

HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN
Technical Advisory Committee
Tuesday, July 26, 2005 1:00 – 4:00pm
Arizona Game and Fish Department Conference Room
555 North Greasewood Road
Tucson, Arizona 87545-3612

MEETING SUMMARY

Attendees: Trevor Hare, Ralph Marra and Bruce Prior (City of Tucson – Tucson Water), Rich Gliniski, Ann Phillips, Dennis Abbate, Guy McPherson, Marit Alanen (USFWS), Cathy Blaush (AGFD), Michael Wyneken (City of Tucson – Planning), Leslie Liberti (SWCA), Ken Kertell (SWCA), Jessica Lee (SWCA), Diana Rhoades (Sonoran Institute), Lynn Hubbard (City of Tucson – Environmental Services)

1) Update on Recent TAC and SAC Meetings/Upcoming Meetings

a. *Scheduled SAC Meetings:*

- **July 27**, 3-5 pm, @ Game and Fish. Conservation measures for Southlands species and implementation options.
- **August 17**, 3-5 pm, @ Game and Fish. Tentative Topics: Conservation measures for Avra Valley species and implementation options.
- **August 31**, 3-5 pm, @ Game and Fish. Tentative Topics: Conservation measures for Santa Cruz River species and implementation options.

b. *Scheduled TAC Meetings:*

- **August 9**, 1-4 pm, @ **Fish and Wildlife**. Continuing conversation on Southlands.
- **August 23**, 1-4 pm, @ Game and Fish. Tucson Water presentation and covered activities for Avra Valley.
- **September 13**, 1-4 pm, @ Game and Fish. Continuing Avra Valley conversation.
- **September 27**, 1-4 pm, @ Game and Fish. TBA.
- **October 11**, 1-4 pm, @ Game and Fish. TBA.
- **October 25**, 1-4 pm, @ Game and Fish. TBA.
- **November 15**, 1-4 pm, @ Game and Fish. TBA.
- **November 29**, 1-4 pm, @ Game and Fish. TBA.

Leslie said that, at the last SAC meeting (July 13), the group brainstormed about possible implementation tools. Leslie handed out a brief summary of the conservation strategies, implementation mechanisms, funding sources, and management arrangements for several other HCPs to jump-start the discussion. Their next meeting is to see what implementation options are available for both the City and the County, considering issues such as equity concerns surrounding who should pay what portion of the costs. Leslie suggested that SAC/TAC do another combined meeting in September so the two groups can check in with each other, ask questions and make sure they are on the same page.

2) Old Business

a. *Meeting Minutes – Discussion and Approval of May 27, June 7, and June 22, 2005 Minutes*

Leslie said that the TAC has three sets of meeting minutes to approve. She added that Linwood had sent an email regarding the June 7 meeting minutes. He had previously said that he had comments, but decided that they were all minor and not worth worrying about. He did have a few comments regarding nest parasitism for the yellow-billed cuckoo (YBC). His concern was that the meeting minutes overly stressed the threat of cowbirds to YBC nests. He wrote that there are less than a dozen records of cowbirds impacting cuckoos in the U.S., and that he doesn't think they are as big of a problem as they sounded in the meeting minutes. Leslie asked if anyone else had comments. Ralph said he has comments to the May 4 SAC meetings minutes. No one else said they had comments. TAC approved the meeting minutes for May 27, and June 7. The June 22 minutes were tentatively approved pending approval from the SAC. Leslie said that if the SAC had comments on the joint meeting minutes, she would send out the revised minutes and they could be approved at the next TAC meeting.

b. *Action Items from Previous Meeting*

No action items were held over from the July 12, 2005 meeting.

c. *Topics held over from Previous Meeting*

No topics were held over from the July 12, 2005 meeting.

