



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**

July 16, 2009

Meeting Summary

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Jim Barry called the July 16, 2009 meeting of the City/County Water and Wastewater Study Oversight Committee (Oversight Committee) to order at 5:00 p.m. at the Tucson Association of Realtors, 2445 N Tucson Blvd, Tucson, AZ 85716.

Members Present:

Jim Barry, Chairman
Vincent Vasquez
Bonnie Poulos
John Carlson
Rob Kulakofsky
Marcelino Flores
Christopher Brooks
Joseph Maher
Tina Lee

Representing:

Citizens Water Advisory Committee (CWAC)
CWAC
County Planning & Zoning (P&Z) Commission
Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Committee (RWRAC)
RWRAC
RWRAC
CWAC (to be confirmed July 7, 2009)
City Planning Commission (to be confirmed July 7, 2009)
CWAC

Alternate Present:

Bob Cook

Representing:

County P&Z Commission

Absent:

Thomas Saylor-Brown
Bruce Gungle
Mark Stratton

Representing:

City Planning Commission
County P&Z Commission
RWRAC

City/County Staff Present:

Nicole Ewing Gavin, City Manager's Office
Sabrina Cotta, City Manager's Office
Chris Avery, Tucson Water
Nicole Fyffe, Pima County Administrator's Office
Kathleen Chavez, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Melaney Seacat, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Eric Wieduwilt, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Arlan Colton, Pima County Planning
Albert Elias, City of Tucson Planning
Chris Kaselemis, City of Tucson Planning
Suzanne Shields, Pima County Flood Control
Carla Blackwell, Pima County Development Services
Greg Hitt, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department

A quorum of the Committee was established.

2. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Melaney Seacat announced that the committee was receiving an updated Committee roster.

Nicole Ewing Gavin announced that this is Sabrina Cotta's last meeting as her internship with the City is finished.

Jim Barry announced that the Committee has until the end of November to finish Phase 2 and the last effective day to vote on the Phase 2 report is November 20th. There will be presentations through September. Marcelino and Jim will be sending a proposal to the Committee for completing the Phase 2 report that can be discussed at the August meeting.

John Carlson asked what happens after November. Jim Barry answered that this Committee would go out of business but proposed that CWAC, RWRAC, P&Z and the City Planning Commission monitor progress on implementation of Phase 2 recommendations.

Marcelino Flores commented that CWAC and RWRAC has a cross pollination of Directors and maybe the Committee should propose that the P&Z Committees become involved with the other Committees.

3. **APPROVAL OF June 25, 2009 MEETING SUMMARY***

Bob Cook stated that the meeting summary had him as absent even though he was there and wanted the written summary of his comments that he provided at this meeting entered into the meeting summary.

Approval of the June 25th, 2009 meeting summary with suggested edits passed by a voice vote of 7-0.

4. **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE**

No one spoke.

5. **FOLLOW UP ON GROWTH AND URBAN FORM PAPER**

Nicole Ewing Gavin distributed the follow up document to the Growth and Urban Form paper and explained that these documents are intended to capture follow up items and the Committee's discussion themes. There are three levels of records for all the Committee meetings (with varying degrees of detail): the follow up document, the meeting summary, and the meeting transcript.

Nicole Fyffe provided the Committee with requested GIS maps that show the differences between the presented growth scenarios. These maps will be posted on the website. Marcelino Flores requested the number of acres assigned in each scenario. Nicole Fyffe answered that she would get him a spreadsheet of the data.

Bob Cook stated that the three scenarios are complementary and together they are one scenario called "smart growth". If we want more open space, density would need to increase. Balanced, sustainable infrastructure is part of the solution and we really need a cost benefit comparison between the status quo and the smart growth scenario.

6. **DYNAMICS OF POPULATION GROWTH AND PROJECTIONS**

Jim Barry reminded the Committee that they were presented population projection information in Phase 1. Jim suggests the Committee revisit the topic and sent out the memo to spark discussion. This is the beginning, not the end of the conversation.

