



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**

**October 1, 2009
Meeting Summary**

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Jim Barry called the October 1, 2009 meeting of the City/County Water and Wastewater Study Oversight Committee (Oversight Committee) to order at 5:06 p.m. at the City of Tucson Pueblo Conference Room, 481 W. Paseo Redondo, Tucson, AZ 85701.

Members Present:

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

Representing:

Citizens Water Advisory Committee (CWAC)
CWAC
Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Committee (RWRAC)
RWRAC
RWRAC
RWRAC
CWAC
CWAC
RWRAC
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
Fernando Molina, Tucson Water
Melaney Seacat, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Ed Curley, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Arlan Colton, Pima County Planning
Albert Elias, City of Tucson Housing and Community Development
Suzanne Shields, Pima County Flood Control
Carla Blackwell, Pima County Development Services
Rich Franz, Pima County Development Services
Kathy Chavez, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department

A quorum of the Committee was established.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Marcelino Flores introduced Mette Brogden, the facilitator chosen by the sub-committee based on the results of the facilitator evaluation process. Mette will facilitate the process of writing the committee report during the remaining meetings.

Melaney Seacat formally acknowledged the expedient work of the procurement staff in pushing through the facilitator request proposal in just over 2 weeks. Melaney announced a brown bag lunch sponsored by the Water Resources Research Center on Friday, October 2, 2009. The speaker will be discussing Chino Valley in Prescott.

The entire water and wastewater study will be featured in the upcoming WESTCAS Fall Conference (Western Coalition of Arid States) October 28-30, 2009, at the Westward Look Resort, Tucson, AZ.

3. **APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 17, 2009 MEETING SUMMARY***

Rob Kulakofsky asked for the following amendments to the September 17 minutes: He asked if water was going to be taken from the three groundwater basins the CAP canal travels through not if CAP water was going to be taken as recorded in the minutes. Vince Vasquez should be added to the subcommittee evaluating and selecting the facilitator. Approval of the September 17, 2009 meeting summary with the above amendments was passed.

4. **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE**

No comments.

5. **FOLLOW UP ON ADDITIONAL WATER, WATER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT AND WATER QUALITY PAPERS**

A list of themes the committee stated during the discussion of the ADD Water paper was the only follow up information. Committee questions of the other papers were responded to during the meeting.

6. **PRESENTATION OF DRAFT PHASE 2 STAFF REPORT AND COMMITTEE FEEDBACK**

Jim Barry turned over control of the meeting to Mette Brogden and the staff to allow him to be able to comment on the report as a committee member not the committee chair.

Mette Brogden introduced herself to the committee. She presented an agenda for the meeting: the committee would hear the key points, goals and recommendations of the staff report, time would be allowed for questions or requests of clarifications from the committee after each section, and finally, staff would be looking for comments and feedback on their report from the committee. The committee would then discuss how their report should differ in focus from the staff report and a preliminary draft outline of the committee report would be developed.

Nicole Ewing Gavin and Melaney Seacat distributed copies of the power point presentation Update on Development of Phase 2 Staff Report to all committee members and made a presentation of the report together.

QUESTIONS / CLARIFICATIONS:

Shared Goals – Water Supply

Marcelino Flores questioned if the shared goals of water supply were prioritized. Nicole responded that the order was random in the draft report but will be prioritized in the final report. He also asked for clarification of working collaboratively, city, county, regional? Nicole responded in the final report the recommendations for each goal will be more specifically tied to city, county or other entity.

Chris Brooks asked where conservation fit into the water supply goal? Nicole responded this issue was placed in the demand management bucket for discussion.

Jim Barry asked if staff was going to address the issue of how much water we actually have and how much we don't know if we have? Nicole responded that the final report would contain more specific information taken from the technical papers to support each recommendation.

Goal 1.3 - Jim Barry asked for clarification of shared system efficiencies mentioned in this recommendation. Ed Curley responded that meant trying to maintain a balance of potable water goals as well as wastewater goals when servicing needs.

Marcelino Flores asked if there was a shared definition of sustainability? The response was no, there is not a shared definition but staff will consider this as a comment.

Jim Barry questioned by focusing so heavily on the ADD Water process to acquire new water supplies, are other sources being dismissed or not given due consideration? Ed answered that all sources are being considered but prioritizing leads to focus on the ADD Water process.