d. *Yellow-billed Cuckoo News*

Ann said that there were six detections of YBC over two days on the south side of the Santa Cruz River at the Simpson Farm Site approximately two weeks ago. She noted that the surveyor (Scott Wilbor), who was doing protocol surveys in the area, said there might be a nesting pair. She said YBC individuals could be curious enough for the same birds to follow the surveyor down the road. Ann and Leslie suggested that YBC surveys be done as soon as possible at the Simpson Farm Site because if they were a nesting pair, it would be the first recorded one in this area. Cathy thought that there are a few people at AGFD who are trained with the YBC protocol who might be able to survey. Dennis said he would get Scott Richardson and ask Scott to contact Ann. Trevor asked what is known about YBC around this area, and perhaps where they are migrating. Leslie said TAC hasn't really talked about movement corridors for YBC, and Ann said she is not sure either. Leslie said that the YBC are coming up from South America, and the general area around Tucson is a corridor. She explained the YBC travel at night, and when it starts to get light they look for green spot to land and stay at during the day. Leslie noted that the YBC subcommittee talked about the Brawley/Altar Wash complex and the Santa Cruz River corridor as potential corridors. Trevor asked Ann if YBC nest in the Upper Santa Cruz River area near Tumacacori. Trevor pointed out that if YBC are coming from Cienega Creek Reserve, they might be traveling across the City/Southlands to get to the Santa Cruz River corridor. Leslie said TAC could pose the corridor question to individuals on the YBC subcommittee to see if they had any thoughts.

3) New Business

a. *State Trust Land Reform Presentation (Diana Rhoades – Sonoran Institute)*

Diana Rhoades, Outreach Specialist for the Sonoran Institute, gave a presentation titled “State Trust Land Reform: A Citizen’s Initiative for Conserving Arizona’s Future.” Diana handed out a campaign sheet for Conserving Arizona’s Future and the draft language of the proposed amendment.

Diana started the presentation by giving a brief introduction of the Sonoran Institute (www.sonoran.org). Diana said that the Sonoran Institute just filed a petition on July 21, 2005 for the citizen initiative that would protect lands owned by the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD). She said that the Sonoran Institute is part of a coalition that is working on state land trust reform (she included a long list that includes organizations from around the state).

In Arizona, State Trust land makes up 13 percent of the total, while 17 percent is private land, 26 percent is tribal land, and 44 percent is federal land. Arizona’s Constitution requires all State Trust land to be leased or sold at auction. Currently, no State Trust land has been set aside for conservation. The state land commissioner, Mark Winkleman (a governor appointee), is the only person who can decide conservation decisions for state land. The initiative, called “Conserving Arizona’s Future,” would require ASLD to: conserve 700,000 acres of some of the most important natural areas in Arizona and protect them from development; provide state and local authorities the power to limit and control development and force developers to build quality projects; to protect an essential classroom funding stream ensuring better schools in Arizona; and to create a seven member committee to oversee the ASLD commissioner.

Diana said that the ASLD was created in 1912 to manage State Trust lands and resources to enhance value and optimize economic return for the Trust beneficiaries. Public schools are the largest beneficiary. Eight million of acres of ASLD are leased for grazing, and the initiative doesn’t try to change grazing program. Ultimately, trust land is sold to the highest bidder. Without reform, all ASLD can do is lease and sell state lands. Arizona is the second fastest growing state in country, and state lands are being pursued at higher rates for development. Around Phoenix is where state trust lands are most threatened and large land sales are happening regularly. However, Diana pointed to the McDowell Sonoran Preserve in Phoenix as an example of people wanting to protect land, but they cannot because ASLD does not have the ability to incorporate conservation values. State Land trust beneficiaries recognize non-monetary values, including conservation values. Diana noted that John Wright, President of the Arizona Education Association, recognizes that land have other values besides monetary values, such as conservation values. The initiative would save approximately 700,000 acres from development; require ALDS to work with local governments, and guarantee classroom funding. She said that these special areas on the map (700,000 acres) come from voter-approved lands for open space, important natural areas, wildlife habitat and corridors, state parks, national parks and public lands.

Out of the 700,000 acres of conservation reserves, there are three types: 73,000 acres are “educational” reserves, 259,000 acres are “permanent” reserves, and 362,000 acres are “provisional” reserve.

Diana said that the initiative would define conservation in the Arizona Constitution as: “preserving the natural, cultural or historical assets of land such as open space, scenic beauty, geology, archaeology, protected plants, wildlife, and other ecological values.” Locally, the provisional areas would expand both Saguaro National Park West and East, preserve state land trust corridors, and protect land in the Rincon Valley and Colossal Cave Mountain Park. Permanent reserves would include expanding: Cienega Creek Reserve, San Pedro River, the Picacho Mountains, Ironwood Forest National Monument, and the Santa Rita Experimental Range. She said that paying for conservation has been successful because citizens have approved a number ballot measures for this purpose. The initiative would also remove language from the Arizona Constitution that dictates all State Lands to be sold at auction.