Vince Vasquez stated that the charts skew the data because the time intervals on the x axis are not consistent.

Jim Barry stated that there is variability year to year but population has increased over time. There are two theoretical growth curves: the J curve and the S curve. Which curve represents Tucson?

Bonnie Poulos thanked Jim for the memo and stated it does a good job of framing a difficult discussion. Looking at figure 3 on the slides, the line follows the S curve more than a J. In the past Tucson had mines, there was work. When these go away, people leave. People move where there are jobs.

John Carlson stated that population projections give it their best shot but they need to be looked at from a water standpoint and revisited every 5 to 7 years. Water will severely limit increase in population.

Jim Barry asked if water was a limiting factor and will move Tucson from a J curve to an S curve. Bob Cook stated that an S curve is more typical of a biological model and with boom and bust cycles. Marcelino Flores responded that over the long term, it is an S curve with upper limits and in the short term is a J curve because of the factors affecting why people move. Low cost of living, weather, and recreation could drive bigger population increases in the near term.

Vince Vasquez said the best statistics are the ones we have available and are the ones we have been using. There are natural resource limits but in many cases we can overcome those through desalinization, acquiring more Colorado River water, groundwater acquisition and greater water use efficiency. The next 20-30 years there will be 3-4 more business cycles and we should assume a consistent growth pattern.

Rob Kulakofsky stated that growth will follow an S curve. Resources are limited and the quality of life can be affected. More CAP water used as irrigation equals more salinity which affects the quality of plant life in the desert. We need to start thinking smarter and the use of rainwater can help support vegetation

Tina Lee stated that eventually bio-systems will hit a carrying capacity and will flatten out, however when this happens is a question.

Arlan Colton stated that is important to update our projections regularly. How much we flatten and when are questions. We will not likely flatten due to water but more likely due to the inability to deliver infrastructure.

Albert Elias said looking nationally and internationally is important. Tucson is attractive in the short term but how long can it maintain that? There will continue to be challenges when dealing with growth, issues such as how to pay for things and we will probably run out of money before we run out of water.

Bonnie Poulos questioned if we are really an attractive place for people to move to. With the exception of cheap housing and land, many quality of life aspects are falling to the bottom of the list. We may be attractive in the short term, but not in the long.

Marcelino Flores suggested this may be why we have a lot of “churn” (in-migration and out-migration).

Arlan Colton responded that out-migration looms large because those are the people with no roots and see Tucson as a pit stop. This has been a challenge since the post war boom issue.

Chris Avery stated that from a water perspective that for the last 50 years water demand has been under-predicted and in the future Tucson may still be very attractive in a time of global warming because it will be easier to cool your house than to heat it in a place like Buffalo.

Jim Barry stated that he lived in Buffalo and it's a nice place!

Vince Vasquez stated that there are many push-pull factors but that comparatively we are better than the rust belt and the mid west and we must consider Mexican immigration as well.

Margot Garcia stated that the J curve is theoretically impossible because the end result would be the entire population of the world in Tucson and the S curve still slightly grows and does not fully flatten out. Places like Detroit and Cleveland expected to be grand forever and way over built their infrastructure. It is dangerous to predict population. We need to think about the factors that could send this city into decline.

John Carlson stated that he hoped this was the last time he had to hear about the J and S curve and that we need to rely on capable experts to project maximums and minimums and adjust these over time.

Bonnie Poulos asked how you prepare a community for the ups and downs of growth so that you are not overly harmed by less growth or a decrease in population.

Jim Barry stated we can't do much about births and deaths so we need to look at in-migration and out-migration in terms of how we can influence growth.

Bob Cook said that right now one of the reasons we don't see a lot of in-migration and out-migrations is people can't sell their house.

Bonnie Poulos stated it is important to find out why people stay here, not just why they move here or leave here - you need both sides of the equation.

Marcelino Flores asked about what migration looks like within the Sun Corridor. Jim Barry answered that that information was not in the census report.

Jim Barry asked what we think the Mayor and Council and Board of Supervisors can/should do about growth.

