asked two people to help us, and we have Margot Garcia and - and Dale Keyes, who are, luckily for us, in Tucson and free at this - over the next couple of months to help us out.

Dale recently retired as a Senior Program Manager at the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution. His professional interests span urban planning and environmental assessment, in addition to conflict resolution, and he's been in the community a long time.

Margot is a retired professor of Environmental Planning. She taught classes in public participation, mediation and environmental assessment, involved in - in voter issues since the 1970s, and served on several panels for the National Research Council. Both of - both Margot and Dale bring a lot of process experience that will help us listen.

So, what you're going to be seeing tonight, while you're presenting, is Margot or Dale recording your ideas, your notes, on - on flip charts. We are filming, yes? We are taping, so there will be a transcript. And we are expecting - we are hoping that everybody who presents, or even doesn't present, there will be written comments so that Margot and Dale will take their notes, the transcripts, whatever written things we have, and make a report to the Committee, synthesizing what we hear, try to identify the major points, where are the areas of agreement, where are the areas of different emphasis, so that we have a basis for taking what we hear from you and integrating it into our report.

MEMBER JOHN CARLSON: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Yes, sir.

MEMBER JOHN CARLSON: You know, they had us send in, if we've had time a couple paragraphs -

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Right.

MEMBER JOHN CARLSON: - that's floating around wherever.

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Right.

MEMBER JOHN CARLSON: What we get tonight, what's - what's the intent? To make one nice big book with everybody's comments, or selectively reproduce some of this stuff, or how are you going to handle -

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: We -

MEMBER JOHN CARLSON: - it, getting it over to us?

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: John has - has made a point; that - that we issued an invitation for all of the Committee members

to submit one-paragraph statements on what you think sustainability is, or what you hope to get out of it. We're not going to present that to ourselves. We're going to have that - we're not asking Margot and Dale to summarize that for us, we will do that for ourselves. But, I envision, again, that we will have every Committee's - member's statement, every statement - that we hear this on the transcript, and every written statement we have, and that we will figure out how to summarize that for the report that we make, and we will keep documentation of all of that.

MEMBER JOHN CARLSON: Good.

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Okay.

MEMBER JOHN CARLSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: So, ground rules: We - we sent out invitations, more than once in more than one format, asking people to - to tell us if they wanted to come. We've had - we've had a number of people who have signed up already. Those people have priority. We will call them - on them, acknowledge them in the order that we have them signed up. We've asked people to limit their comments to five minutes. If you do it in less than five minutes, nobody's going to be mad at you, but we've asked you to limit it to five minutes and, with the Committee's approval, I will do my best to enforce that, okay?

We plan to finish by 8:00. So, if we have more than that, 8:00, sometime around there, Committee, maybe we need to make an assessment. Do we go a couple minutes extra? But, we'll have to - we'll have to play that by ear.

So, that being said, let me ask a question: How many people out here in the audience are prepared to pre- - make presentations tonight? All right. We're not going to run across a problem.

Does the Committee have anything that they want to say?

MEMBER JOHN CARLSON: What's happening next meeting?

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Same thing, more people coming in. Bonnie?

MEMBER BONNIE POULOS: I just wondered if we can make sure that each speaker gives us their name, address -

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Yeah, right.

MEMBER BONNIE POULOS: - and, if they have an affiliation that they're -

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Yes.

MEMBER BONNIE POULOS: - for, if they'll let us know that.

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Okay. Good. Margot, Dale, do you want to add anything by way of introduction? No? Okay. We all set? This is it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Sure.

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Okay. I'm going to read 'em as I see here. Ron Proctor. Is he here?

RON PROCTOR: Yes.

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Okay, Ron, come on. Oh, let me - let me - I'm sorry - let me interrupt. What - my plan is that we're going to treat this kind of like Call to the Audience. We'll - we'll take the com- - the statements, we won't interact with people, 'cause we - we got to make sure that we - we give time for everybody who wants to speak, okay?

