



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 23, 2008
Meeting Summary**

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Dr. Jim Barry called the April 23, 2008 meeting of the City/County Water and Wastewater Study Oversight Committee (Oversight Committee) to order at 6:00 PM, in the Manning House, 450 West Paseo Redondo, Tucson, Arizona.

Members Present:

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

Representing:

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

Members Absent:

Tina Lee
Mark Stratton

Representing:

CWAC
WMAC

City/County Staff Present:

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
Mike Gritzuk, Director, Pima County Regional Wastewater Reclamation Dept.
Sandy Elder, Tucson Water
Leslie Liberti, Director, City Office of Conservation & Sustainable Development
Holly Lachowicz, Ward 3, City Council

Arlan Colton, County Planning Director
Patrick Cavanaugh, Executive Aide, Supervisor Ann Day
Eric Wieduwilt, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Ed Curley, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Chris Avery, City of Tucson Water
Laura Fairbanks, Pima County Regional Wastewater Reclamation Dept.

2. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

There were no minutes from the previous meeting.

3. **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE:**

Following is a summary of the key themes addressed by the public. For a verbatim record of public comment please visit www.tucsonpimawaterstudy.com.

The first speaker was John Kromko who stated he lives at 717 N. 7th Avenue, Tucson. Mr. Kromko stressed to the Committee that if there is a conflict of interest, or something that could be construed as a conflict of interest, they should remove themselves and be truthful. He spoke about the recent City of Tucson brochure on Proposition 200 which he feels misrepresented the facts on several issues including the issue of whether direct delivery of reclaimed water is being planned and the question of whether there is an assured water supply for Tucson given the issue of wet vs. paper water which is not generally understood by the public. Mr. Kromko also cited the claims that Tucson was not in danger of losing access to its CAP allocation as misleading because although we will never lose our allocation, we just might not have any water. He noted that this is a complete misrepresentation, and he hopes that the Committee does not do that.

Dr. Barry responded that he and the committee may disagree but that they are all committed to representing the truth as best as they can ascertain it.

Collette Altaffer, with the Neighborhood Info-Coalition and the President of County of Vista Neighborhood Association, residing at 35 Sierra Vista Drive, stated that yesterday was the first day that she received official notice of these meetings. She encouraged the Committee to keep the process open, and to remember that everyone including neighbors are stakeholders. She asked the Committee to resist efforts from stakeholders to steer this process in the direction that they would like it to go. The legitimacy of this process is extremely dependent on you [the Committee] keeping it open, inclusive and accessible to every member of the public. She supported and encouraged an inclusive educational process to bring everyone up to a common level of understanding.

Dr. Barry encouraged Ms. Altaffer to stay through the entire meeting in order to hear the discussion on the public process later in the agenda. He noted that due to the short turnaround time between meetings the notification for this meeting was much hurried and smaller than the last time. He stated that staff planned to make sure that neighborhoods hear about it. Mr. Sullivan also noted that the Committee had met just two days ago last week and that the reason this meeting was scheduled so quickly behind the other one was in response to open this up to the public. He also stated that staff tried to give notice as quickly as possible.

4. DISCUSSION OF COMMITTEE REGARDING APPROACH TO CONDUCTING WATER/WASTEWATER INVENTORY

Nicole Ewing-Gavin, City staff coordinator for the City/County Water and Wastewater Study, provided a hand out of a proposed process and schedule for delivering the Phase I Water and Wastewater Inventory and Assessment. The deadline for the Phase I Inventory and Assessment report to the Mayor and Council and the Board of Supervisors is December 2008. Ms. Gavin outlined an iterative process for developing the report consisting of presenting information on each topic at bi-monthly Oversight Committee meetings beginning the week of June 2, 2008, soliciting questions and comments from Committee members and the public at the meetings, and following up at the next meeting in response to questions and input received at the prior meeting. Staff will distribute presentation and background materials in advance of each meeting via email and web postings. This process will allow for the incremental drafting of the report chapters leading to a final report that compiles all this information. Once approved by the Oversight Committee, the report will be transmitted to the City Manager and County Administrator as well as the Mayor, Council, and Board of Supervisors. An on-line resource library will be created and all materials that are distributed, presented, discussed will be posted there throughout the process.

Ms. Gavin noted that a series of presentations on the report chapters will be conducted through the end of September. Beginning the week of October 6th, staff will begin synthesizing all the information into a draft report that will be submitted to the Committee for final comment. She suggested the Committee consider holding a public hearing in early November on the report.

