



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)**

**May 12, 2008
Meeting Summary**

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Jim Barry called the May 12, 2008 meeting of the City/County Water and Wastewater Study Oversight Committee (Oversight Committee) to order at 6:00 p.m., at the Randolph Golf Course Club House, Copper Room, 600 South Alvernon Way, Tucson, Arizona.

Members Present:

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

Representing:

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

Members Absent:

Mark Stratton
Daniel Sullivan
James Watson

Representing:

WMAC
CWAC
City Planning Commission

City/County Staff Present:

Nicole Ewing Gavin, City Manager's Office
Sandy Elder, Tucson Water
Chris Avery, Tucson Water
Dennis Rule, Tucson Water
Albert Elias, City Planning Department
Chris Kaselemis, City Planning Department
Andrew Greenhill, Mayor's Office
Holly Lachowicz, Ward 3 City Council Office
C.T. Revere, Ward 6 City Council Office
Leslie Liberti, Director, City Office of Conservation & Sustainable Development
Melaney Seacat, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Nicole Fyffe, Pima County Administrator's Office
Ed Curley, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department

Eric Wieduwilt, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Matt Matthewson, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Colby Bowser, Office of Supervisor Ann Day

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: April 18, 2008 and April 23, 2008

The April 18 meeting minutes had no changes. Motion to approve the April 18, 2008 minutes, duly seconded, passed by voice vote 9 to 0. Sean Sullivan made corrections to the minutes for the April 23 meeting. The revised April 23 minutes will be presented for approval at the next meeting.

3. CALL TO THE AUDIENCE

Following is a brief summary of the key points addressed by the speakers. For a verbatim audio recording of the public comment please visit www.tucsonpimawaterstudy.com.

Tracy Williams, representing Sustainable Tucson, asked the Committee to hold the meetings when the public can attend as the public is very interested in this study. She expressed her thanks to the Committee for holding this meeting in an accessible place. Also, her review of the water website brought some concern about some water figures.

Collette Altaffer, Tucson citizen, prefers the meetings held during the evenings which is best for people who work. She does not want the technical elements farmed out to subcommittees, which would undermine the process.

Bill Dupont, Tucson citizen, asked to correct the April 23 minutes to reflect the fact that he would not like subcommittees to be formed.

Michael Guymon, from the Metropolitan Pima Alliance (MPA) spoke concerning the meaningful participation of the public in the process. He provided a letter to the Committee which is attached to these minutes.

4. FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE

Jim Barry, Chairman, began the discussion of future meeting schedules to get to the December 2008 deadline for completion of phase 1. He suggested that the meetings in June through September be held as working meetings without subcommittees and be open to the public. The necessity of having a draft report by November 10 in order to finalize it by December 8 was discussed. Melaney Seacat, Pima County Coordinator for the study provided results of the survey of Committee members regarding choices for meetings. Those choices being: a) mornings only, b) evenings only, and c) a combination of mornings and evenings.

Carol Zimmerman stated she felt evenings may be discriminatory to women with children.

Rob Kulakofsky disagreed with Carol Zimmerman stating that it is difficult for most working people to get time off from work for these meetings. What is most important is when it is convenient for the public to attend.

Bob Cook stated that the alternating morning/evening schedule worked best as a compromise between the Committee members and the public.

Sean Sullivan stated that Tuesday meetings would conflict with existing Board of Supervisor and City Council meetings.

Bonnie Poulos preferred the alternating schedule as well, in particular early evening. She asked members of the audience to raise their hands if they could attend early evenings. Approximately 20 people raised their hands.

Jim Barry recommended the Committee go with the alternating approach and asked if a standard day could be decided among Committee members.

Melaney Seacat explained that many of these meetings may need to be three hour workshops during this phase of the study.

John Carlson agreed that the alternating schedule provided the most flexibility for the Committee and the public and the schedule can be revisited and if needed changed down the road.

Bonnie Poulos made a motion that meetings be held on Wednesdays alternating mornings and evenings every other week. This schedule could potentially start with an evening meeting on June 4th but it was suggested that staff check the schedules of other committee meetings to determine the best date and time to start this schedule to avoid conflicts. It was mentioned that the schedule could be revisited in August or September to determine if changes are needed. Motion was seconded by Bruce Gungle and carried 8 to 1, with Rob Kulakofsky opposed.

5. DISCUSSION OF COMMITTEE MISSION, STRUCTURE, AND PROCEDURES

Marcelino Flores opened this discussion asking if there were procedures to follow for these meetings.

Jim Barry asked that Nicole Ewing Gavin, City project coordinator address this question. Nicole distributed a draft Guidelines and Procedures document to the committee along with examples of procedures from 3 other committees.