Ron, please go ahead. Thank you.

RON PROCTOR: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: And give us your name and affiliation, please.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Presenter # 1</b> <b>Ron Proctor representing</b> <b>Sustainable Tucson</b></p>
---

RON PROCTOR: My name is Ron Proctor. I live at 1031 East Copper Street. I'm affiliated with Sustainable Tucson. There - well, I'll just mention that there are several people - I don't know how many, four or five or six from Sustainable Tucson with - with messages this evening. Thank you all for doing the work that you're doing and - and bringing this very important issue forward.

I don't know how many of you saw *Frontline* last night on PBS. There's a - a - a - it was an episode called "Heat" about global warming, excellent-base information about where we stand with that, and I'd recommend people seeing that; it's, essentially, what I'm talking about this evening regarding sustainability.

Sustainability is the ongoing process of securing a quality of life for ourselves and future generations. Over the course of human history, we have been able to sustain ourselves by using abundant and readily available resources, and the natural world has had the capacity to process the resulting waste. Now, however, sustainability is becoming part of our greater understanding because we are realizing we live in a world with limits, and those limitations are causing a decrease in our quality of life and, perhaps, a challenge to our existence. The state of our natural ecosystem that yields a continuous flow of valuable goods or services is in a deteriorating state, and population pressures are accelerating the problem.

Tucson is a desert community living beyond the care and capacity of its local resource base. The vast majority of

resources are imported, including food, fuel, material goods and, more recently, water delivered through the Central Arizona Canal. We are sustained by a resource transport system that relies almost entirely on fossil fuel. Unfortunately, consumption of fossil fuel supports us on the one hand, and strikes with the other. While this transport system supplies us with consumable goods, it also produces carbon dioxide, undercutting the stability of our shared climate and destroying the natural capital that needs to remain the basis of our physical support. Carbon dioxide emission reduction should, therefore, be a major part of the sustainability equation.

Science suggests worldwide levels of co2 emissions need to be reduced by between 50% and 85% by 2050. Other argues that zero or negative carbon goals are urgently needed. Regardless of the actual percentage, science is indicating major reductions will be necessary to mitigate climate change. Fortunately, Emission Reduction Agreements have already become stated policy. The Western Climate Initiative, signed by Arizona Governor Napolitano, and the U.S. Mayor's Climate Protection Agreement, signed by Mayor Walkup, both call for large-scale co2 emission reductions. A draft Greenhouse Gas Inventory for Pima County and the City of Tucson just released will help determine the baseline for greenhouse gas reductions and what part the City and County Water and Wastewater Systems should play in meeting those goals. An 85% reduction in co2 emissions worldwide by 2050 is a daunting task, to say the least. It seems likely a rethinking of infrastructure and levels of services will be necessary in order to meet those goals.

One way or another a sustainable water system will require making sure the whole system satisfies carbon emission goals. In rethinking the water system in this time of environmental fragility, and considering the problems associated with carbon emissions, one obvious approach suggests creating a system that inherently requires less energy. Developing water supply that falls naturally at, or near point of use, can use gravity to advantage, eliminating major environmental and energy costs. The case may be made that the water we have been importing over long distances and raised to great heights may be better used in other ways. Colorado River allotments currently delivered to Tucson may be more efficiently used supporting agriculture in the Colorado River lowlands and restoring the fisheries beyond its delta.

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Ron, one minute, please.

RON PROCTOR: Okay. So, what might - so, what might a sustainable water system look like in Tucson? It could be based on non-imported water catching all necessary rainwater for

residential use at or near where it would be used. Charles Cole, who has presented for this Committee, has demonstrated that water harvesting - harvesting can be done, satisfying typical residential water needs in Tucson.

A public wastewater system could collect excess or sewer wastewater, purify it to necessary standards, and recirculate it for toilet flushing and distribution to recreational areas and for fire suppression. Aquifer pumping could be discontinued until natural recharge restored surface flows in riparian areas. Once the aquifer was restored, excess water could be banked appropriately.