Ms. Gavin clarified that the schedule provided only lists the proposed week that each meeting could be held and that the Committee needs to establish the exact date of the meetings.

John Carlson requested that the Overview presentation include the whole context for water supply -- where it comes from, what comes across County borders, the location of isolated underground storage reservoirs. He said there needs to be a map and a knowledgeable presenter on this topic.

Rob Kulakofsky agreed with Mr. Carlson stating that it was important to have access to information on all the water resources in our area including information on where the water in underground water reservoirs flow, where it is isolated, and where we are lacking information on flows. He noted that Mr. Kromko also referred to the condition and capacity of water, wastewater, and reclaimed water infrastructure, and that what we really want to know in this Committee is not what the paper potential is but what actual wet water is out there, because we need to deal with actual real resources.

Bob Cook also requested that references for future population estimates, and the rationale for the estimates, be brought to the Committee so that they can use that information in their decision making.

Bruce Gungle stated that the correct term is "aquifer" not "reservoir" and stressed the need to develop some vocabulary. Secondly, Mr. Gungle asked to clarify when this Committee ends.

Dr. Barry responded by stating that there are two reports due to Mayor and Council 1) a report by May 23rd on what kind of public participation process ought to be involved and 2) a Phase I Inventory and Assessment report which is due in December 2008.

Sean Sullivan suggested adding restoration projects to the list of topics. He said staff should address what is currently being planned, what kind of resources are currently allocated, and what kind of resources would need to be allocated in order to see them through.

The Committee discussion that followed highlighted the potential for the Arizona Department of Water Resources Tucson Active Management Areas (AMA) and/or or the Central Arizona Water Control District (CAWCD) to provide information on the larger water resource management picture. It was suggested that a number of people could provide that information and that a two hour workshop focusing on water resources from the Tucson AMA and CAP replenishment district perspective would be useful in getting everyone on the same page.

A member of the public commented that the topic of future resource scenarios and conservation intended for the week of September 1 is ambiguous in light of the rapidly changing science concerning climate and water. It was requested that a leading climate scientist in our community or at the University be invited to present on the ranges of scenarios and how some of the issues that we used to think of as long term could actually be more short term. This actually applies to many areas including energy, economic development, etc.

Chris Avery, Interim Deputy Director of Tucson Water and Eric Wieduwilt, Acting Deputy Director for Pima County Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department presented a more detailed overview of each of the topic areas listed in the schedule handed out.

Mr. Avery and Mr. Wieduwilt noted that what they were presenting was a proposal for discussion and modification as needed. They also noted that staff had already received a lot of comment from the Committee members on how some of these topics might need to be adjusted or modified. For example, the desire to include outside technical expertise had been expressed and staff is working on identifying areas where technical expertise could be brought in. The goal is to move us all up to the same level as we move into the more technical discussions. Following is a synopsis of the presentation by week:

Week of June 2nd – this week deals with the overview of water and wastewater systems.

This presentation will cover:

- The extent of the water and wastewater systems, reclaimed water and the service areas of the two utilities and where they overlap vs. where there are discontinuities.
- The “Urban Water Cycle” focusing on the home as the center, where the water comes from, where the wastewater goes, etc. to establish a basic understanding of the relationship between the water system, wastewater, and the reclaimed system.
- The history, and the regulatory background of the Tucson Water and Regional Wastewater Reclamation Departments. Both utilities operate under fairly stringent clean water regulations and groundwater management regulations that constrain what can be done.

Week of June 16 deals with current customers, and the water and wastewater demand and supply picture. Key areas to be covered include:

- Consider bringing in a third party expert to provide a regional context relative to water supply - what types of water resources are available and the amounts of those resources.
- Historical change of population water use by sector in the Tucson Active Management Area. Information on how agricultural, industrial, and municipal water use has changed over time in the Tucson AMA, and what the future looks like relative to those factors and per capita usage by sector.
- Usage patterns and future demand for reclaimed water.
- How different customer bases form the basis for demand on Tucson Water and for supply for Pima County Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department (RWRD).

Dr. Barry asked if this is where staff would start educating the Committee on the difference between paper water and wet water.

Chris Avery responded that they will talk about it all -- wet water and paper water, global water resources, effluent water resources. He noted that they want to have a comprehensive discussion of the entire water supply picture. He noted that Mr. Kromko mentioned the difference between paper water supplies and wet water supplies and the different ways that you use those supplies to meet your demands as a water provider and subsequently how those water supplies end up being treated by Pima County Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department. Mr. Avery said that from Tucson Water's perspective, the most important regulatory component is the Assured Water Supply program that is administered by the Arizona Department of Water Resources. He noted that that is another place where third party expertise can be brought in.