Diana talked about specific local wildlife corridors that would be created, including: Catalina State Park to the Tortolita Mountains, and the Santa Rita Mountains to the Tumacacori Highlands. She said that approximately ½ of the 700,000 acres is in Pima County (287,828 acres).

The coalition wants to get cities to plan for conservation. She said we have seen very little in the way of conservation planning on State Trust land, although the Houghton Active Management Plan (HAMP) is an example of where planning for future growth in the area has included trust land. She pointed to the Fantasy Island Bike Park as an example of how citizens can be involved in conservation planning. The initiative would require ASLD to follow local plans, such as preserving Fantasy Island. She noted that various state counties have successfully passed bond packages and/or sales taxes to pay for conservation. In Pima County, passed conservation legislation in 1997 and 2004.

Arizona also needs a constitutional amendment to improve ASLD management of the 9.2 million acres of state trust land. ASLD has no plans to sell rural lands; the land they sell is usually urban trust land.

Diana said that the coalition would need to get approximately 280,000 signatures by July 6, 2006, to get the initiative on the ballot. She welcomes anyone who wants to get those signatures.

Bruce asked if it was possible to add additional preservation areas. Diana said yes, ASLD would be required to comply with local conservation planning decisions. Dennis asked Diana whether hunting would be allowed on the protected lands. Diana said that those lands would have “reasonable public access”, so nothing would change.

Trevor wanted to know what would happen to existing grazing leases on those lands. Diana said they would undergo the same process where the exiting grazing list would continue, but an entity could buy out the lease as Pima County is doing currently. If the lease is bought out, the new leaser would have to compensate for the entire lifespan of that lease.

Ann asked how the price of the land would be set. Diana said it would be set by the appraised value, and the seven-member oversight committee would oversee ASLD commissioner to make sure that value was fair. Ann wanted to know if ASLD staff knows this initiative is underway. Diana replied that they did, and that Commissioner Mark Winkleman has seen the maps. Although he says he wants ASLD reform, he has not officially endorsed the initiative. Diana also noted that the governor has said she wants

to see reform, but also has not officially endorsed the initiative. Ralph asked specifically if the governor said commented on the package. Diana said that she has seen parts of this package, and has approved what she has seen. Diana was asked what type of opposition she foresees to this initiative. She said that stakeholder meetings have occurred, and that they have tried to do a lot of outreach and bringing people aboard, and thus hopes there won't be too much opposition. She said that the Cattleman Association has indicated that they don't like the initiative, but she is not sure if they are going to launch a campaign against it.

Ann wanted to know if the Sonoran Institute has worked with the development community on this initiative. Diana said yes, that there is a six-member steering committee, which includes Ed Fox. It also includes Maria Byer who worked with Governor Hull and is now with Valley Partnership. Diana said that this presentation will be given to the Realtors Association soon, and that the homebuilders association in Flagstaff has said that they approve of the proposal. Ann suggested that the land that will surround the new preserves will increase in value, and that this might make ASLD more money. Diana agreed and pointed out that this is what is currently happening in Scottsdale.

Diana was asked for more detail on the Superstition Vistas. She replied that the Sonoran Institute is working with the East Valley Partnership to plan for smart growth in that area. Diana said that the idea is that you will make enough money selling some of the land (because the value increases from the creation of open space) that you don't need to develop all of the land.

Diana added that there was a huge effort last year to push this through the Legislature, but it didn't work out. Thus, they are now taking the citizen initiative route. Ann asked when was the last time the Arizona Constitution was amended. Diana replied that it has not happened very many times. Diana said that if voters approve the initiative, it is only the first step. She said that the Federal Enabling Act will also have to be changed by the federal legislature, but she said that land conservation should start happening as soon if the initiative is passed by Arizona voters.

b. Survey Results

- Pima Pineapple Cactus (PPC)