Commercial and industrial users would be responsible for their own water supplies, either by leased catchment or private pipeline, and be responsible for any costs incurred or waste products produced. Water rates would be based on the cost of treatment and pumping using carbon neutral - renewable energy, as well as the amor- - amortized cost for the catchment and necessary piping infrastructure. In this whole system approach, each - each citizen would be responsible for their actual water use, and assessed a share of cost of public amenities such as green space and fire protection.

Any sustainable water supply system for Tucson will need to meet the carbon emissions requirements necessary for climate change mitigation. If we continue to import long-distance water, a thorough analysis is needed to prove its merit. Alternatively, one could design a system based on the only truly renewable water resource we have: rainfall. We have technology that allows us to recycle that water to maximize its use for our community purposes. What environmental and financial costs, either of these options incur, should be compared and brought before an informed public before requesting funding for major public investment. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Thank you, Ron.  
Okay. Madeline Kiser.

**Presenter #2**  
**Madeline Kiser representing**  
**Sustainable Tucson**

MADELINE KISER: I'm Madeline Kiser, and I'm also from Sustainable Tucson and I, too, thank you. My colleague, Carol, is actually handing out a poem which I will send to the Committee. I've come to feel that we're fellow travelers on a good road. I use this metaphor to recall Chaucer, who's endearing message about the importance of fellow travelers sharing stories came to mind as I was preparing for tonight. As much as present views about sustainable water management, I want

to share a few lessons learned from another region, another story.

Two years ago, as a laywoman concerned about rivers and aquifers here, and also in Costa Rica, where my husband is from, I assisted over two dozen environmental groups, government agencies, and university departments in Central America and here in Arizona in shaping conferences about sustainable water management practices. They included leading water experts from three continents who came together to expediently translate water science, or to respectfully borrow a term Mr. Ken Seasholes used last week, "wonkiness," into terms policymakers and the public can understand. In this era, perhaps above all, sustainable water management is coming to mean scientists from different disciplines communicating clearly among themselves and then, with a sense of urgency in these urgent times, with the public. The time for having time for wonkiness has ended.

The main point I'd like to make is that sustainable water management involves two categories. I'll focus on the second. First, personal behavioral. As we all know, everywhere a profound cultural shift is taking place; it's centering assumption, north on a road, is that we need to consume less water, less everything. Water harvesting, gray water, Xeriscaping, all are part of this shift.

Second, sustainable water management involves setting into place at the basin, regional and national levels to-scale, as well as locally, comprehensive water laws and policies that reflect the understanding that nature is alive and has limits, north on a road. This is a profound paradigm shift, one that implicitly questions our current leading paradigm in Arizona that high-tech options, like effluent and desalinization, will allow more and more people to live here, as long as we have money and technology, we can defy nature's limits. In her presentation to this Committee, Kathy Jacobs called part of this - part of this shift, "adaptive water management;" growing numbers of countries are turning to it.

This new paradigm, in turn, includes two important components: Designating nature itself and people as the only two entities that have a right to water is the first. Sustainable water management begins with stating these principles at the outset of any decision-making process and translating them into law.

The second is assembling teams of local and international experts to evaluate the triple bottom line, or potential economic, social and environmental costs and benefits of altering any river or aquifer and presenting - presenting potential scenarios of change to the public. These scenarios must include the harshest, as well as mildest possibilities.

What, for example, will the true costs and benefits of relying on effluent be in Arizona? What will the cost to our children's health be in the long run? How will we pay for high-tech options in a time of financial crises? Changing costs and supplies of energy needed to produce water? And, as the current issue of southwest hydrology suggests, declining interest in financing big-water projects?

Ultimately, sustainable water management means turning to these teams of local and international experts to address the hardest questions about proposed alterations to the - to nature at the outset of decision-making so that policymakers and the public can fully understand what we're choosing.