Marcelino Flores questioned if recommendations were prioritized. The response was no.

Bruce Gungle asked if storm water/water harvesting, either at a local or municipal level, had been removed from the potential supply discussion? The response was that it is still being considered and studied.

Jim Barry questioned if there will be a specific action plan proposed to meet the recommendations put forth in report? Nicole responded that staff needs the governing body endorsement at the recommendation level before proposing an action plan.

Goal 2.3 - Bonnie Poulos asked for clarification of item 2.3. In studying the use of gray water it was found that the engineering of some areas did not allow for the reduced flow of gray water and the buildup of solids requiring additional flushing of lines. The county is in full support of the use of gray water in situations where the benefits outweigh the problems of using it. Carla explained that the County offers developers an array of options to mitigate water use including the use of gray water, however this pertains mostly to new developments. The City faces the challenge of existing infrastructure that is not designed for the lower flow of gray water.

Marcelino Flores asked if the options presented to developers needed to make engineering sense? Carla responded yes, there is actually more opportunity in new construction and new development to coincide with engineering at the subdivision plat design level and the individual lot level.

Nicole acknowledged that there is considerable overlap between the bucket of water supply and demand management. The staff tried to separate recommendations to the individual buckets rather than duplicating the recommendations.

Goal 4.1 - Regarding 4.1, Jim asked if the option of getting Pima County voter authorization for Geo Bonds for extending effluent lines is still being considered? Chris Avery answered yes and that it also relates to financing options. Jim asked what the cost was of extending the effluent lines? Chris responded it could be very costly.

John Carlson asked about building a treatment plan on the southeast side of Tucson to service the Vail area. Chris responded that areas of most development on the southeast side drain into the Santa Cruz River not the Pantano Wash. Building a treatment plant slightly west of Pantano Wash in the I-10 corridor makes sense, as there is an immediate demand for service there and a positive demand in the foreseeable future.

Marcelino Flores asked if there is a precedent for a tax-supported system and what type of entity is responsible for carrying out those government obligation bonds? Chris did not know of a precedence but Tucson is unique in that it operates its reclaim system as a separate entity from the waste water treatment system.

Bonnie Poulos asked if it is desirable to feed effluent to plants by gravity doesn't that require sewage to be pumped uphill thereby switching the cost from the effluent user to the sewage provider? Chris answered that by locating scalping plants throughout the system liquids can be removed from the wastewater stream while sending the solids to the treatment plant and the weight of pumping is in the liquid portion.

Mark Stratton asked if opportunities were reviewed for new master planned communities where reclaim lines are in close proximity to require the new development to have dual piping systems so their outdoor usage can be put on reclaim system? Chris responded that Civano is an example of just this. A substantial amount of money was invested to bring reclaim lines out to the Houghton corridor. Viewed in isolation this may not make sense but viewed as a step in a reclaim system it does as this area is most likely where the next set of real opportunities will be.

Shared Goals - Comprehensive Integrated Planning

Goal 1.1 - Jim Barry asked what other legislative actions might entail? Arlan responded that this may include state legislative changes or state land reforms.

Marcelino Flores asked how the city and county are represented in this process? Arlan and Albert are involved in leading this process. Attendance for these meetings has been very consistent and regionally well represented.

Marcelino Flores asked if existing infrastructure should be improved before it is actually needed for infill development? Nicole responded that recommendation 2.2 addresses this issue and the need to be proactive with planning for infrastructure improvements.

Marcelino Flores asked if eminent domain has been considered for the acquisition of "Z status" properties so the city will not be overcharged for these properties when it comes to infill development? Arlan responded that it would be looked in to.

Goal 3.1 - Chris Brooks questioned who has the staff in these economic times to do the long range planning suggested in this recommendation? Nicole and Arlan responded that issues facing City and County will need to be prioritized in order to be addressed in these times of short staffing. The importance of this issue must be emphasized to elected officials.

Goal 3.5 - Marcelino Flores asked if there are regional solutions to address the disconnect between where water is being pumped and where it is being replenished? Suzanne responded that a new regional perspective (city, county and private water companies) is required to look at areas beyond just who has jurisdiction for that area to more efficiently manage the water uses and needs.