Leslie said that Marc Baker had finished his Southlands cacti surveys. She noted that there is a preliminary draft of his results, but she wants Mima to have a chance to review and comment on the draft before it is distributed. Leslie explained that Marc's research strategy was to attempt to predict areas in the Southlands that might have higher densities of PPC by evaluating soil type, vegetation density, and known PPC locations. After identifying those "better" areas, he then surveyed for PPC within those areas, and also just outside of them. Marc first "higher density" polygons covered 34 percent of the Southlands planning area. Marc did a total of 40 transects. Marc reported finding 92 new PPC, for a total of 162 found in the undeveloped portions of the Southlands. He found that 86 percent of the PPC found along transects and 84 percent of PPC found along vehicle routes were located within the original polygons, and all but two detections were within 300 meters of the polygons. Leslie said that he then revised the predicted polygon areas based on the survey results. The revised polygons cover about 46 percent of the Southlands planning area. She said that the northeast corner of the planning area

seems to have lower densities of PPC, and that the far southern end is where higher quality habitat appears to exist. Trevor pointed out that these results don't jive well with the Pima County Conservation Areas. Leslie said this was originally the case, but the County is in the process of revising the PCA for this species. Leslie noted that there is a meeting on Thursday, July 28 at USFWS to discuss the PPC PCA revisions.

- Needle-spine Pineapple Cactus (NSPC)

Marc's goal for this species was simply to try and find out whether there were any plants within the Southlands planning area. He did find eight NSPC individuals in an approximately two-hectare area, located in the extreme northeast part of the planning area. Marc concluded that the habitat outside of these 2 hectares does not appear suitable for NSPC, although there is the possibility of additional suitable habitat within a few hundred meters of the detections. Trevor wanted to know who owns the land where the NSPC were found. Leslie thought that it was probably ASLD.

c. Review of Goals and objectives for Target Species and Conservation Strategies

Leslie noted that draft goals and objectives have been developed for cactus ferruginous pygmy owl (CFPO), PPC, burrowing owl (BUOW), and Pale Townsend's big-eared bat (PTBB). Goals and objectives for NSPC were not developed because Marc wasn't sure if they were in the Southlands project area or not, but Mima had indicated that the NSPC would most likely have the same types of issues as with the PPC. Leslie briefly ran through the major elements of the draft goals and objectives for the Southlands species. For CFPO, there is some potential wintering habitat within the Southlands, along the two larger southernmost washes. Buffering that wintering habitat and extending out to the edge of the planning area is some dispersal habitat. For the PTBB, the discussion focused on potential foraging areas in the Southlands, since there is no suitable breeding habitat. Foraging habitat was originally defined rather broadly, i.e., all paloverde-mixed cacti and grassland habitat, but later discussions have focused predominately on existing riparian habitat and edges between riparian and upland habitat. The burrowing owls are thought to prefer upland areas, and ridges that were not subject to extensive sheet flooding had been mapped as potential breeding habitat, although it is generally accepted that this area is marginal for breeding. Only a couple dispersing owls, and no breeding activity, has been documented in the planning area. Another goal focuses on the protection of dispersal habitat for the burrowing owl, but those areas were not officially mapped because there was a feeling that the entire Southlands could provide the small stop-over points that essentially constitute potential dispersal habitat. Leslie suggested putting off the discussion of PPC conservation until after Pima County revises the PCA for this species. She noted that there are basically two riparian and two upland species with modeled potential habitat in the Southlands.

Another goal that the TAC identified was the need to minimize mortality, although the potential causes were different for each species. Also with respect to the CFPO, Mima had raised the issue of augmentation, and suggested that the TAC not just look at what habitat is suitable now, but to make sure that future augmentation efforts are not precluded by habitat loss in the Southlands.

(At this point, TAC members gathered around maps of the Southlands to begin discussing how to approach conservation strategies. The maps included the "Base Map for Southlands," "Southlands Santa Cruz River Connection," and the "Regional

Conservation Opportunities and Constraints: Land Protection Map.” The group spent the rest of the meeting discussing possible conservation approach by identifying critical factors, and potential opportunities and constraints. Ideas were drawn on the maps when possible and a list of additional data requests was made for the next TAC meeting.)

The initial discussion centered around the layout of roads and highways proposed under the Southeast Arterial Study, especially the by-pass freeway that will come through the Southlands from Sahuarita. Ann suggested that if Sahuarita has the ability to decide where the freeway will connect south of the Southlands, then the TAC should block out areas where they recommend the freeway not cross. Trevor said that he thought that Sahuarita Road would be used as the new east/west freeway. Michael replied that Sahuarita didn't want that because it would cut through where they are planning their city center. Michael explained that the new road would come off of I-10 somewhere in Sahuarita, head east to the Wilmot alignment, and then roughly follow Wilmot, jogging out to connect up with Kolb road and then I-10. Michael said that the road would cut through state land and avoid private land. The TAC members made several suggestions regarding how the proposed road alignments should be shifted to avoid areas with the most riparian habitat. Although this was considered an important principle, a number of other factors were identified that will also affect the ultimate road alignments. Leslie suggested that, since the TAC would not be able to identify recommended alignments that would satisfy relevant safety and engineering standards, that they instead recommend criteria for determining road placement to be incorporated by the project engineers. Michael felt that developing a set of recommended guidelines for roads would be good approach. Ann suggested that the TAC identify areas that should not be disturbed by roads, or only minimally, and then let the engineers figure out whether and how that can be done. Leslie said that she liked Ann's suggestion.