This mix of local and international experts is important for the exchange of best practice is afforded, as well as the opportunity for transparent peer review. When faced with a serious illness, what we seek are not only best practices in our hometown, but global standards. We need to adapt the same habit of vigilance, of seeking out the best, of placing where we are in our State in the broadest context when evaluating sustainable practices in Arizona and the west.

And our state at this moment - I think that, perhaps, first and foremost, sustainable water management would mean holding a visible statewide public forum about what the one conversation which will define the rest: Our search for new sources, the ADD Water Process. We need to bring together our own respected water experts from diverse disciplines, along with outside experts to evaluate the triple bottom line of what are being called our major options: effluent, desal, importing water from elsewhere, among others. Much more rigorous peer-review, and local and also national media attention need to be given to this critical debate; it will define us and define this land we love.

I began with Chaucer and I want to end with Autumn Poet, Ofelia Zepeda: "Tucson is a story. Tucson is a linguistic alternative. Citizens gravitate to Sabino Canyon, the humming, buzzing, clicking water of life. It should be unnecessary for sticky notes to remind us of what a desert place is." Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Thank you, Madeline. Colette?

COLETTE ALTAFFER: Thank you, Madeline. Colette? you want this passed

**Presenter #3**  
**Colette Altaffer representing the**  
**Neighborhood Infill Coalition**

COLETTE ALTAFFER: I'm Colette Altaffer, and I'm here to speak on behalf of the Neighborhood In-fill Coalition. We're a group

of community advocates who focus on quality of life issues in neighborhoods.

As we were thinking about water and sustainability and our neighbors, the recent financial meltdown was never far from our minds. We've been reading about a report which the General Accounting Office delivered to Congress in 1994 in which it warned that the unregulated derivatives market could produce the type of economic meltdown that we have just experienced. Congress, of course, ignored those warnings and allowed the markets to continue as if the party would never end, until it did. And we were struck by the parallels between the financial meltdown and Tucson's own political climate from the undue influence exerted on our politicians by special interests to government's failure to act in a way that protects the interests of all its citizens.

From this financial fiasco, we chose three lessons that Tucson could learn from and applied them to water and sustainability. The first lesson is: Practice the precautionary principle. We've probably all heard the term, "precautionary principle," but it - and it is defined in many ways, but one of the most succinct definitions describes it as, "caution practiced in the context of uncertainty." When it comes to water, uncertainty is one thing. Tucson has an abundance.

During these past few months, you've helped our community learn a great deal about water and wastewater treatment, and the infrastructure that makes our lives here possible, but you've also shown us that Tucson's water future is fraught with uncertainty, and uncertainty leads to troubling questions. For example, we're told that Tucson sits on top of 60 million acre-feet of water, but how accurate is that number? How much of this water is off limits due to pollution? And how much do we have to keep in the ground to avoid the severe infrastructure damage that comes with subsidence? How much further can we extend our sewer system without dramatically increasing the water deficit that it already operates at? How can we create greater density within the City's core without expensive upgrades to the aging and undersized infrastructure that this increased population will need to rely on? How do we pay for the exorbitant costs of desalinization, when a disproportionate number of our citizens are living at or near the poverty level?

It is crucial that we answer these questions before we continue with growth as usual, which leads us to our second question: Don't paint yourself into a corner. Our democracy thrives on having choices, but having choices requires flexibility. Flexibility only occurs when there is enough room

to maneuver. So, we need to ensure that the recommendations we make, and the actions we take, provide us with enough wiggle-room so that our choices aren't limited to crisis-based decisions. If we continue down the path of growth as usual, and blindly pursue a megalopolis that stretches from Mexico to Prescott, we may find that the ability to choose is no longer ours and a Federal Judge, or even nature, will make the choice for us.

