



COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE
130 WEST CONGRESS, 10TH FLOOR
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701



CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
P.O. Box 27210
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85726-7210

**CITY/COUNTY WATER AND WASTEWATER STUDY
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
(Also known as the Regional Water Study Oversight Committee)**

**April 18, 2008
Meeting Summary**

1. Call to Order

Chairman James Barry called the April 18, 2008 meeting of the City/County Water and Wastewater Study Oversight Committee (Oversight Committee) to order at 8:05 AM, in the Manning House, 450 West Paseo Redondo, Tucson, Arizona.

Members Present:

Jim Barry, Chairman
John Carlson
Bob Cook
Marcelino Flores
Bruce Gungle
Rob Kulakofsky
Daniel Sullivan
Mark Stratton
Sean Sullivan
James Watson
Carol Zimmerman

Representing:

Citizens Water Advisory Committee (CWAC)
Wastewater Management Advisory Committee (WMAC)
County Planning & Zoning (P&Z) Commission
WMAC
County P&Z Commission
WMAC
CWAC
WMAC
City Planning Commission
City Planning Commission
CWAC

Members Absent:

Bonnie Poulos
Tina Lee

Representing:

County P&Z Commission
CWAC

City/County Staff Present:

John M. Bernal, Deputy County Administrator, Public Works
Nicole Fyffe, Pima County Administrator's Office
Melaney Seacat, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Nicole Ewing-Gavin, City Manager's Office
Andrew Greenhill, Mayor's Office
John Thomas, Tucson Water
Dennis Rule, Tucson Water
Tedra Fox, County Sustainability Manger

Adam Smith, City, Department of Urban Planning & Design
Albert Kin, Tucson Water
Mitch Basefsky, Tucson Water
David Smith, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Sandy Eller, Tucson Water
Phil Simon, Tucson Water
Leslie Liberti, Director, City Office of Conservation & Sustainable Development
Mae Anderson, Ward 1, City Council
Katie Bolger, Ward 2, City Council
Holly Lachowicz, Ward 3, City Council
Andy Squire, Ward 4, City Council
Arlan Colton, County Planning Director
Marie Pearthree, Tucson Water
Ilene Grossman, Tucson Water
Patrick Cavanaugh, Executive Aide, Supervisor Ann Day
Jeff Nichols, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
David Schaller, City Office of Conservation & Sustainable Development
Eric Wieduwilt, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Sandra Current, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Casiolda Quinones, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Ed Curley, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Tom Barry, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Rose Hylton, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Suzy Hunt, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes The Committee approved the minutes of the April 9, 2008 Oversight Committee meeting.
3. Call to the Audience There was no response from the audience.
4. Discussion of Committee Organization, Meeting Days/Time/Location

Oversight Committee members discussed possible days, times and locations for committee meetings. Some members expressed that they would like some meetings held during evenings and weekends and at various locations in order to involve the public as much as possible. It was also suggested that Channel 12 record the Oversight Committee meetings because this is such an important policy discussion. Members noted that the Oversight Committee needed to make sure the process remains open and inclusive.

5. Discussion of Public Outreach Process to be Reported to Tucson Mayor and Council and Pima County Board of Supervisors
 - A. Overview of Other Public Processes

Dr. Barry stressed that this was the first of many meetings and outreach the Oversight Committee would hold on the issue of overview of other public processes. This will not be the only meeting at which the Oversight Committee will be asking for input from the public. He noted that this committee has two tasks: 1) to provide oversight for Tucson

Water and the Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department as they work through Phase I and Phase II of the Water Study's approved Scope of Work; and 2) to provide a report and recommendations to the City of Tucson Mayor and Council and the Pima County Board of Supervisors on the public participation process for the Water Study. Dr. Barry reminded Oversight Committee members that this committee is only tasked with Phases I and II of the Water Study. The public participation process will go on through Phases III, IV and V of the Water Study. Today, we are primarily asking what kind of public process does the Oversight Committee want to recommend to the Mayor and Council and the Board of Supervisors.