Shared Goals - Demand Management

Goal 1.1 - John Barry asked if staff was going to recommend a time frame for establishing these goals? The response was that endorsement from elected officials that this is the direction to go in must be received before staff will provide a time specific action plan.

Jim Barry questioned asterisk on the word efficiency in section 1.1. Melaney responded the asterisk will relate to a definition of the word in the actual report.

Goal 2.1 - Bonnie Poulos suggested that waterless urinals be considered along with high efficiency toilets as a water usage savings option. She questioned why redevelopment is not mentioned in this goal? The response was that the County building code does require waterless urinals in new construction for commercial buildings but it is not in the City code at this time. Most redevelopment construction avoids redoing bathrooms/plumbing as developers try to save money by not having to bring plumbing up to new building codes.

Jim Barry asked if staff looked at the Water CASA recommendation to eliminate the use of potable water for landscape requirements? The response was to recommend the reduction of using potable water for landscape requirements, not eliminating it and encourage the use of other sources.

Joseph Maher asked what a branch twig piping system was? The response is that it is a recirculation plumbing system.

Goal 4.1 - John Carlson asked what are the current regulations for retention/detention basins? Suzanne responded that city and county adopted regulations around 1986 for retention/detention basins. Currently these regulations are being refined as work is done to quantify water that is held in depressed medians, etc. that can be added to mix.

Jim Barry asked if this demand management goal is linked to the comprehensive management planning goals? Arman responded that there are parts of the demand management goal that could become policy or part of the comprehensive plan. Suzanne stated there are two areas where this could be incorporated. Stormwater harvesting supports the Pima County water policy. Stormwater and flood control plans support the water quality goals that the city, county and other jurisdictions must meet.

Goal 5.1 - John Carlson asked if ADWR had any conservation programming going? Fernando said an extensive audit of the large water users was conducted a few years ago. This provided a fairly detailed picture of who was using the water and how much. Big users do not necessarily mean big opportunity for conservation. There is need to identify regionally where conservation programming has the most potential.

Shared Goals - Respect for the Environment

Goal 5.1 - John Carlson asked if hydriparian areas are to be restored shouldn't the cost of that restoration be included in the report? Suzanne responded that the focus is to prevent the future loss of hydriparian habitat in groundwater areas. This goal is about the preservation of the existing to the best of ability.

Rob Kulakofsky asked if staff purposely stayed away from 3rd rail of progress in AZ legislature by not mentioning trying to affect legislation to allow municipalities or counties to have some say over what wells can be turned off or slowed down. Chris responded that City and County asked and received legislation that can prevent the drilling of new exempt wells in the service area. When dealing with existing wells it is more a matter of judicial 3rd rail issues not a legislative issue.

Goal 2.3 – Jim Barry asked what areas are being considered for preservation and or restoration? Suzanne responded for the purposes of this report the metropolitan area is what is being considered, focusing on preservation where new development is occurring and where

can restoration be done that would add value to the area keeping in mind that some restoration work may be required to maintain compliance with the endangered species act.

Goal 3.2 – Bruce Gungle asked what is the focus of recommendation 3.2? Melaney responded that by utilizing areas of impervious surfaces there might be opportunities to do mini-restorations with very little additional water needs.

Goal 5.1 – John Carlson asked how was the figure of 10,000 AF of effluent arrived at? Chris responded that it was the result of negotiations between Tucson Water and Pima County and the number is an estimate that can be used for calculation purposes.

Jim Barry asked how soon this could this be presented to Mayor and Council or Board of Supervisors? Chris answered very soon from the city side.

GENERAL QUESTIONS

Jim Barry asked if staff said anything in the report about a sustainable water future? Nicole responded this would be mentioned in the introductory comments that elements of a sustainable water future tie together the important issues of the report.

Is staff going to talk about population estimates of the future and tie that into the comprehensive planning section? Nicole stated population will be discussed in build out scenarios and population modeling will be referenced but there will be no population predictions as such.

Is staff going to prioritize among the buckets? Melaney responded that prioritization will take place at the recommendation level not at the bucket level.

Jim Barry asked if the staff was going to do any reporting on the conservation effluent pool? Melaney responded this topic was inadvertently omitted from the draft report but it will be in the final report.