Rob Kulakofsky suggested that appointing a vice-chair as a backup to the chair might be appropriate and would like to add this item to the next meeting agenda.

John Carlson emphasized that the procedures need to include the importance of the committee being open to the public.

Bruce Gungle suggested that the committee be governed by Roberts Rules of Order as is standard for most committees and that this be included in the Guidelines and Procedures.

Marcelino Flores asked how the Committee intends to bring new business forward as well as respond to the public including written comments and call to the audience.

John Carlson stated that the venue for public input should be the committee meetings.

Jim Barry asked staff to return with an updated Guidelines and Procedures document at the first meeting in June.

Ed Taczanowsky, President, Southern Arizona Home Builders Association (SAHBA) and member of the Tucson Regional Water Coalition, addressed the Committee about public involvement in the study. He submitted a letter to the Committee which is attached to these minutes.

6. PRESENTATION/DISCUSSION OF DRAFT PUBLIC PARTICIPATION REPORT

Jim Barry asked the Committee for comments on the draft Progress Report to be submitted to the Mayor and Council and Board of Supervisors by May 23.

Carol Zimmerman emphasized the importance of distinguishing between phases 1 and 2 of the study in terms of phase 1 focusing on data collection and phase 2 focusing on policies and values. The latter will require more public participation and will be a whole different process than phase 1. She suggested the committee revisit what phase 2 might look like in October.

Bonnie Poulos stated that the public will be involved in phase 1 hearing the presentations on the data and being able to ask questions and comment throughout the process. She mentioned the importance of responding to public comments and questions throughout the process. Phase 1 will lay the groundwork for phase 2 and the values discussion will follow from data.

Rob Kulakofsky asked that stakeholder input be submitted in writing when possible and that 3rd party review be part of the process. He suggested discussing phase 2 public involvement later in phase 1 when we know more.

Sean Sullivan stated that it will still be important to look at population and resources scenarios from a data perspective in phase 1, while values and interpretations will come in phase 2.

Val Little representing Water CASA spoke about the issue of homeland security affecting water providers' ability to reveal infrastructure locations. She also mentioned that water providers who are members of Water Casa wish to participate in their own study and are looking for a template so they can conduct their own inventory and assessment consistent with the City and County.II.

Jim Barry asked staff to incorporate the comments and bring the report back to the next meeting for committee review and approval.

Bonnie Poulos suggested that the last 3 meetings be in an expert panel debate format.

Sean Sullivan suggested town hall meetings be incorporated into the fall schedule.

Bruce Gungle suggested that time be set aside in the fall to consider public input on the report.

7. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

During Item 5, Rob Kulakofsky asked that the appointment of a vice-chair as a backup to the chair be discussed at the next meeting.

8. CALL TO THE AUDIENCE

Following is a brief summary of the key points addressed by the speakers. For a verbatim audio recording of the public comment please visit www.tucsonpimawaterstudy.com.

Madeline Kiser, of Sustainable Tucson spoke about the importance of looking at holistic solutions, not just high tech solutions, and questioning the paradigm we are operating from.

Bob Cook, alternate member of the Oversight Committee, addressed the following issues:

- Economic development must be on the table in Phase 1, per Mike Hein's comments on cost of growth and the fact that growth could be subsidized by the City of Tucson for economic development purposes.
- In reviewing other public processes' best practices, it is important to look at water processes, including those in other places, which have more relevance than processes dealing with other topics.
- Phase 1, part C should be moved to Phase 2 because it is inherently a values discussion.

Margot Garcia discussed the importance of laying out assumptions behind the facts that are presented and pointed out that when you look at the underlying assumptions between seemingly divergent views, you often find agreement.

Tres English discussed the importance of distinguishing between water uses vs. water needs.

Tony Novelli spoke about focusing on points of agreement as the process moves forward.

Tracy Williams, of Sustainable Tucson spoke about the Arizona Water Bank being a crucial part of this puzzle.

Jim Kiser, with Southern Arizona Leadership Council, described the Tucson Regional Water Coalition and agreed to provide information on the group to the Committee.

Mark Marikos, with the University of Arizona, made a suggestion regarding improving the sound system at future meetings.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 7:47 p.m.