B. Sharon Megdal Presentation on Water Resources Research Center (WRRC) Study

Dr. Barry introduced Dr. Sharon Megdal, Director of the University of Arizona Water Resources Research Center (WRRC). He informed Oversight Committee members that he had asked Dr. Megdal to tell the Oversight Committee about a study the WRRC is conducting which is germane to the Water Study – the Tucson Regional Water Planning Perspective Study. The WRRC Study interviewed approximately 50 leaders in the community and asked a series of questions about their perspectives on water issues. These individuals were being interviewed in their roles as representing constituencies, organizations and groups as opposed to their personal opinions. Questions asked included what should be the goals of a regional process, what issues and projects should be on/off the table – who should be around the table – also what should be the roles of organizations such as the Central Arizona Project (CAP) and the Department of Water Resources, what should be the focus, what assumptions should we use to inform the process, what about the outcomes, what are your thoughts about a regional water authority, and what are your concerns about engaging in a regional process. Two specific questions dealt with public involvement: 1) who should be involved in the process and who should lead the process; and 2) how would the process incorporate stakeholders and public comment. These interviews were conducted from about the beginning of March 2008 through the beginning of April 2008. The intent is to get a draft of the report out by the end of April 2008 to those who were interviewed to give them a chance to provide feedback. Dr. Megdal anticipated the final report would be released by the end of May 2008.

Dr. Megdal highlighted some of the initial results of the WRRC Study. All interview participants agreed that opportunities for meaningful public comment are critical to the success of any regional planning. The majority felt it should be as inclusive as possible. The models for participation cited by interviewees were the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan, the Regional Transportation Authority, and ArizonaTown Hall with a public comment period. There was no general agreement on one approach versus another. What interviewees did highlight in many instances was that education was essential to this type of a regional process. Whatever is done, they felt that education was critical to the process. There was no consensus at all on who in general should lead this type of water planning process. Many did feel that an independent facilitator would be needed at some point in this process – just by sheer magnitude of the issues involved.

Dr. Megdal expressed that the WRRC as well as other colleges of the University of Arizona would like to help if there is a role for them. She informed Oversight Committee members that the WRRC self-initiated the funding of this particular study. It was not paid for by any interest group.

C. Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR) Presentation on Process for Fourth Management Plan

Dr. Barry introduced Ken Seasholes, Area Director for the Tucson Active Management Area (AMA).

Mr. Seasholes provided background on AMAs which were established in 1980 as a part of the Ground Water Management Act. To help establish a framework for achieving long-range goals, the Act established five management periods and plans. He informed Oversight Committee members that we are rapidly approaching the Fourth Management Period. These management plans are a compellation of background information/trends as well as regulatory provisions associated with conservation programs administered by the State of Arizona. Formal oversight for the management plans/process is governed by the Groundwater Users Advisory Council, a five member body appointed by the governor.

In the past, the management plans were associated with very extensive public processes. The decision was made a number of years ago that the Fourth Management Plan would be different than the previous ones, in part because of staffing levels but also in part because some of the requirements have been codified and due to a narrowing of the statute. The Fourth Management Plan, from the ADWR's perspective, will be a staged effort, and based primarily on data and analysis. ADWR is wrapping up the volume of the water atlas – data from all of the basins within the state has been collected. This will show what happened in the large management areas. Internal to the ADWR, extensive effort is going into evaluating historic data, which will allow ADWR to make an up-to-date assessment. Mr. Seasholes informed Oversight Committee members that there are localized areas of overdraft (e.g. Green Valley and Northwest Pima County).

Mr. Seasholes anticipated the Fourth Management Plan would be completed in mid to late fall 2008. For each of the AMAs involved, ADWR will conduct a public outreach effort. Discussion followed.

John Carlson suggested that the Groundwater Users Advisory Council would be a good source for how to frame the infrastructure inventory.

Bob Cook noted that the Tucson area had benefited from speakers from various areas around the world who have discussed best practices in other parts of the world. He asked if there would be any peer review of the Fourth Management Plan by international experts. Mr. Seasholes responded there was not a particular nexus for that kind effort, but would welcome any suggestions.

D. Carol Zimmerman Central Arizona Water Conservation District (CAWCD or CAP) Strategic Plan Presentation

Ms. Zimmerman provided a brief overview of the CAWCD Strategic Plan, and also provided Oversight Committee members with copies of the Plan. She noted that the Strategic Plan could also be accessed on CAWCD's website (http://www.cap-az.com/docs/Approved_Plan%20Rev%201.pdf). The Strategic Plan governs the entire CAP project, and Tucson is the largest municipal user.

