

## Brenda Garcia

---

**From:** Angie Gelsinon [angie@kaneenpr.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, October 29, 2010 11:53 AM  
**To:** Melaney Seacat; Nicole Ewing-Gavin  
**Subject:** FW: E-mail from TucsonPimaWaterStudy.com - Comments

Sorry this comment was caught in the spam filer - sorry for the late delivery.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** noreply@tucsonpimawaterstudy.com  
[mailto:noreply@tucsonpimawaterstudy.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 07, 2010 12:15 PM  
**To:** info@tucsonpimawaterstudy.com  
**Subject:** E-mail from TucsonPimaWaterStudy.com - Comments

Email Address: eaverburg@yahoo.com

**Comments/Questions:** The Tucson Mountains Association provides the following comments on the draft action plan:

**Overall Comment:** We congratulate the Action Plan Team Members for the comprehensive and coordinated approach to water sustainability. Key components of a successful plan are addressed, including: 1) integration of land use, infrastructure and water resources planning, 2) effluent, 3) gray water, 4) water harvesting, 5) environmental needs, 6) sensitive riparian ecosystems, and 7) many other important elements for a successful effort. The plan does not rely on additional resources to move forward, but recognizes the need for additional partnerships and outside funding when feasible. We congratulate the group on the thoughtful integration across the various segments of the action plan. Suggested modifications are noted below:

**Comprehensive Integrated Planning (page 11):** Regarding the indicators of future success, it might be better to have the first indicator read as follows: Percent change in residential units/acre. There may be some instances where increased density is not the best outcome.

**Effluent Management (pp. 19-21, and 23--indicator number 2):** We are concerned that the previous earmark of effluent for the environment should be maintained into the future as our population expands. According to the Phase 1 Report, water resources currently available total 217,444 acre feet. Only 10,000 acre feet have been reserved for the Conservation Effluent Pool, or 4.6 percent. We believe this CEP allocation, which is being revisited again in this draft report, should be the minimum amount earmarked for the environment. It should not be redirected to aquifer augmentation. This is true especially with regard to the contaminants (e.g., pharmaceuticals) that may remain in the effluent in the long run if it were placed in retention pools used to augment the aquifer. If more effluent is produced due to growth in the four designated areas, the additional resource logically could go to irrigation or additional environmental needs as development occurs.

Dr. Edwin A. Verburg  
President  
743-7728

Do you wish to receive emails and posted mail information from the Water Infrastructure, Supply and Planning Study?

No