Week of July 7 will deal with an assessment of the potable water, wastewater, and reclaimed water systems and will cover:

- An overview of condition assessment including the physical assessment of the infrastructure and projected future capacity for water, wastewater and reclaimed water systems.
- How the system has expanded both by developer driven construction and by our larger capital improvement processes.
- Preventative maintenance schedules and methods for assessing infrastructure conditions e.g. how systems are prioritized ("graded") and how the utilities' plan and budget for rehabilitation, repair and replacement of assets.

Week of July 21 shifts from a discussion of the existing systems to a discussion of planning for future infrastructure needs. This section will address what must be built to serve the people who already live in Tucson (i.e. meet existing capacity needs). Looking at the future needs will involve issues of where and what kind of infrastructure is going to be needed to accommodate growth.

Week of August 2 addresses the financial resources and structures including:

- Rate structures, connection fees, and revenue bonding opportunities.
- Where the money comes from and how we plan for our capital improvement.

- This is another opportunity to bring in experts such as consultants hired by both utilities in the past to develop their respective financial plans.

Dr. Barry commented that we need to talk about financial planning from the perspective of capital expenditures and not just the capital budget perspective.

The week of August 2 marks the end of what staff is referring to “Water 101” which entails a basic education on water systems, the regulatory/institutional framework, supply, capacity, conditions and financing.

The week of August 18 begins the “assessment” portion of Phase I and will address the issue of future population scenarios, planning and growth including:

- How population estimates and scenarios are developed
- What kind of population scenarios have already been developed
- What kinds of variables are used to develop those population scenarios
- How growth has occurred in the past and how it is occurring in the Tucson area today, and what does that say about how to predict what will happen in the future.
- This is another place where additional staff and possibly third party (outside) expertise is being considered.

Week of September 1 will cover future resource scenarios, conservation and environmental needs for water. This section will explore a variety of interrelated factors. For example, in looking at the environmental needs for water staff will also be looking at those needs in relationship to the availability of water and use of reclaimed water or effluent. Similarly, conservation will be discussed in terms of quantity (e.g. reductions in irrigation) and in terms of quality (e.g. keeping pharmaceuticals out of the sewers). Additionally, drought and climate change are other factors to consider this is an area where third party expertise is going to be welcomed. Mr. Avery and Mr. Wieduwilt recommended that a wide variety of people with expertise what the future environment is going to look like in terms of water supply and in terms of drought and climate change be considered.

Sean Sullivan commented that the conversation about water steering growth begin during the week of August 18.

Bob Cook commented that there is concern about just using local expertise in the discussion on future population scenarios. This topic is going to be highly scrutinized and there is potential for disagreement up front to a single baseline scenario, if the baseline data isn't defensible.

Mr. Avery responded what we want everyone to understand the uncertainty involved with the population scenarios and how much variability there is in population. This is certainly a place where a third party expertise could come in. He noted that he is not an expert on population growth.

Week of September 15 will address the topic of sustainable water population. Water sustainability will be discussed in terms of quantity and quality perspectives, i.e. in terms of not only what the available water supplies are, but how clean do we want those supplies to be in the future.

This concluded the staff presentation on the proposed Phase I Inventory and Assessment scope of work and a question and answer period followed.

John Carlson noted that when he looks at population growth, sustainable water, availability, climate change there is an upper and lower limit. He asked if they were going to look at some of the extremes and be able to discuss them.

Mr. Avery responded it would be reasonable to do that. He added that predicting population is not easy and we ought to be able to be prepared for wide variability.

Rob Kulakofsky recommended that in the week of June 16th staff go beyond looking at home water uses and include a discussion of the water uses of businesses since businesses are the economic drivers for our community.

Mr. Avery responded that the report will address all customers including residential, multi-family, commercial and industrial.

Mr. Kulakofsky added that the reason this is very important is that we have to consider what kind of businesses and what kind of industries do we want to bring into our community and their impacts on water supply and pollution.

Mr. Bruce Gungle addressed the term sustainability which is important and that at some point in this discussion, before September 15th, we actually take a moment to discuss and agree upon a definition of that term. Mr. Avery agreed.

A member of the public recommended that staff develop a glossary of terms. Dr. Barry and John Carlson both agreed.