Democracy also thrives on all voices being heard, and this leads us to our third lesson: We like to call this the all-hands-on-deck approach. For too long we have tolerated our political system where we elect our representatives, and then they largely ignore us while the special interests get their way. This has recently culminated in Town Halls and growth forums that are controlled by these special interests who mute the voice of our citizens, and then represent the outcome as community consensus. This needs to change. We can no longer accept that a handful of people know what is best for Tucson, while ignoring the vast untapped resource that is our citizens. It is in our citizens we have available to us a wealth of knowledge, expertise, life experience, and creative energy, and we need to utilize that resource.

Sustainability isn't just about conserving resources, it's also about utilizing those resources more efficiently, just as we can no longer afford to have water flowing off of our yards and onto our driveways, we can no longer afford to marginalize the talents and energy of one of our greatest untapped resources, our citizens. If we're going to turn this ship around, we need all hands on decks. This process has provided us with the opportunity to step back from the growth as usual abyss and assess the uncertainties of our community's water future.

As you draft your report, we hope that you will draw from the lessons of our current financial crisis and ensure that you practice caution in the context of uncertainty, avoid painting yourselves into a corner, and involve the entire community in achieving Tucson's sustainability.

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Thank you -

COLETTE ALTAFER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: - Colette. Tracy?

TRACY WILLIAMS: Next week, please.

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Next week? Okay. Kendall . . . and you - I'm going to ask you to pronounce your last name for me, Kendall.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Presenter # 4</b> <b>Kendall Kroesen representing Tucson</b> <b>Audubon SOciety</b></p>
---

KENDALL KROESEN: Kendall Kroesen from the Tucson Audubon Society.

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Okay. Thank you.

KENDALL KROESEN: There are two big problems with our current water delivery system. First, it assumes that humans are the only users of water. In the United - western United States, less than 1% of the total land area is covered by the lush riparian vegetation found along rivers, streams and washes. Yet, in Arizona and New Mexico, about 80% of all vertebrates depend on riparian areas for at least part of their life cycles. More than half of all bird species that reproduce in the region are heavily dependent on riparian areas. Riparian areas are among the most endangered ecosystems, along with wildlife that depends on them. Seventy percent of threatened and endangered vertebrates in Arizona depend on riparian habitat. Riparian vegetation often depends on the presence of surface water or high groundwater tables that come close to the surface. Groundwater pumping has severely compromised local riparian areas. The central historic natural resource for Tucson, the perennial flows, and rich wildlife habitat of the Santa Cruz River and Rillito have been eliminated.

We have a responsibility to conserve water for species that need water; to conserve riparian areas for their aesthetic value and other inherent qualities; and to protect the wildlife watching industry that represents a significant revenue stream for our region, and which is also heavily dependent on riparian areas.

Any Comprehensive Water Plan first must protect remaining high water tables that support riparian areas and strive to restore those that have been lost. Groundwater pumping has been reduced, at least temporarily, by importation of Colorado River Water, but there is a high monetary and environmental cost of this as well. We use - now use over 144,000 acre-feet, or nearly 47 billion gallons, annually from the Colorado River; it comes with a high energy cost and carbon footprint and contributes to the desiccation of the Colorado River Delta. The Delta was formerly one of the greatest freshwater estuaries in the world and now receives only one-tenth of 1% of river flow - the river's flow and, by one estimate, only 5% of its historic biological productivity. So, taking more water from the river, perhaps even maintaining our current level of use, should not be an option.

The second flaw in our current outlook is to confuse the true human need for potable water with the current

per-capita demand. Easily more than half of the water that we use in homes does not have to be potable. About 35% of the water used by Tucson commercial and industrial sites is used outdoors, and 45% of water used by single-family residences is used outdoors; much of that on landscaping. This does not represent a need for potable water; it represents a desire for water for landscaping and other potable uses. Tucson has started down the path toward using potable water only where potability is really called for, and substituting rainwater, gray water, and reclaimed water for other uses. Recently, approved City Ordinances are a welcome start, as are Tucson Water conservation efforts that were funded recently, but we can do much more. Conservation is always the least expensive step and, in the long run, the least painful step.

