



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**

**September 17, 2009
Meeting Summary**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Jim Barry called the September 17, 2009 meeting of the City/County Water and Wastewater Study Oversight Committee (Oversight Committee) to order at 5:10 p.m. at the Tucson Association of Realtors, 2445 N Tucson Blvd, Tucson, AZ 85716.

Members Present:

Jim Barry, Chairman
Vincent Vasquez
John Carlson
Rob Kulakofsky
Marcelino Flores
Christopher Brooks
Tina Lee
Mark Stratton

Representing:

Citizens Water Advisory Committee (CWAC)
CWAC
Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Committee (RWRAC)
RWRAC
RWRAC
CWAC
CWAC
RWRAC

Alternate Present:

Bob Cook

Representing:

County P&Z Commission

Absent:

Bonnie Poulos
Joseph Maher
Bruce Gungle

Representing:

County Planning & Zoning (P&Z) Commission
City Planning Commission
County P&Z Commission

City/County Staff Present:

Nicole Ewing Gavin, City Manager's Office
Chris Avery, Tucson Water
Sandy Elder, Tucson Water
Jeff Biggs, Tucson Water
Ralph Marra, Tucson Water
Fernando Molina, Tucson Water
John Thomas, Tucson Water
Steve Dean, Tucson Water
Remy Sawyer, Tucson Water
Leslie Liberti, Office of Conservation and Sustainable Development
Melaney Seacat, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Kathleen Chavez, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Ed Curley, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Jim Dubois, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Suzanne Shields, Pima County Flood Control

Jeff Prevatt, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department

A quorum of the Committee was established.

2. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Melaney Seacat handed out the paper, Tucson Environmental Water Banking through Conservation Program on behalf of the Water Resources Research Center to the committee members. The agenda was too full to accommodate a presentation. The information is related to the paper on water needs for the environment.

Melaney announced, on behalf of Madeline Kiser, a Southwest Summit on the Environment to be held Thursday, October 8, 2009 from 8:00 am to 4:00 pm at the Walter Cronkite School of Journalism at Arizona State University.

The next four meetings of the City/County Water and Wastewater Oversight Committee will be held at the City of Tucson's IT Building on Paseo Redondo. The dates of the meetings are: October 1, 2009, October 15, 2009, November 12, 2009 and November 19, 2009.

Jim Barry stated staff has drafted a response to the letter received from Cliff Neal of the Central Arizona Water Conservation District. The letter will be sent out with a copy to the committee.

3. **APPROVAL OF AUGUST 20, 2009 MEETING SUMMARY***

Rob Kulakofsky asked to amend the minutes to reflect that he asked that the Economic Needs for Water paper be stricken from the record. Approval of the August 20, 2009 meeting summary with the above amendment was passed.

4. **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE**

No comments.

5. **FOLLOW UP ON COST OF GROWTH AND WATER AS AN ECONOMIC RESOURCE PAPERS**

Nicole Ewing Gavin distributed the follow up document to the Cost of Growth and Water as an Economic Resource paper. Only the following comment/recommendation was listed: It is important to locate a wastewater treatment plant on the southeast side as growth occurs in this area. All other committee questions were responded to during the meeting.

6. **PHASE 2 REPORT WRITING FOLLOW UP DISCUSSION**

Nicole Ewing Gavin handed out copies of a Draft Outline – Staff Phase 2 Report.

Jim Barry and Marcelino Flores sent an email suggesting that the final report be written in two parts. The staff will write a report analyzing and prioritizing the information from the presentations made to the committee. The committee will write it's own report based on the presented material.

Rob Kulakofsky suggested that the papers submitted by staff or outside experts be classified as white papers. Papers submitted by non-experts, i.e. the S Curve paper by Jim Barry and the Economic Needs for Water by Ron Shoopman, should be included and considered but not classified as white papers.

Jim Barry responded that the papers could be separated or reclassified but should not be stricken from the record as the papers are already part of the audio record and meeting summary from the previous meetings.

Bob Cook raised the concern that there had been no consultation with the committee of the scope of the papers or the key issues to be addressed. Jim responded that he and Marcelino brought ideas for phase 2 to the committee in November and December. Those issues brought forth were approved.

Jim Barry asked the committee if they agreed that the papers should be reclassified based on the expertise of the authors.

