



PLANNING COMMISSION

Department of Urban Planning & Design P.O. Box 27210 Tucson, Arizona 85726-7210

Approved by Planning Commission on

Date of Meeting: February 18, 2009

The joint meeting of the City of Tucson Planning Commission and the Pima County Planning and Zoning Commission was called to order by Catherine Applegate Rex, Chair, on Wednesday, February 18, 2009, at 6:00 p.m., in the Public Works Building, Basement Conference Room, 201 N. Stone Avenue, Tucson, Arizona. Those present and absent were:

1. ROLL CALL

Present:

Catherine Applegate Rex, Chair	Member at Large, Ward 5
Rick Lavaty	Member at Large, Ward 1
Joseph Maher, Jr.	Member at Large, Ward 6
Mark Mayer	Member, Ward 5
Shannon McBride-Olson	Member, Ward 2
James E. Watson	Member, Ward 4
Daniel J. Williams	Member, Ward 1
Craig Wissler (arrived at 6:17 p.m.)	Member, Ward 3

Absent:

Brad Holland, Vice Chair	Member, Ward 6
William Podolsky	Member at Large, Ward 4
Thomas Sayler-Brown	Member, Mayor's Office

Staff Members Present:

Albert Elias, Urban Planning and Design, Director
Nicole Gavin, Assistant to the City Manager
Ramona Williams, Urban Planning and Design, Secretary
Yolanda Lozano, City Clerk's Office, Recording Secretary

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was presented by the entire assembly.

3. WATER & WASTEWATER STUDY PHASE I REPORT (STUDY SESSION)

Melaney Seacat, Project Coordinator, Pima County Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department introduced her fellow staff members present at the meeting. She also introduced Nicole Gavin, her counterpart from the City of Tucson, as well as City staff members. She also acknowledged the Commissioners from both entities who were serving on the Water & Wastewater Oversight Committee for their hard work the past eleven months, attending twenty-three meetings and numerous presentations from staff and outside presenters. She said there was a tremendous amount of work that had gone into the report.

Ms. Seacat stated their presentation was going to be a synopsis of the executive summary. The executive summary was thirty pages which was rather long, but the report itself was several hundred pages and the appendices were over a thousand pages which was quite a big volume of work, it was an inventory and assessment of water resources and infrastructure from water, wastewater, and reclaimed water and an assessment of water resource supplies. She stated it was also an initial look at what some of the critical planning factors associated with planning for a sustainable water future were.

Ms. Seacat stated the conclusion of the public comment period ended this evening. She said they had an outpouring of public comments that came in at the end of the day and knew there were others struggling to get their comments in, so they were thinking about extending the deadline to noon on Friday, February 20, 2009. She said they would be compiling all the comments and emailing them to the Oversight Committee, as well as people on their extensive mailing list. She stated they would be meeting with the Oversight Committee to review all of the comments, decide on how the report would be changed, endorse recommendations, and update the final report which will be posted to the website with copies given and presented to the Mayor and Council and the Pima County Board of Supervisors by mid March.

Ms. Seacat and Ms. Gavin gave their presentation as follows:

Study Goal

- Define and develop a sustainable water future and a livable region

Ms. Seacat stated the study goal was a long range goal to take a look at a sustainable water future. It was a multi-phase, multi-year study. She said the Mayor and Council and the Board of Supervisors adopted a scope of work in April 2008, which looked at an incremental approach to actually moving towards defining what a sustainable water future and livable region would look like. She stated there was a long term goal to look evenly at the topic of sustainability and water resource planning, but there was also short term incremental goals.

Study Overview

- Phase 1 City/County infrastructure, resources, sustainability & improved cooperation
- Phase 2 City/County common water & conservation goals
- Phase 3-5 Conjoin a regional dialogue on these issues to develop a sustainable water future.

City/County Citizen Oversight Committee

- Guiding Phases 1 & 2 – Four (4) members from CWAC; Four (4) members from RWRAC; Two (2) members from the County Planning & Zoning Commission; and Two (2) members from the City Planning Commission.