At the same time that we expend non-potable water delivery systems, we should not, in our haste, dedicate all reclaimed water for these purposes. It is important to maintain effluent flow in the Santa Cruz River, which is the only thing currently providing any semblance of the vegetative and wildlife richness of our unrestored rivers.

It is time to expand the Conservation Effluent Pool and determine a system for actually implementing its use. In addition to conservation, the Comprehensive Water Plan must link development policy within an assessment of how much water is - extraction is really sustainable, while protecting and restoring wildlife and riparian functions and protecting us from subsidence. It should identify areas off limits to groundwater pumping to should protect and restore groundwater supported streams, and it should include incentives for conservation and assurances to users that they are not conserving only to provide future growth capacity.

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Kendall, one minute, please.

MR. KROESEN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Thank you.

MR. KROESEN: A new Plan should (inaudible) various - very expensive and unproven technologies, and ones that would harm ecosystems in other regions, such as nuclear-powered desalinization or cloud-seeding; it should apply water rates that reflect not only the cost of acquiring and delivering water now, but the replacement cost of water being unsustainably removed from the system today. I believe we can meet these challenges. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Thank you, Kendall.

Tres English. Oh, there you are. Okay.

**Presenter # 5**  
**Tres English representing**  
**Sustainable Tucson**

TRES ENGLISH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Tres English. I'm also a member of Sustainable Tucson.

There's a lot of discussion about - a lot of confusion about what sustainability is. I think it actually has a very simple definition. Sustainability means nothing more, nothing less than the ability to sustain; it's that simple and that profound. The issue before us with respect to water is with all sorts of things; it's not an issue of: Do we have enough water? The issue before us is: Who are we and what do we need our water for?

Within the boundaries of the Tucson SMSA, the Standard Metro- - Metropolitan Statistical Area, which I believe is around 450 square miles, a large area, much larger than the City of Tucson, there's approximately a quarter of a million acre-feet of rainfall every year; that's more than we use for everything in this metropolitan area; that comes out to over 80,000 gallons per person per year of rainfall; it's a huge amount of water, and we waste almost all of it. Only about 4% of the water we use we receive ends up as recharge in the ground, and most of what gets used is spent on decorative purposes; it's not spent for anything that would really constitute a high priority in a desert. The issue is not: Do we have enough water? It's who are we and enough water for what?

Sustainability is really an issue of rights and priorities. Do we - do we have a right, as citizens, to water? That's an issue that I bet you've never even thought of, let alone seen any serious discussion of. Do we have a right to water here in this desert community? And what do we need to use our water for? We don't talk about needs. We don't talk about priorities. We talk about demand. Well, there's a lot of things that we might want, and if you've got enough money you can get it under our system because, with the current rights - or with the current issue of - of rights, we do have rights. As citizens, we have the lowest right of any water user in the metropolitan area. Current residents have the lowest right for water. Higher users are turf users. They are new development, all sorts of different things where we have a systematic policy of forcing current users to decrease their water use, to pay for the infrastructure to expand the water capacity so we can give water away to more people; that, to me, says that the current users have the lowest possible priority for - for water.

And then the issue of priorities is very simply: How much money you got? If you're poor and you want to use your water for a high-efficiency garden that would feed your family, you're going to be paying the same rate as a rich family that has a large grass - grass lawn. So, we have priorities and they're totally screwed up.