Bonnie Poulos stated this may not be the right question. The question should be if they take certain action, what affect could that have. Jim Barry asked for an example. Bonnie stated that not serving water outside the TW service area creates a growth boundary and could have an impact.

Vince Vasquez stated that the policy implication of not serving water outside the service area pushes people to outlying areas.

Marcelino Flores stated that planning at the watershed level makes sense and there is vulnerability with bringing water over the mountain.

Arlan Colton stated that there are things local government can do to influence growth such as no economic development or provide no services. We can direct location of growth and urban form. If you change pace of growth by limiting building permits, you drive up housing prices. Phoenix metro studies state that for every three people that move in, two move out. In the next 25 years there will be 100 million new Americans and if the theory of megapolitans is true some of those people will be drawn to Pima, Maricopa and Pinal counties and how should those people be divided. I estimate we will not take our share since we are more resource constrained but that doesn't mean we won't grow.

Bob Cook said that rate of growth is a critical factor in making decisions on investments.

Marcelino Flores stated we need to focus on diversity and quality of our jobs.

Jim Barry asked what the Committee thought about the various population projections.

Bob Cook answered that there is a disconnect. There is a water shortage, climate change, grassification of the desert, etc. and questioned the assumptions behind the population projections. Jim Barry asked Bob how far off he thought they were. Bob Cook answered that the real issue is how to sustain the existing population. Jim Barry asked what he thought we would see. Bob Cook answered not more than 1.2 -1.3 million.

Vince Vasquez stated while this discussion is intellectually interesting, the Committee is not going to change the numbers, and the purpose of the study is not to determine what population projections are correct and these numbers are what we have and what we have been using. We have spent a lot of time on these issues and they are beyond the scope and capability of the Committee. Jim Barry disagreed saying it was central to the scope and asked for staff's preference for population projections.

Albert Elias stated there is no agreement and the further out, the less dependable the numbers. Arlan Colton agreed saying the beyond a certain point the numbers are wrong but it is reasonable to assume that the line will keep going. Jim Barry asked if they were good until 2030. Arlan answered yes. Bonnie Poulos stated that these forecasts and projections work information they don't have and it is important to look at the model regularly. Marcelino Flores stated the population has bell curves with males and females in age ranges and it might be important to look at that.

Bob Cook said that we need to consider climate change and by 2050 we will need to reduce the carbon foot print which means no more coal burning, no fossil fuels.

Vince Vasquez estimated a population of 2.5 million.

John Carlson reminded the Committee that the numbers needed to be looked at again and again.

Marcelino Flores brought up the idea by Rob Kulakofsky that the Committee need to find areas of agreement and moved to revisit population numbers on an annual basis at CWAC and RWRAC.

Claire Zucker from PAG said that the population projections are done for the whole region and for broad time spans. These numbers do not tell you where the people are going to go. Marcelino Flores directed staff to see how much it would cost to look population projections bi-annually versus annually. Claire Zucker said that they have a model they will be bringing in land use information into which should be running in October.

Bob Cook questioned why there was not multiple scenario planning for growth projections.

Bonnie Poulos asked for Jim Barry's opinion. Jim Barry stated he was comfortable with the projections through 2025, disagrees with Bob and does not think that elected officials influence why people move in or out of this area. He agrees there is an inherent limit to how much the area can grow and that we will grow along an S curve. Marcelino Flores asked Jim Barry why he has stayed in the area. Jim answered that he was invested in the community and it had been very good to him.

7. **PRESENTATION: INTEGRATING LAND USE AND WATER RESOURCE PLANNING/ DISUSSION AND Q&A WITH COMMITTEE AND PUBLIC**

Albert Elias, Nicole Ewing Gavin, Suzanne Shields, and Arlan Colton made presentation on the technical paper.

Bonnie Poulos stated that the General and Comprehensive Plans are great if used but they are never taken seriously and doesn't see the point of redoing them if there is no commitment to implement them.