Ms. Zimmerman expressed that there were three strategic issues that would be very important in terms of understanding regional water planning: 1) improving Colorado River reliability; 2) developing new water supplies for the CAP Three County Area (Maricopa, Pinal and Pima). 3) Establishing a collaborative process when new supplies need to be acquired and what entities get those supplies and taking a leadership role in acquiring those supplies.

In terms of improving Colorado River reliability and the future of water, we need to look at three objectives. These are (in order of priority) reduce the risk associated with CAP's junior priority, manage the River to optimize existing supply and augment Colorado River supplies.

Ms. Zimmerman informed Oversight Committee members that position papers related to the junior priorities and augmentation as well as information about a recently formed (2008) Future Water Supplies Team are also available on CAP's website.

Ms. Zimmerman, referring to the CAWCD Strategic Plan, noted the goal of aggressively pursuing consensus resolution of issues surrounding Pima County CAP reliability. A terminal source in Pima County was a part the CAP's 1986 original Strategic Plan. That commitment said that the Tucson AMA should have reliability equal to the other counties and currently it does not. There has been a lot of work by people on the northwest side including Mark Stratton, ADWR and the Bureau of Reclamation (for the Tohono O'Odome), and Tucson Water as far as what reliability should look like. Discussion followed.

Mr. Cook asked if County water providers could take any more CAP reallocation and recharge it? Sandy Eller, Tucson Water staff, responded this summer Tucson Water would be purchasing its full allocation of CAP water.

Returning to the topic of public participation, Melaney Seacat, Pima County Project Coordinator, said in response to a request from the Oversight Committee at the April 9, 2008 meeting, staff completed an evaluation of (to this point) nine public participation processes. This included the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan, East Valley Water Forum, TREO Economic Blueprint, PAG 2030 Regional Transportation Plan, "Program for Active Community Engagement; Tucson Water presented different processes with Mid-sized – Avra Valley Citizens Oversight Committee, Tucson Water: Large – Decision H2O, City of Tucson, Public Safety Impact Fees, Pima County Inclusive Home Design Ordinance and Pima County Bond Program. In addition, staff

will be reviewing the Regional Transportation Authority process. The Report lists methods for public information, public involvement and the scope of the various studies as well as outcomes. Oversight Committee members received copies of the Report for their review. Discussion followed.

Ms. Zimmerman said knowing how people were appointed to these various committees would be of particular interest in terms of the Oversight Committee's recommendations. Dr. Barry informed meeting attendees that the Oversight Committee will soon have a website and everything handed out at the meetings will be posted on the website. He also requested that if anybody has other public participation ideas to please let the Oversight Committee know.

E. Recommendations from Interested Organizations and Individuals on How Public Outreach Process Should be Organized

Dr. Barry requested that everyone wishing to speak fill out guest speaker cards. The following members of the public spoke:

- Barbara Johnson, Public Works Director, Town of Marana, presented requests in three specific areas. These included: 1) clearly defining the roles and responsibilities of each of the members on the Oversight Committee and define terms such as "community," "local" and "regional"; 2) providing a peer review process for the outcomes of each phase of the Water Study which would include other municipalities; and 3) involving other representatives on the Oversight Committee from the surrounding communities (e.g., Marana, Oro Valley, Sahuarita as well as Native American groups not currently represented). In addition, Ms. Johnson expressed that Phases I and II goals of the Water Study could not be complete without the involvement of the other affected communities. She also expressed particular concern about Phases IV and V of the Water Study, which address policy issues. The Town of Marana would like to participate in how these are formed. She felt this would enable communities to engage at a local level. Ms. Johnson also presented a letter from Michael Reuwsaat, Marana Town Manager to Dr. Barry outlining the Town's position.
- David Crockett, Superintendent of Flowing Wells Irrigation District and President Southern Arizona Water Users Association, expressed that he was present as representative of SAWUA and read from a prepared statement. He noted that the members of SAWUA are the experts who should be consulted with or before any decisions are made that will have a long-term impact on water in this region. SAWUA previously proposed a voluntary nonprofit organization be created that would obtain, manage and use renewable water supplies. Its primary task would be to find and secure additional water resources for the Tucson region and serve as a wholesale water provider to its members. SAWUA would be pleased to provide more information to the Oversight Committee about its original proposal for a cooperative water organization. As a representative of a large number of entities and very important sector in the community, SAWUA is requesting a seat at the table in any future regional water discussions. Mr. Crockett provided a written copy of his remarks to the Oversight Committee.