The initial list of criteria include:

- Avoiding washes altogether where possible
- Cross as few washes as possible
- Span all washes crossed
- Cross washes at right angles
- Cross riparian areas where width of habitat is narrowest

Rich suggested that the TAC look at any existing information on how to put roads over riparian areas/drainages. He recommended that the TAC look at work done by Norris Dodd. Trevor noted that road engineers have been designing roads sensitive to wildlife for a while so it shouldn't as big of a concern. Trevor brought up the issue of road water run-off and wondered how TAC should think about it. Ann suggested that a creative way to deal with ponding could be to provide extra water for mesquite bosques that would improve habitat for CFPO, for example. Trevor said that the TAC might have to do a trade-off to protect one type of habitat over the other (riparian vs. upland). Trevor suggested focusing on protecting riparian areas and protecting as much of the uplands as possible. Rich countered that riparian habitat could be created by channeling sheet flow, and that the upland areas should be a higher priority for conservation. Rich felt that there is a good opportunity to redirect water in the Southlands when development happens. He thought that the TAC could suggest to the engineers where to redirect water to compliment or enhance specific preserved areas. Rich said that washes could be designed that would grow vegetation and create corridors for CFPO, and cacti habitat should be higher priority areas for protection because they couldn't be recreated. Leslie

suggested looking at whether see if there is an overlap between Marc's "higher density" PPC polygons and other modeled potential habitat. She also brought up the fact that much of the PPC mitigation would likely have to take place off-site since most of the Southlands is state trust land. Trevor said he doesn't want to write off the PPC in this area, and that the City might still need to do on-site preservation because of the extent to which development impacts PPC. Rich added that the conflict isn't going to be with the riparian areas because they can't build in those areas anyway; rather the conflict will be in the uplands area.

Everyone wondered how Pima County prioritized the Harris lay of washes to identify Important Riparian Areas (IRAs). There was also some discussion about on the difference between the County's IRAs and Harris riparian habitat. Ann thought that it might have something to do with the Harris expanding the mapped riparian habitat to include sandy floodplain type areas. Rich said that he has problems with the County maps and that that he doesn't trust them.

Ann suggested superimposing the species habitat on each other to see if there are areas that jump out and make this process easier. Leslie pulled out the map that showed the overlap of all of the modeled species habitats in the Southland.

The discussion then jumped to CFPO dispersal corridors. The general concern was that the success of the dispersal corridors in the southwest area of the Southlands might be impeded by development in Sahuarita. There was concern that the way the dispersal corridors were mapped that they did not provide a sufficient corridor for owls coming around the Santa Rita Mountains (west side) to reach the Rincon Mountains.

Ann wondered if priority areas could be delineated based on sub-watersheds. If an entire sub-watershed was protected and impacts to the wash system within it were minimized, it would preserve a functional landscape and also provide good wildlife corridors. Ann suggested it might be simpler to recommend to the engineers that they protect an entire wash system, rather than just protecting smaller parcels fragmented through the Southlands. She also noted that there may need to be culverts put in under I-19 to create a safe corridor for wildlife to travel.

Leslie said there were two lines of thought in the discussion, one focused on identifying priority areas based on the habitat models and the other about identifying hydrologically functional areas to preserve. She noted that, since the bat habitat was so broadly defined, this overlay map does not necessarily provide an accurate indicator of the most valuable or sensitive habitat areas. Trevor said that bat conservation strategies might come down to just having bat-friendly bridges and preserving native vegetation, although he pointed out that lighting would also be an issue. Trevor and others agreed that the bat habitat may be confusing the issue and the suggestions was made to redo the habitat overlap model to exclude the bat habitat and using Marc's "higher density" polygons.