City/County Water & Wastewater Study Oversight Committee Meeting- 5/12/2008 Attendees



	Last Name	First Name	Organization	5/12/2008
1	Baker	Beryl		✓
3	Bowser	Colby	BOS	✓
4	Brooks	Chris		✓
5	Cachora	Phyllis	Tohono O'odham Nation	✓
6	Caporaso	Mike	Westland	✓
7	Carey	Bryce	BBVNA Neighborhood Assoc.	✓
10	Cordy	Gail		✓
11	Current	Sandy	PCRWRD	✓
12	Detwiler	Andrew	KE&G Construction	✓
13	Dickerson	Dennis		✓
14	DuPont	Bill & Denise		✓
15	Elder	Sandy	Tucson Water	✓
16	Elias	Albert	COT Urban Planning & Design	✓
17	English	Tres		✓
18	Ester	Charles	SRP	✓
19	Freitas	Chuck		✓
20	Garcia	Margot		✓
21	Greenhill	Andrew	Mayor's Office	✓
22	Guymon	Michael	Metro Pima Alliance	✓
23	Heller	Carol		✓
24	Kaselemis	Chris	City Planning	✓
25	Kiser	Madeline		✓
26	Kiser	Jim	SALC	✓
28	Lachowicz	Holly		✓
30	Liberti	Leslie	City - Conservation & Sustainable Dev.	✓
31	Liston	Olivia	Tohono O'odham Nation	✓
32	Little	Val		✓
33	Lopez	Mary J.	TON Legislative	✓
34	Mackey	Paul		✓
35	Marikos	Mark	University of Arizona -- Facilities Management	✓
36	Matthewson	Matt	PCRWRD	✓
37	Niemann	Wendell & Rosema	CUNA	✓
38	Novelli	Tony		✓
39	Pierce	Les	Arroyo Chico Neighborhood Association	✓
41	Revese	C.T.	Ward 6	✓
42	Roe	Alice		✓
43	Romero	Wavalene		✓
44	Rule	Dennis	Tucson Water	✓



City/County Water & Wastewater Study Oversight Committee Meeting- 5/12/2008 Attendees



	Last Name	First Name	Organization	5/12/2008
45	Scadron	Arlene		✓
47	Taylor	Mark	Westland Resources	✓
48	Taczgnowsky	Edward	SAHBA	✓
49	Urbon-Bonie	Angela	Sewell Neighborhood Assoc.	✓
50	Vasquez	Vince	DVI	✓
51	Von Rago	Lilian	PCRWRD	✓
52	Ward	Kathy	Town of Sahuarita	✓
53	Williams	Tracy		✓
54	Zucker	Claire	PAG	✓

Statement to the City/County Regional Water Oversight Committee

May 12, 2008

By the members of the Tucson Regional Water Coalition

Michael
Guymon
MPA
Statement

Most of the concern surrounding the City/County water study involves the stakeholder list and the timing of various stakeholders' participation. On several occasions, the Oversight Committee has discussed opening the process to a wider range of interested parties sooner rather than later. We ask that today you formally endorse and strengthen that position with your recommendation to our elected officials.

Your recommendation to open the process enjoys broad-based support. A wide spectrum of interests from every corner of the region has asked the Committee to create a meaningful public process that drives this study. Neighborhood groups, developers, concerned citizens, environmentalists, elected officials, homebuilders, water organizations, municipal providers, private water utilities, business groups, and members of this Committee have urged the creation of a large table where all parties are heard. Committee meetings have included references to the region's most successful planning processes. Invariably, successes have been attributed to a spirit of inclusiveness and an understanding that every member of our regional community contributes a vital piece to balanced solutions. The talents, knowledge base, and resources of all parties should be included today—not tomorrow, not in later phases of the study—and should have a meaningful impact on the foundation of this important endeavor. Among other things, this should include a thorough vetting of the proposed scope of work.

The City Council's motion to approve the regional study on February 20th included similar statements regarding broad participation. The motion grants the Oversight Committee ample latitude to recommend a process that addresses the diverse interests of the community. It asks your committee to recommend "a broad-based and transparent public process for engaging our diverse community"

Councilmember Shirley Scott specifically requested that the motion be amended to clearly define that a "balanced" committee means "that voices from various communities are represented."

Supervisor Ray Carroll sent a letter February 12th to the Tucson Metro Chamber of Commerce in response to concerns about limited representation in the City/County outlined study. He wrote:

"Obviously, in dealing with regional water issues we must deal with all regional entities. This must include more jurisdictions than only Pima County and the City of Tucson, and has to include private as well as public sector interests."

Before leaving office, Councilmember Carol West wrote a memo November 14th, 2007 offering an alternative whereby an engaged citizens' committee representing the entire region—not narrow jurisdictional interests — would develop the scope of work. She emphasized the need for impartiality and for the citizens' committee to identify the questions the study should address.

The County Administrator's memo dated March 18, 2008 includes specific statements about meaningful participation from all regional interests. He wrote:

“Specifically, regional interests need to develop a forum for all to meaningfully participate in a regional water discussion. All simply means all—business, neighborhood, environmental, water, governmental, trades, etc. Every person or organization with an idea should have a place at the table of public debate, all with an equal position.”