- Debbie Collazo, private citizen, noted that at the first meeting of the Oversight Committee on April 9, 2008, both the County Administrator and the City Manager stated that they are not looking for a particular outcome from this committee. Ms. Collazo offered a comment on the important distinction regarding how the Oversight Committee provides information to citizens, both through its new website and other forms of media. Because the Oversight Committee is not seeking a pre-determined outcome, Ms. Collazo expressed that information should be provided in a balanced, objective fashion. The presentations should be educational, rather than public relations. On the Oversight Committee's website, if studies or research are made available, funded by government or special interest groups, she requested that citations be included to give their constituents an opportunity to talk directly with them about water. Ms. Collazo noted that the Pima County Board of Supervisors voted on April 1, 2008 to host a public forum this August on these issues. Ms. Collazo thanked the Oversight Committee for volunteering for this important task.
- Tracy Williams, private citizen and Sustainable Tucson Committee member, indicated that she was speaking on behalf of herself and stated that she was glad to see that this was an open, public process. She felt there was an extreme lack of trust when it comes to the water issue. She felt one of the Oversight Committee's primary objectives was to rebuild that trust in the community and full disclosure of all information was important. She also expressed that the infrastructure aspect of the Water Study was extremely interesting to all citizens who are now becoming lay experts in water – they do not want to be excluded from any part of this process and the subcommittees also need to be open to the public. She expressed that neighborhoods and citizens are the largest stakeholders in this community and she would like the meetings of the Oversight Committee noticed in the newspapers. She suggested that the next meeting of the Oversight Committee be held in the evening so working people have access to this very important Water Study. She noted that the City Department of Neighborhood Resources can notify Presidents of Neighborhood Association very easily via email. She said the City of Tucson Ward offices also have newsletters and no-cost outreach to their citizens. She expressed that we do not want to see a repeat of the processes that have happened in the past where elite people in the foothills and elsewhere start establishing the agenda – we want this to be a very clear and very open process. She also would like to encourage some inclusion on the subcommittees by members of the public.
- Nancy Freeman, Executive Director, Groundwater Awareness League, stated that she lives in the Town of Green Valley and the Town has a 40,000 acre foot water deficit. She also mentioned that this deficit number was not public, she had to dig out these numbers herself over a long process, and the number she used for natural recharge is from a 1997 number – she could not find anything more recent than that. Ms. Freeman then reviewed some information on the history of water management in Arizona. She noted that in the last five years, the number of customers in her water company has doubled even though in her area they have a 40,000 acre foot deficit. She also said that in 2006 and 2007 about 50 people from around Arizona committed their time for one and one-half years for a study of rural situations and to bring up legislation for adequate water supplies in rural areas. The

legislation was not passed by the state legislature. Ms. Freeman commented further that we do have ADWR and the Tucson AMA and expressed that they are wonderful regional managers, but the problem is the state legislation and also the money to do the project.

- Diana Lett, Feldman's Neighborhood Association, expressed that holding meetings evenings and weekends would be better because most working people cannot attend meetings during the week. She noted that many in the audience represented various bureaucratic entities and the developers. Addressing the Committee's outreach activities, Ms. Lett suggested that a place for including email addresses be included on meeting sign-in sheets. She also suggested the Oversight Committee get access to the list server of the City's Department of Neighborhood Resources in addition to notifying the presidents of the neighborhood associations as they might want to have information posted on these list servers. In addition Ms. Lett agreed with posting meeting notices in newspapers, and recommended posting meeting notices at public libraries. She also thought the Pima Council on Aging could reach people that do not have internet access. She expressed that it was not acceptable to not have broad-based outreach to the community.
- Anne Mehochko, Vice President for Public Affairs, Tucson Realtors Association, commended the City and County for setting out with a plan to address regional water issues. She encouraged the Oversight Committee to reach out to make the Committee's meetings as accessible as possible so that all interested parties be able to participate in this discussion. The Association would also encourage the participation of other communities such as Marana and Oro Valley. She suggested possibly including experts in their fields at the table on the subcommittee level. Ms. Mehochko expressed the Association's strong support for this effort, and its desire that the process be inclusive. The Association wants to be partners in trying to make the Tucson region as prosperous as possible.
- Alex Jácome, Southern Arizona Home Builders Association, noted that the reason the Oversight Committee exists is because there has been no political willingness to address regional water planning and conservation (i.e., the City of Tucson or Pima County). He noted that the members of the Oversight Committee have been appointed by the City and County and the program is somewhat suspect that nothing will come of it – he expressed that he hoped it would be just the opposite. Mr. Jácome expressed that if this was really going to succeed, it behooved the Oversight Committee to think out of the box and not necessarily adhere to the scope as proposed by the City and the County. He added that a consideration should be recharge upstream - heard the lady from Green Valley that it is strange that all of our recharge is done north of Pima County where it will benefit the entire County and metropolitan areas. It does the basin no good to recharge downstream unless you are in Pinal County or Marana, of course. After the latest efforts to amend the water portion of the Pima County Comprehensive Plan, it is critical to address the process. He added that Pima County went to a lot of work to get its story out to disparate groups to explain its position. He said the problem with it was that there was no stakeholder group input as a body; therefore, there was no consensus. He urged this body to consider establishing a stakeholder