Involving the Public

- Committee meetings open to the public
- Website – presentations, reports, background information, meeting summaries and public comments
- TV broadcast of Committee meetings
- Radio public service announcements
- Open Houses
- Informational materials

Ms. Seacat stated, in the first phase, the purpose was to inventory existing infrastructure, take stock of water resources, and begin looking at the critical planning factors associated with planning for a sustainable water future. She said the next phase would look more at policies and recommendations for increased City/County cooperation in water resource planning. She stated in phases three to five, dialogue would begin to look more at long term water resource planning on a region-wide basis.

Ms. Seacat said on the short term, phases one and two were focused on the City/County service areas, which was what she meant by an incremental approach. The City served water to about seventy-two percent of customers in the region and the County provided wastewater services for about ninety-seven percent. She said the two utilities were very large and there had been lost opportunities for efficiency and good cooperation since their separation in 1979. She stated the future for regional water resource planning and one of the primary goals in the first two phases, was to bring the two utilities into closer communication, coordination, and cooperation for planning water and wastewater since the two were inter-related systems. She said the Oversight Committee also mirrored another underlying goal to do a better job at integrating water resource planning and land use planning which was the rationale for establishing the committee following the criteria listed above.

Ms. Seacat stated one of the mandates/requirements in the scope of work was to ensure an open and transparent process. Beyond posting of meeting notices and complying with open meeting laws regarding the twenty-three meetings held, there were also bus signs used, audio and video tapings of the meetings posted to the website, as

well as. Presentations, reports, and references to information used in the presentations and public service announcements. She said the website became a key vehicle for both informing and compiling all of the data for Phase 1.

Phase 1

- City/County Service Areas

Nicole Gavin, Project Coordinator, Assistant to the City Manager, stated Phase I only focused on Tucson Water's and Pima County's service areas. She said staff experienced a fair amount of grief for focusing only on the two utilities and not opening it up to the region right away. As pointed out, in the past, if perhaps the two utilities had communicated better, they could have opened it up to the region, but their goal was to try and improve their situation before going out into the region. She stated the two utilities were, by far, the largest providers and if they could get the two utilities on the same page first, Tucson would be off to a good start.

Ms. Gavin stated Tucson Water served seven hundred thirty, thousand customers within a two hundred ninety square mile service area primarily with Colorado River water. She said Tucson Water also operated their reclaimed water system. Pima County Regional Wastewater operated eleven wastewater treatment facilities, served two hundred sixty, thousand accounts and worked within a seven hundred square mile service area. She stated there were four issues they were asked to address in the scope of work.

Ms. Gavin reviewed the four issues listed below and stated there were about twenty items related to the four issues.

- Scope Items

1. Current State of Water, Wastewater and Reclaimed Water Systems
 - a. Water and wastewater systems are reliable and well maintained
 - b. Both utilities face increasing need for investment in maintenance, rehabilitation, and replacement
 - c. Tucson Water has focused recent investments on utilization and delivery of CAP
 - d. Pima County Wastewater will need to make significant investments in its treatment facilities to meet new wastewater quality standards
 - e. While further expansion of the reclaimed water system is desirable, it will require prioritization of uses and analysis of potential funding methods
 - f. Growth should pay for itself
 - g. Energy is a significant cost of operating the water and wastewater systems

Ms. Gavin stated the Committee sat at many meetings and heard many presentations from staff of both utilities as well as outside experts about our water and wastewater systems. She said overall, the Committee was encouraged. Tucson was in pretty good shape compared to other cities and national trends about infrastructure deficits; systems tended to be newer and a lot of investments had been made in the past to

these systems. She stated the utilities were well run and felt the Committee was impressed by the professionalism of the staff and quality of information received. She said generally, it was a positive message; however, both utilities faced increasing needs for investment and maintenance, rehabilitation and replacement.