Tracey Williams, a Tucson resident, offered her perspective of infrastructure, and water infrastructure in particular. She divided infrastructure into two categories 1) Man-made infrastructure and 2) Natural-nature made infrastructure. She noted that she sees infrastructure as managing surface water, ground water, and waste water. She said regarding surface water, she would like an inventory of washes and detention-retention basins. She noted that this inventory is already available, and it is important when we are discussing recharge to look at how does nature do this naturally. Ms. Williams also requested that staff provide information on ground water aquifers including what shape the natural aquifer is in, how deep it is, and how it varies in size in Oro Valley versus Tucson. Additionally, she wants information on subsidence and its impact on the aquifer. She said she would like to see the USGS come in as experts to give us that information, including the storage. Ms. Williams also asked for information on the CAP and whether or not it is bringing us sufficient water down here, as well as information on our reservoirs and lakes and how much snow is actually happening, and what is our rain count.

Ms. Williams spoke about wastewater, treatment plants, pipes, pumps, plants, and wells, which we have and need to know how they are doing, and the cost associated with the infrastructure. She wants to know about the costs that will pay for maintaining, improving, rebuilding, and accommodating the growing population. She also wanted to know who will be

charged for paying for these infrastructures. She also wants to know staff qualifications, years of experience and job description. Other information requested included: how much energy it takes to transport water, how much it costs to move water from Colorado to Tucson, what is the capacity. She stated that it would be a disservice to have Subcommittees.

Dr. Barry stated that the idea of Subcommittees was no longer being considered.

Jane Evans spoke to the Committee regarding her concerns related to uncontrolled growth and her feeling that a growth-based economy is not sustainable in the Sonora Desert. Ms. Evans feels that for Tucson to remain a sustainable community its residents must have enough water to live and thrive in a pleasant environment. She noted that she was not going to give up her vegetable garden so that more people could move here. Tucsonans in her view are not interested in drinking effluent so more people can live in this region. One of the most important outcomes for this committee must be that education can and will occur for the public and a sense of comfort and trust. The public must be made to feel that the water manager decision makers know what they are doing, and are operating in the interest of entire public, not just the public that pushes money in their direction. People choosing to live here should actually pay the true cost of their move.

Dr. Barry asked Jane to submit her comments to the committee in writing and she agreed.

Mike Nicksic asked if the inventory of users includes institutions like the University of Arizona, Davis-Monthan, and various hospitals and nursing homes, which have grandfathered water rights. Also, if we are considering wastewater as a resource what process is going to be in place for dealing with the effluent especially from the University of Arizona's plan with mega expansion from Kino Boulevard where they expect 15,000 to 20,000 water users in the next 10 years? It's going to be a biochemical and biophysical research facility that they are going to be using all kind of chemicals some of which they are going to invent. Mr. Nicksic asked where is that going to go and how are we going to get it out of the water before we have to drink it. He added that we need to consider Nogales Sonora and it's relationship to the study and recommended the Committee vastly rethink the scope of the study.

Bill DuPont, residing at 3249 E. Camino Campestre, said that he is grateful that there is not going to be subcommittees and he hopes that the meetings are held in the evening when the general public can attend. He also asked for a definition of all the acronyms.

Carol Zimmerman announced a free, May 14 workshop on CAP at the Sheraton Four Points and encouraged people to attend the workshop. Bruce Gungle asked that Ms. Zimmerman e-mail that information to all the committee members.

Dr. Barry asked if the committee is comfortable with the schedule, meeting every other week, and with the proposed of set of deliverables and review process for the deliverables.

Carol Zimmerman responded that it is excellent how we build on each other and have a chance to reflect on the time before so that if there are pieces missing we will discover them very quickly and be able to get into the mix. She said she is not clear about the definition of inventory and asked that this be defined.

Bruce Gungle asked that there be built-in flexibility in the schedule as needs may come up along the way. Dr. Barry noted that it was seconded and doubled in agreement by some of the members.

Rob Kulakofsky agreed about defining the term "inventory". He added that the influence of water pumping by private well owners, like the U of A, and up stream users should be considered. He agrees that Nogales has a huge impact on whether or not the Santa Cruz River is going to provide water to us.

Marcelino Flores confirmed that the study website would be kept up to date as information is developed and that this would include a library of information and resources.

A discussion about the word inventory ensued. Although there may be different definitions, Dr. Barry stated that what is meant by inventory here is the list of topics provided for the study in today's hand-outs – nothing more than that.