subcommittee to provide input - made up of such possible groups as Southern Arizona Leadership Council, Tucson Association of Realtors, Southern Arizona Home Builders Association, Metropolitan Pima Alliance, Alliance of Construction Trades, Arizona Builders Alliance, Tucson Utility Contractors Association, Audubon Society, Nature Conservancy and the other municipal jurisdictions such as Marana. He said the invitation should be extended – if they choose not to attend, at least the Oversight Committee would have extended the invitation.

- Dale Keyes, private citizen, identified himself as retired from University of Arizona, Udall Center and with expertise in environmental conflict resolution. Mr. Keyes expressed that he was relatively unfamiliar with the charge of the Oversight Committee. He spoke to the general principles of public involvement. Mr. Keyes said people in his area of expertise often speak of a “spectrum” of involvement from informed to consult to collaborate. He informed Oversight Committee members that, as it suggests, informed means that a body like this committee would put out information for the public to digest. It also suggests that you put out information and solicit feedback and new ideas, and importantly you tell the public how you used their input so there is accountability. At the far end of the spectrum is collaborating – what is being done here by the Oversight Committee– the stakeholders. He noted that seniors, males and Anglos seem to be pretty well represented on the Oversight Committee. Mr. Keyes suggested that the Oversight Committee consider adding those other representative parts of the population on subcommittees. He suggested the Oversight Committee look at making a public involvement plan and continuing involvement during the whole duration of the Water Study. Try to make meetings at convenient times and locations at places other than just downtown Tucson. He suggested the Oversight Committee think of a variety of forums (e.g., breakout groups and focused discussions). Mr. Keyes suggested keeping meetings/forums structured around specific questions or issues but be prepared to respond to things that are not on the agenda – at least have a plan for how to address those in another form. He also asked the Oversight Committee to keep in mind that the public often suffers from process fatigue. There are whole series of continuing special study groups and on-going governance meetings – be prepared to explain to the public how the Oversight Committee’s public outreach program is different from other on-going processes as well.
- Jim Kiser, Vice President, Southern Arizona Leadership Council, reviewed for Oversight Committee members his view of how the Oversight Committee came about so that we can be sure that everyone here understands the critically important role to have to play in our community. He noted that in November 2006, Supervisors Richard Elias and Sharon Bronson and Councilwoman Karin Ulrich sent a letter to the City Manager and County Administrator asking them to put together a scope of work for a comprehensive water study “collaborative effort to better our area’s water future.” The Leadership Council supported regional planning, but it had questions. Specifically when talking about “our areas water future,” were they talking only about the City and County or were they talking about the entire region? What did they mean by a collaborative effort, who did they want involved – did they intend for the City and County to involve other jurisdictions or to work alone? The Leadership Council asked these questions, and the answer they received was trust us. On