John Carlson responded that to reclassify the papers is fine as long as there is some definition of what a white paper is versus a non-white paper.

Mark Stratton stated the papers need to be identified by the authors to allow committee members to judge the level of expertise.

Vince Vasquez stated that he believes the papers should be taken as a whole body of information and not differentiated as submitted by experts versus not as that may defeat the committee process. If any one questions the validity of the information, it is left to them to research the data and bring it to the committee.

Rob Kulakofsky restated that he feels papers should not be categorized as submitted by experts if they were not. Jim responded that it is too late in the process now to reclassify the papers.

Mark Stratton stated that since all papers were presented and discussed in the same way, they are part of the process and part of the record.

Melaney Seacat handed out the Schedule of Activities: Phase 2 noting that there will be four meetings to be held at the City's IT building on October 1, October 15, November 12, and November 19 from 5:00 pm to 9:00 pm and there must be a quorum for each meeting.

Jim Barry made a motion to accept the meetings on the given dates, time and location. Rob Kulakofsky seconded the motion. Motion was passed.

Melaney Seacat outlined the facilitator procurement process. The Request for Qualifications (RFQ) was sent out. A ranking criterion must be set up to evaluate facilitators. Six RFQ's were sent out. A ranking sub-committee must be formed to evaluate the RFQ's submitted. The sub-committee is to be made up of one City staff member, one County staff member, three oversight committee members. The committee will meet on Friday, September 18, 2009 to review the 3 returned submissions. Jim Barry moved to nominate Bob Cook and Vince Vasquez to join the sub-committee. Rob Kulakofsky seconded the motion. Motion was passed.

Melaney Seacat handed out the Facilitator Proposal Evaluation Form for committee discussion.

Mark Stratton questioned the legality of having price as part of the evaluation process. Melaney responded that she was told that price had to be considered in the evaluation process.

Mark Stratton believes that qualifications of facilitator are more important than price and would like to see the category of experience in facilitating groups weighted higher than the form currently states.

Vince Vasquez would like to see additional weight be added to the category of ability to understand the specifics of water and wastewater rated higher also.

John Carlson suggested that the committee secure a legal opinion as to the inclusion of price in the evaluation process to protect the process as it moves forward.

Suzanne Shields explained the Pima County Procurement Process for professional services as a two-step process. First a selection is made based on qualifications; secondly, the professional service is requested to provide costs for the services. As this process normally takes 3 to 6 months, it was suggested to include cost in the first step to expedite the process. The committee can set parameters to determine how much cost is factored into the decision as well as setting an upper limit for the cost.

Mark Stratton made a motion to adjust rating points of the evaluation form to increase importance of experience facilitating groups and understanding of water and wastewater issues and decrease the rating points for price. Jim Barry suggested that the sub-committee be entrusted to change the points so the evaluation points totaled to 100. Tina Lee seconded the motion. Motion was passed.

Jim Barry stated his personal opinion of what the scope of Phase 2 should be. The facilitator should not be looking only for consensus and unanimity. The differing opinions of the group should be flushed out during discussions. Rob agreed saying that the committee could use assistance in articulating its thoughts and ideas and putting those thoughts on paper.

Jim Barry stated that he feels the committee should accomplish two things. First, all the recommendations should be looked at, evaluated and prioritized. Secondly, there should be a general theme of how things tie together, perhaps even a strategic plan for sustainability.

Marcelino Flores emphasized the importance of the committee stating their expectation of the upcoming phases and how those expectations may be implemented. Jim agreed that the committee should articulate to the facilitator what the expectations are from the process.

Bob Cook commented there should be a way the committee can bring up important questions that the technical papers did not address. Jim answered that the committee can respond to the staff report in just that manner.

7. WATER RESOURCE ANALYSIS (MEGDAL/TUCSON WATER 2050 PLAN) FOLLOW-UP DISCUSSION

Jim Barry briefly reviewed the information on water resources from the Phase 1 Executive Summary. The information was what renewable water resources are available and what the population carrying capacities of these resources are. The basic sources of water are CAP water and three types of ground water. Tucson Water's Assured Water Supply report and the Sharon Megdal report addressed these issues also. Although the findings of each report were somewhat different, the results are not an order of magnitude different, indicating that the numbers reached are reasonable. The Tucson Water 2050 Plan took these numbers to

determine when new renewable water supplies will be needed. The conclusion was a range from the year 2017 to 2032.