Ann suggested checking with Frank Soussa since he did a lot of ground-truthing on washes in the Southlands and has a pretty good understanding of surface hydrology in this area. She suggested bringing him in for future TAC discussions. Ann asked whether the TAC would want to preserve strands of washes here and there or focus on protecting an entire watershed. Trevor asked which would be easier for developers to deal with. Ann pointed out that preserving a large watershed could be seen as an amenity. Michael said that as long as we are ahead of the developers in planning out conservation areas,

it make it easier for developers in the long run. Leslie asked if the TAC wants to start with what is known about the Southlands, such as the sub-watershed boundaries and the Environmental Resource Zone wash protections, and then to talk to Frank about any additional information, e.g. flow rates for the washes, that he can provide. Michael said there is not a 100-year flood plain map for the Southlands, because making one would be an incredibly huge undertaking and would have to be approved by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

Trevor wanted to see a map of the larger area around the Southlands because he wants to make sure that, if the City protects a certain sub-watershed, it could be protected upstream/downstream. Ann agreed that the TAC need to know what is off the Southlands map so they know what the washes connect with. Trevor asked if the Tac could see current zoning and existing development around the washes outside of the planning area. Michael noted that a sunset clause was supposedly enacted for a lot of that zoning and it would expire fairly soon. Trevor said that Sahuarita is interested in preserving the Santa Cruz River as the “recreational” opportunity in their area, or at least that was how it was presented to Pima County.

Leslie noted that there is one entire section and another quarter section of Tucson water property in the Southlands, both of which have PPC. She wonders what Tucson Water’s plans are for these properties. Ralph said this is part of the Santa Cruz well field, one of the four important fields the City has, and Tucson Water is not going to put more wells in because it is not a great area for pumping water. Ralph says that those wells will continue to be active wells in the future. The wells only take up an area of approximately 100 feet by 100 feet.

Ralph said that Tucson Water had taken a close look at some of the water development activities that would be up-coming along the Santa Cruz River, west of the Southlands. He noted that the recharge facilities north of Pima Mine Road might become more active in the future. Asarco owns this land.

Leslie wants to know what other information TAC needs for the next meeting. Ann suggested bringing in the slope map again. Ann said it is important to keep natural connections intact; in 100 years nature will take care of the rest. Leslie asked about the road component and whether the TAC wants continue this discussion at the next meeting or just focus on identifying priority areas to protect. Trevor said it would be good to know what Norris thinks first before going to far with road design guidelines.

Cathy brought out a map from the City Department of Transportation website showing sub-watersheds in the Southlands. Michael suggested inviting Frank Soussa to next meeting. Trevor also suggested inviting Julia Fonseca to next meeting also since she is knowledgeable about watersheds.

Leslie asked Michael if the City had any information Sahuarita’s future annexation plans. Michael said that, at one time, the City had a map that showed each City’s sphere of influence. Trevor emphasized that the TAC needs to think on a big scale about the connection of Southland washes, especially to Santa Cruz River. Leslie asked Ralph if Tucson Water could provide information about the connectivity of the Southlands to the Santa Cruz River. Ralph said that there may be future recharge and recovery around this area, but may be 10-15 years out, and there are areas where additional wells could come in. Ralph said that City looked at a parcel south of town as a possible recharge

location and did a lot of subsurface work trying to get an understanding where the most permeable sediments might be. Ralph says Tucson Water's knowledge of the Southlands is limited to specific areas where the department had interest, but would be glad to share that information. Ann mentioned that the airport authority owns land in Southlands, thus the land won't be sold off to development. Leslie suggested that maybe the City might be able to work with TAA as they preserve flight zones and maybe that could correlate to what areas on the ground the TAC thinks should be protected. Ralph pointed out that they don't want any surface water (recharge basins, etc.) nearby because of the threat of birds colliding with planes. Ann also noted that Hughes Aircraft at one time said they were interested in doing habitat restoration in their lands.

4) Call to the Public

No members of the public were present.

5) Next steps/Future Meetings

TAC scheduled meetings through November. All meetings will be from 1 to 4 pm at the Arizona Game and Fish conference room. Scheduled meeting dates are: September 13, September 27, October 11, October 25, November 15, and November 29. The group agreed that a joint TAC/SAC meeting in September would be beneficial. This meeting time has not yet been scheduled.

Leslie asked Ralph if he would mind bumping his Tucson Water presentation of Avra Valley lands again to the next week (August 23) so TAC doesn't keep switching between the Southlands and Avra Valley. Ralph said that was okay.