Jim Barry asked about Tucson Water's obligation to provide water service to new growth within the Obligated Service Area. Chris Avery responded that is uncertain since case law is 30 years old. The City's ability to control what development to serve is enhanced if it is referenced in the General Plan and approved by voters.

Bob Cook questioned where the obligation came from. Chris Avery answered that inside City limits they are obligated to provide on an equal basis as long as have the available resources and must serve the agreements that have been made in the past even in areas that have been annexed into another jurisdiction. Albert Elias stated that if have urban form goals linked to water service goals there is a stronger case. Jim Barry questioned that interim policy and it the boundary was fuzzy. Chris Avery answered that case by case decisions were being made on where to start and stop the obligated areas. Jim Barry questioned if CAP was a regional commodity. Chris Avery stated that the allocation was never sufficient to supply the entire area and not defined to a specific location or obligated area.

Marcelino Flores questioned where the City was in the jurisdictional hierarchy compared with ADWR? Chris Avery answered that as an Assured Water Provider, Tucson Water is required to follow ADWR regulations.

Jim Barry questioned if a drop in GPCD was happening to other water providers? Other local water providers in the audience answered yes. Chris Avery stated that it seems to be happening all over the western U.S. and there doesn't seem to be one single factor but maybe is a result of the cumulative effect of all factors that lead people to reduce consumption.

Jim Barry questioned the different water resource quantity numbers being used and asked for consistency. Chris Avery said that different numbers represented different views of the water supply or specific reporting requirements. Jim Barry restated that the committee needed one number. John Carlson said to pick a number and define it. Vince Vasquez gave the opinion that the number for AWS was the most firm and supported by a regulatory agency.

Marcelino Flores asked Chris Avery to explain the resources and GPCD in Maricopa County. Chris answered that the majority of Maricopa has the Salt River which is inexpensive and urban areas can receive agriculture water rights. Marcelino Flores questioned how this affects GPCD? Chris Avery answered that it is about 1/100th the cost per acre than what it costs a TW customer, so cheaper supply means more use.

Vince Vasquez stated that physical access to renewable supply in reference to CAGR basis to recharge in different areas is exploited by everyone in the state even Tucson Water. Well sites serve peak demand, even though they have a renewable source and the report comes across as we are the good guys and CAGR is not. Chris Avery responded that the CAGR is what it is. Some folks located near recharge, some not and one idea going forward may be to wheel water and wheel long term storage credits but this is a regional discussion.

Ken Seasholes from the CAGR stated that though the paper lays out a central issue, the paper loses site of what is happening in the TAMA as a whole and staff are working on comments. There is under-utilization of CAP sub-contracts, there are local resource impacts that are confined and need more attention. The physical supply is local groundwater and the answer to this is safe yield, but that is one part in a larger framework.

Bob Cook stated that part of the renewable supply includes storm water and rainwater to meet recharge needs and wonders why there is no enthusiasm for an apples-to-apples analysis. Vince Vasquez reminded Bob that there are legal constraints to this. Chris Avery replied that storm water and rainwater are something that customers can do, not something TW will provide for customers.

Bob Cook stated that he didn't hear how transportation affects and determines land use and there needs to be an integration of these three things.

Marcelino Flores requested that the energy connection be included.

Colette Altaffer reminded the committee that it is crucial to talk about cost of growth and growth paying for itself and that it is expensive to replace existing infrastructure when it comes to infill.

8. **AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING***

Jim Barry reminded the committee that Cost of Growth, Economic Needs for Water and a revisit of projected water resource availability will be on the next agenda.

9. **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE**

No one spoke.

11. **ADJOURNMENT***

The meeting was adjourned by Jim Barry at 8:40 p.m.

Attendees:

Dorothy O'Brien
Colette Altaffer
David Graham
Chuck Frietas
Bob Iannarino
Margot Garcia
Tamara Prime
Ken Seasholls
Mac Hudson
Michael Block
Charles Ester
David Godliewski
Paul Mackey
Charles Cole
Marilyn Robinson
Greg Hess
Alice Roe
Ted Seddon
Sheila Bowen