5. FOLLOW-UP DISCUSSION REGARDING OUTREACH PROCESS:

Melaney Seacat, Pima County Project Coordinator for the Water Study, provided an update on the public participation and public input received to date. She noted that the Committee had received a lot of public comment in the past two meetings. She distributed a packet of information that included a summary of the public comments received to date, the initial stakeholder's mailing list and the outline and schedule for preparing the May 23, 2008 Public Participation Report to Mayor and Council and the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Seacat said the website was expected to go live by next week and the domain name is tucsonpimawaterstudy.com. She clarified that Open Meeting Law requirements prohibit having a blog on the study website but said it would be possible to link to Committee member blogs on their own websites if so desired. Similarly, the on-line comment form should not be used by Committee members again due to restrictions imposed by Open Meeting Law requirements. Ms. Seacat said the mailing list is under development and will be a primary tool for notifying interested members of the public about upcoming Committee meetings and Study documents.

Ms. Seacat then reviewed highlights of the summary of public input and the scope and schedule for the Report on Public Participation. She asked committee members to review and comment on the public input summary, additions to the mailing list and report schedule.

She concluded by stating that the primary deliverables for the Public Participation effort for Phase I will be an interactive Web-site, a study phone line, business cards with Web-site address and phone number, a mailing database, progress reports on public comments received to date, action items from meetings, and a report with recommendations for public participation to be submitted May 23, 2008 to City / County elected officials.

Speaker (unknown) requested that presentations from Sustainable Tucson be provided on the website and that the meetings be televised and available through Access-Tucson for Channel 12.

John Carlson noted that the mailing list did not include Avra Valley which is a big area that the City is using for recharge and there are people out there.

Dr. Barry asked the Committee what they thought about the proposed schedule.

John Carlson said he likes that there has been a lot of thinking and fast work. He asked what will be done when we do not have a quorum, what do we do and how are we going to determine whether we are going to have a quorum.

Dr. Barry stated that if we are not going to have a quorum he wants to know that before hand as the meeting will be canceled.

John Carlson agreed and recommended staff poll Committee members ahead of time via email.

Dr. Barry asked Committee members to take responsibility for letting staff know whether or not they will be attending in order to determine whether or not there is a quorum and if not to allow time to let everyone know, including everyone on our e-mail list, that the meeting is being canceled.

Marcelino Flores addressed the issue of who is at the table and how to involve people at the appropriate level.

Carol Zimmerman asked for clarification on the scope of the public participation process and whether it was focused on Phase I, Phase II or beyond.

Dan Sullivan said he interprets the original Scope of Work as directing the Oversight Committee to address public outreach for Phase I and II. Mr. Sullivan noted that the Scope of Work clearly states that a broader range of stakeholders would be necessary during Phases III, IV and V.

Bruce Gungle agreed that the Committee should work themselves out of a job at the end of Phase II.

Carol Zimmerman asked whether they should only make recommendations for public participation for Phase I or should they make a recommendation for a general approach to Phase III.

Sean Sullivan stated that we need to know right away what that scope of the participation plan is before we start making decisions on inventories that we may not be involved in anymore.

Dr. Barry responded that it is his belief that Mayor and Council and the Board of Supervisors created this Committee to provide oversight over Phase I and Phase II and to suggest the public participation process for Phase I. He said this probably meant that they (the elected officials) saw Phase II public process as very different than Phase I. Dr. Barry stated he feels this means that we (the Committee members) are supposed to be going out of business by July 9, 2009. It may be that there will be a recommendation that the Board, Mayor and

Council will look to some other body to start doing a parallel public participation process. Dr. Barry feels that the Committee needs to make a recommendation in the May report about how to ensure an open and accessible process for Phases I and II with general concepts for how to transition to the larger community outreach.

Carol Zimmerman noted that she is troubled about the Phase II Policies and Values noting that limiting the values discussion to just City and County is difficult and that identifying what process is needed for the values discussion in Phase II needs to be addressed at the beginning of Phase I.

Dan Sullivan noted that while he concurs with Carol, rationally and legally he can not go that extra step. He noted that they are both a product of what the Board of Supervisors and the City Council directed and have no greater role other than what they have created us to be. He said they indicated that we are to produce a product relative to Phase I and Phase II as it impacts both on the City and the County interests. The broader range of regional participation is not anticipated by the Council or the Board until we get to Phase III, and he thinks that it is at this point we will get a signal from the powers that be what our role is in the future public process.