February 7, 2007, the Leadership Council and several other business organizations sent a letter to the City Council and Board of Supervisors asking that they submit to a process that is open, inclusive, regional and solution oriented. A week after sending their letter, Mr. Huckelberry and Mr. Hein released their draft scope for the Water Study. The Leadership Council and business interests liked the Water study overall, but had some concerns that in some places, even in Phases I and II, the Scope was proposing that the City and County make decisions on their own that should include other jurisdictions and other water providers as well as the general public. The Leadership Council wrote a second letter expressing their concerns, and a few days later the City Council called for the formation of the Oversight Committee and then Mr. Huckelberry sent a letter defending the scope of work to the Board of Supervisors. According to Mr. Kiser, Mr. Huckelberry criticized the Leadership Council and business groups saying their concerns were premature and not accurate and wondering in writing whether this group could provide a public involvement plan. As Vice President of the Southern Arizona Leadership Council, Mr. Kiser said he was also speaking on behalf of local businesses and other organizations that are concerned with this process. He noted the group is not business alone – they are beginning to work with environmental organizations and other water providers who share the group’s concerns. He said they remain committed to the values that they have expressed throughout – they want a process that has no predetermined outcomes, a process that is open, inclusive, regional and solution oriented. They want a process that provides for the most involvement with these decisions by those who are most directly affected by the outcomes. He added if the Oversight Committee devised a process with these qualities, the Oversight Committee would have the group’s total support. He expressed that the Oversight Committee may have to rethink its role as a committee. He was concerned that the Oversight Committee may view its role not as broadly as he thought it needed to. He noted that at the April 9, 2008 meeting of the Oversight Committee, he praised the revised scope of the study but expressed concerns about several areas of Phases I and II that were much too broad for the City and County to work on alone – they affect other jurisdictions and providers – and that was the argument that he raised. Afterward, he was told that the issues he raised were outside the scope of the work of the Oversight Committee. He expressed that he would like to encourage the Oversight Committee to determine what is in fact the scope of its work. He hoped that the Oversight Committee would consider the scope of the Water Study and make recommendations for changing it as the Committee thinks appropriate – especially for bringing more regional involvement to Phases I and II – so that all who are interested have an opportunity to participate in making those decisions. Mr. Kiser said he would email his written statement to the Dr. Barry.

- Madeline Kiser, private citizen and Sustainable Tucson Committee member, presented a process which she felt would be helpful in identifying “what is a water fact.” She felt this was precisely what was dividing the community. She referred to information that went out yesterday on the website (<http://www.sustainabletucson.org/>) of the Sustainable Water Committee. This information pertains to a range of public scenarios related to water supply created by a team of local, state and also outside experts with experience in holistic and adaptive management to compliment experts with more traditional engineering and

economic backgrounds. She expressed that Phase V of the Water Study should be incorporated into Phase I. She noted that a number of our water documents do not acknowledge openly what internationally is being done to address sound water management in this time of climate change. She expressed that given the range of scenarios the area might face and the potential for rapid change in the region, Phase I of the Water Study, needs to articulate our shared values. A clear understandable document is needed which presents the range of scenarios the region might face. This document should articulate holistic and humanitarian values related to water and solutions. Additionally, it should clearly and transparently evaluate high tech solutions in terms of their potential social, environmental and economic costs need to be presented to the public in a variety of media. Ms. Kiser expressed that a cross-sector regional water advisory group should be created. Ms. Kiser said she would provide a hard copy of her remarks.

- Mike Nicksic, private citizen, expressed that the definition of what is open and public in 2008 is radically different from what was open and public in previous years. He suggested an on-line archive of all the documents which are submitted to the Oversight Committee and a list of meeting attendees – especially all of the people who speak be created/included on the Oversight Committee's new website. In addition, he suggested that staff look into electronic recording of the meetings for download with an idea that it might mitigate some of the public misapprehensions. Mr. Nicksic commented that he would like to see more engagement from the members of the Oversight Committee with the public possibly through individual blogs or communication on the Committee's website once its established.
- Ken Taylor, Board Chairman, Community Water Company of Green Valley and representative of the Upper Santa Cruz Providers and Users Group (USCPG), expressed that he was at the meeting to represent the USCPG, which is a diverse recently formed group less than six months in existence. The USCPG's areas of interest covers two communities one of which is an incorporated community with strong resident connections to the work place in Tucson and the other is an unincorporated retirement community. The thing they both have in common is a strong sense of community availability and an insistence in having a role in shaping the future of their communities. USCPG's current priority is to bring CAP water to address the area's water deficit in the Greater Green Valley-Sahuarita area. He noted that the USCPG does not consider a 100 year water supply an adequate definition for the community's future – they hope to have an indefinite future. USCPG supports regionalism.
- Wavalene Romero, Legislative Representative for the Tohono O'Odham Nation, expressed her appreciation to Ms. Seacat for forwarding the meeting notice. The Tohono O'Odham Nation appreciates being included, and would like early notice of the meetings. Ms. Romero expressed the Nation's appreciation for the efforts of the Oversight Committee.
- Carolyn Campbell, Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection member, noted that one of the public processes that is being considering is akin to the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan Steering Committee. Ms. Campbell offered some