Ms. Gavin said Tucson Water, in the past, focused most of its capital improvement program on the ability to deliver Central Arizona Project (CAP) water; building the infrastructure to be able to do that. She stated there was now a built up need for maintenance on the mains and pipes and, in the future, there would need to be a shift in funds for that purpose. She said Pima County would also need to make significant investments relating to reconstructing its major treatment facilities at Ina and Roger Road. Other issues the County faced, as they moved forward, included adding cross-town conveyance capacity and the effect of gravity and flow of the wastewater system as more water was served and there was less liquid in the system.

Ms. Gavin stated, in terms of the reclaimed water system, Tucson Water delivered to approximately eight hundred twenty sites including golf courses, parks and schools. The key message was that all significant turf users that could be reached in a cost effective manner had already been reached with the system. She said an expansion of the system would further require a study to establish priorities and funding methods. Typically, in the past, if they had an end user, such as a golf course that could pay to extend the line, they were then able to catch users along the way. In the future, if extensions are made to parks or for environmental purposes that do not necessarily have a revenue source or funding mechanism, ways to fund the improvement would have to be sought.

Ms. Gavin said the final two things related to infrastructure were financial in nature. First was that growth should pay for itself. She stated this was something the Committee heard and talked about a lot, as well as hearing from the public. She said both utilities had mechanisms in place to capture the cost of growth, but making sure growth paid for itself was an idea that needed to be evaluated and continually looked at. Second was the idea that energy was a significant cost of operating water and wastewater systems that the public was not aware of. She said, as energy costs increased, it affected water and wastewater rates. She stated that the City needed to be thinking about renewable energy sources as they moved forward.

2. Water Resource Assessment

- a. Tucson Water has a reliable and renewable water supply for the near term
- b. We face uncertainty on a variety of fronts and need to be prudent with our resources
- c. Expanding the Tucson Water service area must be done thoughtfully and deliberately
- d. New water will be needed in the future and the time to plan for it is now
- e. We should strengthen City-County and regional cooperation around water and planning issues

Ms. Gavin stated the second major scope item on water resources, that was frequently asked about, was how much water was there and how many people could be served. She said in the report they attempted to do a scenario which had a lot of caveats in it. She reviewed charts which showed the City of Tucson's estimated water supply of two hundred seventeen thousand, four hundred forty-four acre feet a year. Of that amount, they calculated how many people could potentially be served which was estimated at 1.1 million based on gallons per capita per day of one hundred seventy-seven, which was Tucson's twenty-five year historic average of how much water was delivered per capita and included all types of uses. She said recent trends were currently more in the one sixties. However, as uncertainties are faced on the variety of fronts and the need to be prudent with resources, Tucson Water was in a pretty good situation in terms of its resources and ability to serve current customers and future growth. She stated the theme of uncertainty was big during Phase 1 of the study. Uncertainties included global warming, climate change, and long-term drought; and how these could affect both local demands for water and rainfall amounts as well as future flow to the Colorado River. She said the economy was another uncertainty along with the relative importance within the sun corridor, Arizona, and the six other states that relied on Colorado River water. Any of these uncertainties could threaten our Colorado River water supply. She said, therefore, we needed to act conservatively and responsibly when it came to managing our water resources and that we needed to diversify our water resources portfolio so that we were not overly dependent on imported water, increase water conservation and maximize the use and reuse of renewable, locally generated water sources, which included rainwater and effluent.

Ms. Gavin stated the City of Tucson had an interim water policy in effect which established an obligated service area for Tucson Water. She said basically, the service area was within the City limits, as well as, built areas of our water system. She stated, after Proposition 200 failed, the Mayor and Council recognized it was an important issue to look at in that we needed to understand how much water we had, how many people we were obligated to serve, and how it affected our need for new resources. She said part of the study was to look at that. Tucson Water, in the past, operated in the context of a large planning area, extending service throughout the region based on demand. This approach led to the ongoing expansion of the service base and had increased the need to focus on the acquisition of new water resources. She stated before decisions to extend beyond the obligated area are made, the City needs to understand the economic, social, and environmental implications of extending services and would be something they looked further into during Phase 2.

Ms. Gavin said now was the time to plan for new water resources for the future. She stated, while each utility and water provider might have a different need for new water, in order to be successful, this was something that needed to be done as a region and in a collaborative way.