Vince Vasquez asked for clarification of how Tucson Water arrived at the figures they did and asked for more discussion in the future of the cost component of the entitlement as it may be relevant to the cost of new water coming into the portfolio.

Ralph Marra (chief hydrologist TW) responded the figures were based on the renewable water available minus amount of effluent and at what point in time does demand exceed that available amount. Chris Avery added that part of the difference is due to how effluent is considered and that the city now has more CAP water available than it had when the calculations were made.

Vince Vasquez stated that he feels it is important to distinguish the difference of what the entitlement portfolio is versus what we have already proven to the state for our designation of AWS and what the cost component of that is.

Bob Cook suggested that all components of water supply be listed with the different alternatives lined up for comparison. Jim suggested that only the AWS numbers be used for discussion. John added that these different scenarios be revisited periodically over time.

Chris Brooks asked if the TW numbers meet the constraints of the AMA management objective. Ralph responded that TW had to meet the constraints of the AMA management plan to get AWS.

8. **PRESENTATION: ADDITIONAL WATER**

Ralph Marra and Chris Avery of Tucson Water presented a paper on Additional Water Resources. The paper is posted to the study website.

Clarification was made of main stem Colorado River water, this is water that has already been diverted from the river for agricultural uses and for Indian tribes. Water shortages may require this diverted water to be reallocated away from agriculture use to different uses.

Chris Brooks asked if ground water credits can be recovered – are there physical limitations and or legal limitations for GW credits. Ralph answered that ground water credits should be reserved for times of shortage and other sources of water should be utilized before tapping into the GW credits.

Bob Cook asked why the year 2032 for the water shortage? Ralph answered when a shortage is declared on the Colorado River, the lower priority CAP water users are shorted first. The large municipal water users, such as Tucson, will not feel any effects unless there is a very serious shortage declared on the Colorado River. Most likely this will happen at some time in the future.

Mark Stratton expressed concern that the cost of additional water supplies in the future will be much higher than the cost at present and how will those costs be handled. Ralph responded that a variety of solutions must be done to mediate the cost knowing that the cost could be significantly higher for new resources in the future. The willingness of people to pay for this supply must be considered. However, if the increased cost of water is spread out over a larger number of users then the cost to any one individual is lessened. It will be the small water supplier with a small customer base that will be affected most.

Bob Cook stated that the cost per volume of water is a very important point and it needs to be emphasized more to compare the different costs per acre-foot of each supply over time. Ralph responded that ground water is still the least expensive source of supply but it is a short term solution. The decision has been made to use alternate renewable water sources that are sustainable over time.

Rob Kulakofsky asked if water was going to be taken from the three groundwater basins it travels through, would it be done as safe yield practice or would the basins be sucked dry and what would be the environmental and economic consequences of that? Chris responded that the consequences of draining those basins would be very severe and the cost of mitigating those consequences would be very high so draining the ground water from those basins would be avoided.

John Cook questioned if CAP had considered the desalinization of sea water as an optional source of water? Chris responded that CAP has presented desal options but the consensus of water providers is that the process is still cost prohibitive and the technology is still lacking. Mark Stratton commented that the permitting process is monumental.

Mark Stratton asked about the desal of brackish water? Ralph responded that there is a large supply of brackish water in the Phoenix area and that there is no other good use for that water. Phoenix is looking at that water as a potential source for the ADD water process but there has been no quantification of amount available or the cost of that yet.

Marcelino Flores asked what is the role of the Water Banking Authority? Ralph responded that the Water Banking Authority is firming our water supply as it firms supply for the cities. Water is being banked in Tucson's AMA account. It is being stored at the SAVSARP facility. This firming process was developed to bolster the water supply in a drought situation, which is a temporary situation. The firming process did not take into account climate change, which is not temporary.

Marcelino Flores asked if an entity has the ability to pay for the water are they able to take all of it? Chris responded that the water supply must be paid for up front and that the cost should be a deterrent to monopolizing the supply. CAP supplies a three county area at this time so interested parties outside of Arizona are not eligible for any allocation of the water.