“This process should allow regional interests to be engaged, and to make very specific participatory recommendations to the jointly appointed CWAC, WMAC, and City and County Planning Commissions.”

The Tucson Regional Water Coalition has been involved with this process since its inception. The Coalition's historical leadership on this issue and its concerns over the current direction prompted the County Administrator to ask the group to “propose a public involvement plan that would resolve their concern in this area.”

Therefore, the Coalition recommends a process similar to that being practiced currently in a statewide water resources planning effort. The Oversight Committee would work with Stakeholders to ensure that their concerns are considered in the scope of work and the development of alternatives, and provide feedback on how stakeholder input influenced each work product.

Stakeholders would be defined as representative individuals, organizations, or political entities that have an interest in the outcome, including but not limited to: Agriculture, Neighborhood Groups, Business & Economic Development, Environmental Groups, Government Agencies, Homebuilders, Developers, Indian Communities, M&I Water Providers, Mines, Member Organizations, Universities, Interested Individuals, etc.

The Oversight Committee would finalize plans for stakeholder meetings, including agenda, meeting structure, content of materials, objectives and work-products. The Oversight Committee would finalize work products summarizing results of stakeholder meetings for the City and County elected bodies. The Oversight Committee would also attend and participate as stakeholders during stakeholder meetings. And a neutral public participation facilitator would guide the implementation of the Stakeholder Participation Program in order to maintain the integrity of the process. At the conclusion of the Stakeholder process, the elected bodies would be asked to consider action on the recommended plan.

CONCLUSION:

Virtually all dialogue and correspondence on the issue of participation has included the concept of broad inclusiveness. However, Supervisor Carroll and the County Administrator more completely framed the issue by using the phrase “meaningful participation.” Meaningful inclusion and participation entails more than open meeting laws and calls to the audience. It means a seat at the table; it means a chance to participate from the study’s foundation—not a casual invitation midstream. It means reviewing, and if necessary amending, everything from the scope of work to the study’s final documents.

The revised scope dated April 1st provides broad latitude to the Oversight Committee to recommend changes to the study if necessary. Your recommendation to our elected officials could reshape this process to ensure meaningful participation from the entire region. We ask that you send that message to our elected officials with your recommendation today. Thank you.



ed. T. Statement

May 12, 2008

Southern Arizona Home Builders Association

2840 N. Country Club Road
Tucson, Arizona 85716
Phone: (520) 795-5114
Fax: (520) 326-8665
Web: www.sahba.org

President
Edward P. Taczanowsky

2008 Executive Officers

Chairman
Randy Agron
A. F. Sterling Home Builders

First Vice Chairman
Steve Craddock
Lennar

Second Vice Chairman
Steve Washburn
Washburn Custom Builders

Secretary
Martha Wright
Southwest Gas Corporation

Treasurer
John Shorbe, Sr.
Canoa Development, Inc.

2007 Past Chairman
Art Flagg
KB Home

Legal Counsel
John E. Kofron
Fennemore Craig

To Members of the City/County Water Oversight Committee:

As a member of the Tucson Regional Water Coalition, Southern Arizona Home Builders Association supports the Coalition's request to open the City/County study to a wider range of regional stakeholders immediately. SAHBA strongly believes that this study must be founded on the meaningful involvement of a diverse stakeholder group. Meaningful involvement fundamentally includes input on the proposed scope of work prior to initiating the study. SAHBA supports a public process that includes both public and private interests, and full representation for all who are impacted by decisions.

It has been reported that other jurisdictions and water providers are being encouraged to initiate water resources and infrastructure inventories concurrent with the City/County study. The proposed scope of work includes bringing other jurisdictions, water providers, and interested parties into the City/County study after these so-called inventories are complete. Notwithstanding our support of the above, there are several items in Phases I and II that go beyond data collection and inventorying, and include decisions affecting the larger region. We feel strongly that the Oversight Committee should recommend amending the scope to delay all items that involve more than data collection and inventorying until after the larger stakeholder group is assembled.

These items include:

- o Finalizing the Conservation Effluent Pool and IGA amendments.
- o Agreement on Population Growth, Water, Urban Form, Land Use Planning and Infrastructure.
- o Determining a population based on current water resources.
- o Integration of Land and Water Planning.
- o Implementation of Consistent Water Conservation Standards.
- o Acquisition of new water resources.
- o Common Environmental Standards and Goals with respect to water resources.

In summary, Phase I should include only an inventory of infrastructure and water resources assets. All other items in the proposed scope of work should be delayed until such time when all regional stakeholders may meaningfully impact decision-making processes.

Sincerely,

President