Sustainability is really - if we want to become a sustainability community, we have to do two things: We have to set priorities and we have to establish rights. To date, we have not done any - either of those. To do that, we really need to have a basic community dialogue. What are the - who have - who has rights? And what do we need our water for? Does La Oeste Gardens - which is a commercial garden here in town, over an acre that sells to several of the Farmer's Markets - should they pay the same rate as a decorative lawn? Right now, the answer is "Yes, they pay the highest rate for water in Tucson." Is that the priorities we want to set for this community? Should the environment have a lower priority than new development for water? Do current users have to give up their water in order to provide for additional users? That is a priority - a dialogue that has not occurred in this community. And if we want to become a sustainable community, we must have that - that discussion. The issue is not: Do we have water? The issue is: For whom and for what? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Thank you, Tres.  
Linda Ellinor.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Presenter #5</b> <b>Linda Ellinor representing</b> <b>Sustainable Tucson</b></p>
--

LINDA ELLINOR: Thank you. My name is Linda Ellinor. I'm also with Sustainable Tucson. I'm actually a recent member. I've been involved in social change for about 15 years, and I'm very pleased that this kind of participation is happening between citizen groups and, you know, such as this. I think really this kind of problem in terms of water and anything that's challenging us environmentally right now in terms of peak oil and global climate change really has to come from local regional work.

My talk, actually, is going to build a bit on what Tres talked about in terms of human right to water. I'm coming at this more with respect to privatization and the dangers of what I see happening in our world today in terms of increased drive for for-profit distribution and management and ownership of water. A lot of my comments are taken from this book. I really recommend it. The title is, "Blue Covenant, the Global

Water Crisis and the Coming Battle for the Right to Water," by Maude Barlow; it was published in 19- - or 2007.

The main point I want to make is that there is an essential conflict of interest in following the path of privatization and what is referred to as "co-modification of water resources." This comes in the face of a continued push by recent legislation that opens up opportunities for private investments in the water industry. The conflict of interest is that for-profit concerns are not motivated to conserve water resources, nor are they motivated to provide what we might call "universal distribution," some of what Tres was suggesting. People at the margins, for instance, of a community might be not able to afford water delivery if the prices were too high.

These private interests are whetted to very expensive technological solutions, as you might imagine, that may even lead to more serious challenges regarding peak oil and climate change. I'm talking about large desalinization plants, for instance, and - as some other people have mentioned - the transportation of water to this area from outside the area.

Some 30 years ago, privatization hardly existed in water management. The U.S., Canada, and most of Europe all used a public model for water distribution and management. France and England were the exceptions; they used a private model, which created three very large transnational corporations. They're known as Suez, Deolia, and the Water Thames Company. These three private corporations were perfectly poised to provide for-profit service to third world countries.

We're probably all familiar with World Bank and IMF policies over the last ten to 15 years that have caused quite a lot of disastrous things to happen in that area. These Washington consensus policies put out by the World Bank and IMS - or IMF - are now being seen as having had many disastrous effects. With respect to water, the point I want to make is every time a country's water system has been privatized, it has resulted in waste, corruption, the cutoff of service to the country's poorest peoples, and problems of pollution and wastewater.

Luckily, in North America, we have had a history of the public model. However, today the big three European water companies have bought out the three biggest American private water companies; those are U.S. Filter, United Water, and American Water. These companies and others are now running water systems in such cities as Atlanta, New Orleans, Tampa, Indianapolis, Oklahoma City, Stockton, Milwaukee, Springfield, Pittsburgh, Honolulu, to name just a few. The goal of these private concerns is to control 70% of the U.S. market within two decades. To me, as a citizen, that's frightening.

Just to give you a sense of how the U.S. water industry has shifted in nature over the last few years, the following: Between 1995 and 1998, only half a million dollars was spent on campaign contributions by water companies. In the elections of 2000 and 2002, campaign spending more than tripled. Because of lobbying, federal laws now have been changed that require utilities to consider private partnerships with water companies before they receive federal assistance. So, you see what's happening, there's a lot of pressure on communities, such as ours, to privatize. Because of these new laws, privatization of water services doubled throughout the '90s. Quote, "New liberalized federal tax laws are allowing municipalities to enter into long-term private water utility contracts of up to 20 years. In 1997, only 400 of these long-term contracts were in existence. In 2006, the number grew to 1,600, with over 15% of Americans being serviced by these public/private partnerships." Keep in mind that in long-term contracts, the difficulty is that even if the city decides to go with it, it's very hard to pull out.