Bob Cook stated that rainwater harvesting should be studied and planned for as an additional water source. Chris responded that Tucson Water does have rain water harvesting studies underway but there are several legal issues that need to be resolved before considering rain water harvesting as a policy issue. Vince added that as the cost of water increases the population would look for alternative ways to get water and rainwater harvesting would most likely become more common.

Jim Barry attended an Arizona Investment Council (the council lobbies for utilities) conference recently and the topic was Arizona's water supply. Two points to share with the committee: First – many rural areas do not have a sustainable water supply to meet the existing population. These areas are looking for new sources of water and have potential to become additional competitors for CAP water. Second – some of the Indian tribes that currently receive a portion of main stem Colorado River water will not want to sell their allocations to other areas needing additional water. Ralph responded that re-allocating water would most likely come from agricultural areas not from the Indian tribes.

Jim Barry stated that the committee should keep the following points in mind. The ADD water process is a done deal and the committee will have to accept this process. The ADD water process calls for importing water and that is a done deal. Southern Arizona Water Uses Association (SAWUA) is coordinating activities for our region in the ADD water process. What is the public outreach plan from SAWUA?

Dorothy O'Brien from Marana responded that the ADD water process is discussed at the SAWUA meetings. Several members of SAWRA are on the Hammer It Out (HIO) group for the ADD water process to equate representation from Tucson to that of Phoenix as the needs of Tucson are very different from Phoenix. People from outside the 3 county area have also begun attending the HIO group meetings. The goal is to present the ADD water process to the CAP board in January 2010.

Jim Barry questioned the second recommendation of the paper – what does water on hand mean? Ralph responded that means water we have entitlement to and the infrastructure to make that entitlement into wet water. Jim stated that although he agrees there is not a dire water shortage here now he feels the community should be given a sense of awareness and urgency to plan for the future.

Bob Cook stated that he feels that sustainability should be the central theme to the Phase 2 discussions with the most important aspect being the financial sustainability and the economic sustainability of water resources.

Rob Kulakofsky requested that all documents submitted in the future have page numbers.

9. **PRESENTATION: WATER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

Suzanne Shields, Pima County Flood Control, and Leslie Liberti, City of Tucson Office of Conservation and Sustainable Development, presented the paper Water for the Environment. The paper is posted to the study website.

Vince Vasquez asked for a definition of a hydro riparian environment. Suzanne responded that it is an environment that requires a long term dedicated water supply, either natural or artificial.

Bob Cook asked if monies from carbon tax could be considered as a funding source? Leslie responded that it is still too early in the process for considering that type of funding as the city is in the beginning stages of its climate change mitigation process. Future federal decisions concerning climate change mitigation may have a bearing on the carbon tax as a funding source.

Chris Brooks asked why water rights were needed in certain restoration projects and not in others? Suzanne answered that water can be detained and let out for flood control without obtaining water rights and if the surrounding environment benefits from that it is okay as that was not the primary reason for detaining the water.

Jim Barry reminded the committee as it writes it's report to bear in mind the scope set forth by Mayor and Council that water reservations for the environment must be clearly stated and be able to be translated into action.

10. **PRESENTATION: WATER QUALITY**

Jim Dubois, Ed Curley and Jeff Prevatt of PCRWRD and Steve Dean of Tucson Water presented the paper on Water Quality. The paper is posted to the study website

John Carlson asked for a definition of endocrine disruptive compound. Jim Dubois answered that it is a compound that disrupts the hormonal activity of an organism.

John Carlson asked what the current situation is at TARP with the 1,4 dioxane plume. The response was that the technology is not available to remove the compound. The process is to mitigate the effects of the compound by blending it with additional water at the treatment facility.

11. **AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING**

The agenda will for the next meeting will include the Staff Report and the beginnings of the facilitated discussions.

12. **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE**

None

13. **ADJOURNMENT***

The meeting was adjourned by Jim Barry at 9:00 p.m.

Attendees:

Kendall Kroesen
Madeline Kiser
Dorothy O'Brien
Sheila Bowen
John Kmiec
Mac Hudson
Dave Devine
Holly Lachowicz
David Graham
Malini Banerjee
Colette Altafer
Joanna Bate
David Godlewski
Charles Cole