3. Sustainable Water Future

- a. A sustainable water future must be discussed within the overall context of sustainability

- b. Water sustainability involves equitable consideration of and trade-offs among a variety of inter-related issues.
- c. Planning for and managing growth is critical to creating a sustainable water future
- d. We should increase water conservation measures and maximize our use and re-use of locally renewable water resources
- e. We need to balance human, environmental, and economic needs for water
- f. We need to employ flexible, long-range, participatory, and rigorous planning processes
- g. Water pricing and financing approaches should further policy objectives

Ms. Seacat stated, internally, the information shared with the Commissioners, was referred to as Water 101, which were the basic essential facts. The Committee had so much information to sift through, but decided these were what they considered to be important facts. She said the following information dealt with the planning factors. She said they had two meetings with the Oversight Committee to prepare statements on what they saw as the findings of a sustainable water future and what sustainability meant to them and two meetings strictly devoted to hearing from the public on their perceptions of the same. She stated they received a lot of value-based information; presentations from City and County staff members on land use, population growth and projections, planning for a sustainable water future, conservation and environmental needs water, and experts from the University of Arizona on climate change. She said they had a lot of varied substantive presentations on the range of planning factors. She stated, from all of the information obtained and input from the public, they were able to come up with a distillation of critical factors the Committee felt were associated with the process.

Ms. Seacat stated the first theme, planning for and managing growth in a comprehensive and regional way was a strong theme. Incremental planning was done in the past, not taking into account all the factors associated with growth such as transportation, public services, and so on. She said it was difficult to develop answers on how and where growth should occur. Based on water supply alone, although they had limited water supplies, more water could be acquired at a cost if growth was desired. She stated water was part of the equation but was not the limiting factor or the sole driver. In addition, the city, state and nation, were in a time of flux and uncertainty. Diversifying the economy was one way to address the fact that it was recognized the past was not a predictor of the future and the way we grew in the past was not necessarily how we would grow in the future. She said we should plan ahead for growth, but we should not be facilitating as much growth as possible without considering the impacts of growth and other elements in our quality of life.

Ms. Seacat reiterated that increasing water conservation was a popular theme; however there was input and concerns from the public and the need to have incentives built into any future water conservation programming. She stated their concerns or fears were; 1) by using less water, water rates would need to be increased to compensate for lower revenues, 2) water conservation was providing water for more growth that would occur on the backs of existing residents and affect their quality of life, and 3) the more

the population conserved, additional water will be needed to flush water mains. She said another aspect of conservation that was discussed, was that the future was in maximizing use and reuse of locally generated water sources such as rain water harvesting, gray water and storm water capture recharge and also optimizing the use of effluent which was truly a renewable resource.

Ms. Seacat said balancing human, environment and economical needs for water was another key theme. She stated, in the past, they had done a good job in planning for roof tops and for people, but they had not considered the needs of water for the environment. In moving forward, they needed to recognize that; a) environment was a user of water, b) allocation of water to environmental needs was important, and c) the need for groundwater pumping in environmentally sensitive areas. She said there was recognition from part of the committee that there were state regulations managing water on an AMA wide scale, so the 1980 Groundwater Management Code provided for a goal of safe yield by the year 2025. This meant the amount of water withdrawn throughout the AMA, which extended into Pinal and Santa Cruz counties, was equal to the amount that got naturally, incidentally, or artificially recharged. She said the shared water supply rules, in turn, allowed for pumping water in one location and recharging it another location of the AMA. She said there was a geographical disparity.

Ms. Seacat stated, in moving forward, sustainability in this area needed to consider the fact that safe yield did not equal sustainable yield. She said some other issues were water was critical to the health of the economy, the economic value of water needed to be considered, how much water was needed for industry manufacturing, and what the high value uses of water were. This was something that had not been looked at in the past but would be in Phase 2.