COMMENTS:

Marcelino Flores suggested the report include an acknowledgement page for the dedication of staff members participating in the technical team.

Bruce Gungle suggested a change in verbiage of bullet point 3 of the Comprehensive Integrated Planning Guiding Principles slide – item should read ‘New growth must be located where it is the *least detrimental* to the environment.... Melaney responded this was taken directly from the scope of work. Jim Barry suggested this might be a point of importance for the committee report.

John Carlson stressed the importance of developing a regional approach for the study to include city, county and other water utilities.

Tina Lee agreed that the uncertainties for a sustainable water future are a very prevalent theme. The report should be more inclusive to examine population estimates, regulatory issues and environmental conditions.

Goal 1 - Vince Vasquez suggested that sections 1.1 and 1.5 should both carry a regional tone rather than separate city and county from local water providers using same wording for SAWRSA as for ADD Water. Ed agreed this could be changed.

Goal 2 – Jim Barry commented that native landscaping should also be considered as a way to reduce water usage and perhaps this should be a requirement for new developments.

Goal 5 – Bonnie Poulos noted that mention was not made about policies that are in place as water becomes scarce. Who is going to control the water and who is going to decide what the most important uses of the water are? Chris Avery responded that the scenario planning that was suggested is an adaptive management process that looks at options on a continuous basis as conditions change.

Marcelino Flores suggested that all goals should be SMART goals: Specific, Measurable, Action oriented, Realistic, Time frame.

Shared Goals – Comprehensive Integrated Planning

Goal 1.1 - Jim Barry suggested moving the bullet point of 'Reduced water and energy consumption' higher up in the list as this is the real focus of the study.

Goal 2.1- John Carlson suggested that incentives could be for not doing something wrong or detrimental.

Rob Kulakofsky commented that it is important to consider infill development with design meaning there needs to be a mechanism in place to build/rebuild infrastructure to attract infill development.

Goal 3 – Bonnie Poulos stated that regulatory issues often become a barrier when determining who is going to pay for what as growth develops.

Jim Barry suggests that Goal 3.2 be directly related to Goal 2.1.

Goal 3.5 – Vince Vasquez suggested that verbiage be changed from other jurisdictions to all municipal water providers.

Goal 4 – Committee may want to define methods of encouragement to ensure that growth will pay for itself.

Vince Vasquez noted that the staff report seems devoid of economic instruments or analysis.

Shared Goals – Respect for the Environment

Goal 4.2 – John Carlson suggested a cautionary note that there may not be enough money to do restoration along the Santa Cruz River and that the report should not suggest restoration plans that might not happen. The idea is to change legislation so the secretary's of the interior get 100% recharge credits so they have incentive not to take it out of the Santa Cruz River. Restoration along the river may take many forms including several smaller areas of restoration and oases instead of a narrow band of along the river itself.

7. DISCUSSION OF COMMITTEE PHASE 2 REPORT WRITING PROCESS AND NEXT MEETING AGENDA

Mette Brogden began discussion by reviewing the Staff Report Outline. Clarification of what Item II Overarching Issues included was requested. Melaney responded this would include the key issues, outcomes, 'the elephants in the room' and elements of a sustainable water future.

Discussion followed of how the committee report should differ from staff report, what should the focus/key points/purpose of the committee report be.

- Sustainability
- Carrying capacity
- Economic feasibility
- Reaction to the staff report recommendations and how would the committee prioritize those
- Additional themes that are important to committee members not addressed by staff report

Mette requested that each member submit his or her top three contributions on each line item of the staff report outline to her by October 9, 2009. She will compile the responses, eliminating the overlap, and bring that to the next meeting to begin development of the committee report. She will add the following statement under overarching issues: What are the elements of a sustainable water future.

Tina Lee requested that committee members receive a list of all original recommendations that the staff had initially before condensing them into their report. Jim Barry suggested that staff document how they reduced the 126 recommendations to 50 recommendations.

11. **AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING**

Mette distributed a draft timeline for the Phase 2 Report development. The focus of the next meeting will be to expand on the draft outline for the committee report.

12. **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE**

None

13. **ADJOURNMENT***

Jim Barry adjourned the meeting at 8:52 p.m.

Attendees:

Alan O'Brien

Judith S. Meyer