Let's back up for a moment and consider some of the underlying dynamics that's leading to this.

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Linda, one minute, please.

LINDA ELLINOR: Oh, boy. Okay. For-profit businesses target dwindling national - natural resources, such as water, because of the large profit potential to be made. I'm not going to cover a lot of these statistics; they're here in my - my notes. It is one of the most profitable investment opportunities right - right now out there, which is why privatization is happening so fast.

So, we have surface water pollution. So - so, the point is: It's not that we are running out of water, exactly, water is becoming scarce; it's not that we're actually running out of it; it's that we're running out of fresh water resources. And, when you have a scarce resource and you have growing population as we do then, all of a sudden, the profit potential just skyrockets, so that 's one reason why privatization is happening.

So, what does all this mean to Tucson? One, there will be government incentives and financial pressures to enter into long-term public/private water contracts, and wherever these have happened, as I have said, they have been a disaster. One example was in East London where the Mayor was actually fighting the proposal to put in a desalinization plant because he said, "Hey, you guys are wasting so much water because the infrastructure of the plant that you're already running is so bad."

There's a new practice now of buying, trading and selling bulk water and water rights; it's called "water mining." Well, I'm not clear exactly how that might affect Tucson, there are developers coming into Nevada and Arizona buying up large tracts of water rights. One such company owns more than 135,000 acre-feet of water rights, currently worth more than \$500 million, and is planning to hold on to the water and to buy up more because the price of water is steadily going up in this region. Clearly, we need to be vigilant about who owns water rights in our area and not allow them to be transferred into private hands.

There another phenomena of bottled water - I won't go into - it's very wasteful. It'd be wonderful we could - if we could take a leading position and, perhaps, create incentives for this very wasteful practice to not continue to increase in our area.

There's also some very high-priced technological solutions that I've also already mentioned - desalinization - and others have mentioned as well. We should stay away from those and not allow private enterprise to twist our arm to bring them in.

By keeping water in the public sector, or what we might call "the commons," Tucson can avoid the many pitfalls that other cities have faced in privatization efforts. Public ownership will allow us to take the active role in water conservation that does not occur in for-profit ventures. We need to be focusing our efforts on keeping our precious rainwater in Tucson's local watershed. The practices that have already been mentioned can help us do that, such as roof gardens in family homes and office buildings, urban planning that allows rainwater to be captured and returned to the earth, and water harvesting in food production.

Continued public ownership, we - we - will allow us to monitor - monitor our use of groundwater supply so that we do not extract them at a greater rate than natural recharge; that's the real meaning of sustainability; it's like a bank account. We can't take out more than we can put back in. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Thank you, Linda.

That is - is everybody we have on the list. Do we have anybody else that's not on the list that wants to speak?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can I (inaudible)?

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: No, I've already said I'm not calling on you. You're sitting here. Well, no. We don't have any other speakers.

Does the Committee want to indulge in any conversation, or do you want to do Call to the Audience and go

home early? Call to the Audience. Anybody want to comment?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Okay. I'll entertain a motion for adjournment.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER: Chairman, I motion that we adjourn.

CHAIRMAN JIM BARRY: Second? I want to thank everybody who came and spoke. We will - we'll do again next week. We'll - probably going to have more people. Very, very helpful comments and - and I appreciate it. Thank you very much.

(Conclusion of meeting.)

\* \* \* \* \*

#### **CERTIFICATE**

I hereby certify that, to the best of my ability, the foregoing is a true and accurate transcription of the audio recording of (Sustainability Discussion) of the City/County Water & Wastewater Study Oversight Committee Meeting held on October 22, 2008.

Transcription completed: October 30, 2008.

---

DANIELLE L. KRASSOW-TISDALE