Ms. Seacat stated, in a time of uncertainty, rigorous and analytical planning processes needed to be looked at. She said the term adaptive use was currently being used in a lot of the industry and it gets at needing to have better monitoring and fact-based data driven decision making to ensure all of the uncertainties were being factored into the equation. She stated there were numerous ways, programs, and efforts, both nationally and internationally, to adapt to periods of drought and low water usage and that the City needed to avail themselves of those best practices and start thinking outside the box and be more flexible with their planning.

Ms. Secat said, lastly, their price signals were important to over achieving efficient allocation of water resources. Current retail water rates do not match claims of scarcity and conflict with messages urging conservation.

4. City/County Cooperative Efforts
 - a. Communication and Coordination
 - b. Joint Constructed Recharge Project
 - c. Conservation Effluent Pool and IGA Amendments
 - d. Location of SE side wastewater treatment facility

Ms. Secat stated another element of the scope of work, City/County Cooperative Efforts, looked at a series of projects and efforts that had been underway for a while that elected officials wanted to see advance.

She said joint construction and recharge projects were to address issues of effluent going outside of the County and trying to retain it locally, at a minimum, if not put it to some beneficial use in government restoration or recharge projects. She said the conservation effluent pool was a pool of water dedicated to environmental restoration purposes, ten thousand acre feet. An intergovernmental agreement (IGA) was in place that was being updated and would identify the process and procedures for allocations of that water down the road. Also on the list was the location of the southeast side wastewater treatment facility.

Ms. Seacat stated all of those efforts had their own City/County Cooperative teams and that were making progress on them. She said one thing that had occurred was that the directors of each of the utilities were now serving on their respective Citizens Water Advisory Committees which was a concrete way the City and County were cooperating. She stated staff had been meeting since the inception of the project. The technical, engineering and management staffs from both utilities met for many hours over the course of Phase 1 and the level of cooperation was extremely high and thought that was an important foundation for moving forward.

Next Steps

- Public comment period – January 16 through February 18, 2009
- Report Final – End of February
- Phase 2 – February to September 2009

Ms. Gavin reiterated that the close of the public comment period was that evening and staff was hoping to get final comments from the Commissioners and then be able to get them to the Committee for their final Phase 1 meeting on Saturday. She said Phase 2 was already underway and the first meeting was scheduled in March.

Phase 2 Topics

- Adaptive Management
- Comprehensive Planning
- Water Resources & Environment

Ms. Gavin stated Phase 2 had three areas of focus. First, in early March, they would post on line, the first set of white papers related to adaptive management, dealing with expansions for the reclaimed systems, consistency in conservation efforts between the City and the County, and consolidation of drought planning efforts between the two utilities. She said comprehensive planning would then occur in April or May and felt this was where the challenge began. She stated this was where the scope asked the Committee for agreement on population growth, water, urban form, land use planning,

and infrastructure for the City and County, as well as integrating land use planning with water resources and infrastructure for each jurisdiction. She stated, in the second set of papers, they would also start to look at environmental needs for water. Finally, in the third set of papers, which would occur in June, she said was water resources and environment. The Committee would start looking at new water resources, criteria to be considered or factored into when looking at new water resources and expanding out to the environmental work.

Phase 2 Goal

- City/County agreement on water resource and conservation goals
- City/County agreement on water resource and conservation goals

For additional information

- www.tucsonpimawaterstudy.com
- info@tucsonpimawaterstudy.com
- 884-WISP (9477)

Ms. Gavin asked if any of the Commissioners serving on the Oversight Committee wanted to make any comments or add items missed.

(Commissioner Wissler arrived at 6:17 p.m.)

Bruce Gungle, Chair of the Pima County Planning and Zoning Commission and member of the Water Wastewater Oversight Committee, made one comment which he said probably related more to process than what was actually in the document. He said he probably should have known this, but did not realize this would be their sole chance to comment. He said he thought the Commission was taking the information, discussing it at their next meeting, and then get back to staff with their comments. He stated it seemed like it was a pretty short fuse to get responses from a group of people that had just seen the information for the first time.

Ms. Gavin stated the information had been e-mailed two weeks prior as part of their packet, but did not know if everyone had time to read the entire document.