Marcelino Flores concurred. He added however that the Committee could not control what comments they receive and the opportunities they are then given to evaluate the full range of comments. These suggestions may pertain to who should participate in a regional public participation effort and point to recommendations for the future, regional process. Mr. Flores also asked that the Committee establish by-laws or a charter and to define a base set of terminology and acronyms. He suggested that staff may have some examples of bylaws on how the Committee should interact with one another, how the terminology is used, do we need a super majority, and those kinds of questions.

Bob Cook stated that he thinks that it is entirely appropriate that the managers of the two largest water and wastewater infrastructures have initiated this process and that this is the starting point for moving to a regional perspective. The sustainability issues that we are going to be discussing during this process are regional in nature. We will not come up with a sustainable plan for water for either the County or the City without a regional perspective. He does believe that every meeting that we have had we have had input from jurisdictions from outside the City and the County. He is entirely confident that we are going to be including all the issues. He also noted that this is an unprecedented step we are taking because we are trying to achieve some sort of consensus in this community. Phase I to him is basically answering the question of where are we. Phase II is where are we going.

Dr. Barry commented that the Committee seems to agree on two points - that they are not going to morph into the larger process and that there needs to be a larger table at some point. While he thinks that there is agreement on those two points, he said they probably are not in total agreement on what that means in terms of what the Committee does next. He suggested they consider the May report as a "mid-term" report that addresses a transparent, appropriate process for Phase I and that the Committee come back to the elected officials with another report after thinking more clearly and deeply about Phase 2 and how to transition into Phase II. He said he knows the Board expects us to come back to them in August, maybe we could recommend in May to Mayor and Council and the Board that we will

address the transition into Phase II at that interim period. Dr. Barry stressed that the Committee needs to think about creating a set of generally agreed upon principals for that larger process and to provide options on what that process might look like (e.g. a Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan model). He added that the larger Phase III process could start sooner than July 2009. The phased progressions are logical but they do not have to be sequential. He concluded that this does not need to be decided tonight but in our next meeting where we will talk more specifically about what the report will include.

Dan Sullivan agreed.

6. DISCUSS OF FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE AND COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION:

Staff proposed that the next meeting be held in two weeks and that the agenda for the next meeting focus primarily on the public participation report. Dr. Barry asked if everyone was agreeable and whether they wanted to have an evening meeting.

Carol Zimmerman made a suggestion to meet at a more central location.

Dr. Barry responded that staff had some suggestions for meeting locations including the Manning House, Randolph Golf Course Club House, the Arizona Inn, Tucson Country Club, Lodge on the Desert, Pima County Public Libraries, Flowing Wells School District, and Pima Association of Governments as a downtown location. He noted that the Committee might have other options for meeting locations.

Comments included: rule out the Arizona Inn as a possible location due to the cost; rule out Tucson Country Club it does not look like it is ADA accessible; consider Tucson Association of Realtors as it is an excellent location on Tucson Boulevard where a lot of public process meetings take place and also consider the Mesquite Room at the Randolph Golf Course, Plumbers Union on Tucson Boulevard, U of A Education Building, the Udall Center; UMC-Duval Auditorium, the Northwest Neighborhood Center; El Rio Neighborhood Center, Quincy Neighborhood Center et. al.

A discussion ensued about possible meeting days and times but no clear consensus emerged. It was suggested that staff poll the committee as to their preferences. Dr. Barry stated that getting unanimity on the time, day and place is very difficult. He suggested that the Committee establish the next meeting and have it on the agenda and then talk more about preferences at the next meeting with the goal of establishing a regular schedule of meetings. It was agreed that the next meeting be scheduled for Monday, May 12, 2008 from 6:00- 8:00 p.m. at a central location to be determined.

7. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Bonnie Poulos asked if the members could have some of the meeting material before the meeting so that they will have time to go through them so that at the discussion could take off. Dr. Barry responded to Bonnie with a yes, staff is working at getting that out several days in advance.

Dr. Barry then asked if anyone has any thoughts on future agenda items. Marcelino responded Bi-laws/development. Dr. Barry agreed to place that as an item on the agenda.

8. CALL TO THE AUDIENCE

Mike Nicksic suggested that staff develop a water planning glossary of terms to include all the terms that we want to use from all the papers that we have all been looking at for the last 30 years. He added that the glossary could be a major part of the public participation report to the Council and Supervisors.

Michael Newman, residing at 1820 N. Norton, asked for a definition of the term “region”.

9. ADJOURNMENT:

Meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Attachments: Meeting Sign-In Sheets