comments/insights that she learned from the Steering Committee's process. She noted that everyone that asked to be on the Steering Committee was accepted. The stakeholders were only people interested in conservation, native species and land use in unincorporated Pima County. Ms. Campbell informed the Oversight Committee that the Steering Committee never had a chair or officers because of the breath of the stakeholders. Instead, the Steering Committee had a paid facilitator. It never had any subcommittees until the last six months. After four years of deliberation, the Steering Committee presented a set of recommendations to the Board of Supervisors. Ms. Campbell expressed that you cannot come up with a community consensus on an issue of this magnitude if you kind of pick from the middle 60 percent of the interested people – you really have to have the broadest spectrum possible. In addition, Ms. Campbell felt the Water Study process would take much longer than anticipated.

- Daniel Sullivan, CWAC and Oversight Committee member, shared his perception of the work of the Oversight Committee in response to Ms. Campbell's remarks. The final resolution of all of the issues that have to be addressed related to water calls for a grouping of all of the stakeholders together. He viewed that this is the Oversight Committee's task in addition to Phase I and II of the Water Study - to help shape that future setting of those stakeholders – because this is a limited group and was clearly established as such to pave the way for something that comes afterwards.
- Carol Zimmerman CWAC and Oversight Committee member, commented that the concept presented (of thinking outside of the box and maybe looking at the scope of work) should be factored in as the Oversight Committee crafts its recommendations - particularly around the public process - is important.
- Bob Cook, CWAC and Oversight Committee member. expressed that it seemed clear to him is that the reason the process started this way is that the City and County manage the two largest pieces of the water and wastewater in this region. He thought it was in their interests that this conversation started with that perspective. In addition, he expressed that as an oversight committee, we do need to keep in mind all aspects of each of the phases of the scope of work – in particular what Ms. Kiser said, which if you look at Phase V which has to do with long-term sustainability and trends, he thought (if we are going to truly take a regional prospective) we are going to have to be tracking that from day one. He stressed the importance of getting better and better data in light of the uncertainties we face with the climate, the world of energy and the world of our economy. He expressed that the Oversight Committee should keep in mind the goals of Phase V – if we keep that in mind as move forward, he expressed that the Oversight Committee would open this up so the full region can participate in any of the final decisions.
- John Carlson, WMAC and Oversight Committee member, commented that he had heard the terms “Tucson area,” “regional” and “Pima County” and would like to know when we use those terms what are we talking about? Mr. Carlson expressed that he has been concerned from the start that there be input from the various entities in Pima County. He added that he sensed that the Oversight Committee

might create subcommittees at some time. He said the thing he has always been concerned about is that the community does not look forward far enough for the future generations.

- Sean Sullivan, City Planning Commission and Oversight Committee member, expressed that he would like the Oversight Committee to take some of the recommendations from this meeting and post/send them out to community organizations. Dr. Barry responded the Oversight Committee would soon have a website where information will be posted. As soon as the website is up, everyone will be notified. He encouraged those present to provide their email addresses if they had not already done so. He added that all materials, comments, and minutes will all be posted on that website and there will be a function where people can comment.
- Rob Kulakofsky, WMAC and Oversight Committee member, asked whether the suggestion that Oversight Committee members have individual blogs would be in conflict with the Open Meeting Law. Dr. Barry responded that staff will research this issue.

6. Next Steps

Committee members decided to hold the next meeting of the Oversight Committee at 6:00 PM on Wednesday, April 23, 2008, at a location to be determined.

7. Future Agenda Items

Dr. Barry asked if there are other people that could not attend the meeting and who would want to come and give presentations that they contact the Oversight Committee. He said that a report was needed that synthesizes what was heard on public participation. Additionally, he said an hour should be devoted to the inventory process. Mr. Cook requested that any data that comes in to be synthesized be available to the Oversight Committee. Bruce Gungle requested that meeting agendas be distributed a little sooner. An action item will be location of future Oversight Committee meetings.

8. Call to the Audience There being no response Dr. Barry adjourned the meeting.

9. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 10:14 AM.

Attachments: Meeting Sign-in Sheets