Chair Rex stated there was a matter of reading it and having a presentation and being able to ask questions.

Ms. Gavin stated she thought there was still an opportunity to keep comments coming in. She said they were scheduled to present the report before the Mayor and Council and the Board of Supervisors in mid March. So, if the Commissioners had any additional comments they could still submit them keeping in mind that the Committee would review them on February 21st for changes.

Commissioner Cook, Pima County Planning & Zoning, stated one of the sections towards the end of the report talked about rigorous analysis. He said one theme that came up during the course of the Phase 1 project, was on the water side, if additional supplies were added to the existing distribution system, primarily the CAP system; he thought City staff had reported that we were really talking about an order of magnitude greater than the cost for water currently being paid. He said if we were paying eight hundred dollars an acre foot for water from CAP, then it would probably be more like eight thousand dollars an acre foot for additional supplies. He said at least the alternatives that were being considered in the add water process, which CAP managed, left quite a leeway between what we currently pay and what the future cost of water would be for adding more water to the system. He said for those that had been supporting the consideration of the most obvious local source of renewable water, rainwater harvesting, felt a rigorous analysis should really be done so that there was a cross benefit analysis of what it would take to build the infrastructure for water catchments, rainwater harvesting, and storm water harvesting, etc., so that they really could compare this solution to future water supplies and any alternatives that may be coming down the pipe at the State level through CAP. He said that was really important.

Commissioner Cook stated another issue was what had been described as looking at economic uses of water. He said he understood water was not only used residentially, but also used as part of the economy, for commercial and industrial activities, to the extent that we were considering investing in new infrastructures to expand the capacity of the current system which would have, in a sense, an economic development dimension. He said, in other words, it would be an investment to future economic development. He said those types of considerations really be viewed in relativity to other kind of economic development options that may not require such a heavy investment in the water or wastewater systems per say. He said we had been subsidizing this particular input to our economy with the presumption that it was going to improve the economy, but have never compared it to what other possible public investments could be made to diversify the economy instead of simply relying on population growth. He said it was certainly a rigorous cost benefit analysis that looked at other possible economic development investments and not just the economic use of water but other opportunities that could be looked at that would preclude the additional investment which, traditionally, had been made to encourage industrial and commercial expansion.

Commissioner Cook stated the third issue, which he had addressed at different times and felt was the real challenge, dealt with the wastewater side. He said it seemed, on the water side, it was a little clearer cut in terms of its management and how growth or the lack of growth would be respond to. He stated the wastewater side was unclear because there really were not any alternatives; there was a plan, the Regional Optimization Plan, which was basically to renovate an existing facility to create a link between the two existing facilities so that the excess demand could be shifted to another plan and upgrade for regulatory reasons. He said people had to realize that the anticipated cost was the most expensive piece of infrastructure this region had ever contemplated. He stated it was literally half a billion plus, due to interest and inflation and another half a billion looking at interest and inflation and maybe more. He said he wanted more assurance that that was really the only alternative the City had in meeting the regulatory requirement which was the primary one that needed to be addressed

because the City would be heavily taxed if not met and fees would be very onerous if it cannot be funded through bonds or other more attractive means than simply the rate structure.

Commissioner Williams stated he noticed, in the presentation, staff spoke about the water deficit, potable water needed to flush solids into the system due to the design and maybe infiltration of water out of the system, and also greywater usage and the need, when greywater usage went out of the system, to use for houses watering vegetation. He stated there seemed to be a conflict in that. He said if you had to put in approximately two million gallons of potable water into the system a year to make those solids flush and then allow for greywater harvesting, how was the balance going to be met and what study would be done to determine if that was what should be done in order to make the best use of our water.

Ms. Gavin stated, to answer in a broad way, the Committee recognized that problem and conflict and heard about it a lot. She said more work needed to be done between the City and the County because she thought everyone recognized greywater was probably a good way to go as one of the resources they needed to use, but they needed to figure out a way to address the wastewater system. She stated, in short term, one thing staff looked at was using reclaimed water to flush rather than potable water and they had already started it in some areas.

Ms. Seacat stated Pima County Wastewater supported greywater and were commissioning a study to look at design changes that would deal with the situation better. She said the way it was currently designed was a real issue in certain neighborhoods and was not universal. She said by identifying those neighborhoods and ways to address from a design standpoint was something they were working on.

Much discussion ensued by both Commissions after completion of the presentation by staff on:

- Discussion of values in the community
- Greywater issues
- Compatibility with sewer system
- Other ways of dealing with human waste, such as compost
- Cost for water and wastewater delivery
- Renewable energy sources for water delivery systems and wastewater treatment
- Encouraging energy conservation
- Phase 2
- Public's input and involvement
- Final outcome of the project.
- ADEQ (Arizona Department of Economic Quality)
- ADWR (Arizona Department of Water Resources)

Ms. Gavin stated Phase 1 was really a repository of baseline data. In Phase 2, technical staff and outside experts will help to produce white papers, as the Committee calls them and will be reviewed ahead of their meetings, that will include background

information and recommendations for staff level, management level, and City/County leaders, but not as specific as a text amendment the Commissioners are used to getting. She said staff themselves, were still trying to figure out the exact process.

Ms. Gavin stated the Committee did a lot to get the public involved and would continue to do so during Phase I. She said it was ironic in that they had many people say they did not have a seat at the table or committee and did not feel like they had a role. She stated, if you look at the whole process, she felt the public had more of a voice than the committee because they spent so much time hearing from the public that the committee only had about two meetings to talk amongst themselves. She said they needed to be aware of that since it was a good point, but felt they had already done a good job so far trying to make sure everyone had a voice and was reflected in the report.

Commissioner Cook, Pima County Planning & Zoning, commended the staff for one of the best task forces he had yet seen in the community that dealt with a very difficult and complex problem. He said, in coming off Proposition 200 a few years ago, he felt the community had moved forward in understanding and appreciating these issues. He stated he thought everyone had a higher degree of appreciation for the work the two staffs had done, the quality and level of reporting back to the Committee, and the summarization of materials incorporation of all of the input was exemplary. He said he had not seen anything quite like it and felt everyone learned a tremendous amount during the process. He stated this was a model for community problem solving going forward, and that they had developed a precedent to be used for the future. He stated he was very impressed all along and people had to understand that the process took place during a period of rapid and dramatic change in the community. He said from the time the process began until present, they had seen a dramatic change in the whole growth picture for the City and County. This was reflected in the real emphasis of the report on the aspects of uncertainties that everyone had. He stated there was a real heightened sense of how uncertainty was figuring in on how the systems would be managed going forward.

Commissioner Poulos, Pima County Planning & Zoning, stated the Committee had received an enormous number of reports and technical information and if there was a particular topic that in the executive summary that someone wanted more information on, she encouraged them to go to the website and look up the actual detailed reports on the sections because they got some excellent information, not just from staff, but also from experts in the fields of population growth, history of Tucson, and just an enormous amount of information. She said the information posted on line was incredible and available for everyone to review.

Further discussion ensued regarding:

- Wastewater plant on the southeast side
- Old and new water plants
- Bond rating (Revenue Bonds)
- Regional water and wastewater entity
- Water and sewer services for areas out of the City/County limits
- Land use
- Residential rainwater and greywater harvesting

- Solar facilities to develop solar energy
- Residential water usage

Ms. Gavin stated, for clarification, a couple of items to be looked at in the Phase 2 white papers, were implications of uses of different urban form; density, mixed of uses and what were the more optimal locations of growth than others and the criteria used to judge those.

Chair Rex thanked staff, especially Ms. Seacat and Ms. Gavin for their informative presentation.

4. CALL TO THE AUDIENCE

There was no call the audience.

Ms. Seacat stated she had one final comment to the Commission members in response to the public comment period and not having enough time. She said staff would be compiling all the public comments for distribution to the Committee by the end of the week and Commissioners really had until the end of the day on Thursday to get their comments in on-line.

5. ADJOURNMENT – 7:20 p.m.