CITIZENS' WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE
CONSERVATION & EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, January 14, 2015, 3:00 p.m.
Director's Conference Room
Tucson Water, 3rd Floor
310 W. Alameda Street, Tucson, Arizona

Legal Action Report (**Amended)

1. **Call to Order/Roll Call**
   The meeting was called to order by Member Catlow Shipek at 3:20 p.m. Those present and absent were:

   Members Present:

Mark Murphy	Representative, Mayor
Catlow Shipek	Representative, City Manager
Mark Lewis	Representative, Ward 5

   Members Absent

Amy McCoy	Chairperson, Representative, Ward 2
Jean McLain	Representative, City Manager

   Tucson Water Staff Members:

Jeff Biggs	Interim Deputy Director
Melodee Loyer	Water Administrator
Fernando Molina	Public Information Supervisor
Daniel Ransom	Water Conservation Supervisor
Joaquim Delgado	Public Information Specialist
Candice Rupprecht	Public Information Specialist
Valerie Herman	Public Information Specialist
Tom Arnold	Lead Management Analyst
Kris LaFleur	Staff Assistant

   Others Present

Amy Stabler	City of Tucson, Ward 6
Brian Wong	CWAC
Laurie Richards	TBG / TNC
Christina McVie	Tucson Audubon Society / CWC

2. **Announcements –** Member Mark Lewis announced his recent opportunity to review AMR/AMI projects at Tucson Water and Oro Valley Water Utility, and to engage in discussion with staff about the conservation value of real-time water usage tracking. He indicated that he would ask for a future agenda item to discuss the topic, upon the return of Chairperson McCoy.

   Member Lewis also announced that he was submitting a document request to staff in conjunction with the meeting. He indicated that, at the previous meeting of the full CWAC, he had made a series of requests regarding the Tucson Water Conservation Program FY 2013-14 Annual Report. Member Lewis indicated that his requests were not adopted by full CWAC, so his "Plan B" would be to request the documents himself. Member Lewis submitted a written request for information to staff for the public record.

* Tucson Water Interim Deputy Director Jeff Biggs later asked for a point of clarification on Member Lewis' second announcement. Mr. Biggs asked Member Lewis if his request for information was on behalf of CWAC, or if it was on his own behalf. Member Lewis indicated that the request was related to the Tucson Water conservation charge, and was not something the Committee had asked him to do. Mr. Biggs thanked Member Lewis for his clarification.

3. **Call to Audience –** There were no comments from the Audience.

4. **Review of December 10, 2014, Legal Action Report and Meeting Minutes –** Member Lewis moved to approve the Legal Action Report and Meeting Minutes of December 10, 2014. The motion was seconded by Member Murphy and carried by a vote of 3-0.

5. **Update: Development of Rainwater Harvesting Rebate Program Expansion** – Tucson Water Conservation Supervisor Daniel Ransom presented an update on the expansion of the Rainwater Harvesting (RWH) Rebate program, in the form of a Memorandum to Mayor and Council from Tucson Water's Director. Mr. Ransom discussed elements of the Memo, which was divided into sections corresponding to the elements of the Mayor and Council directive from the November 14, 2014, Study Session. Mr. Ransom summarized progress made toward meeting each of the directive's goals.

   Members asked and staff fielded several questions about the Update. Member Lewis asked if the SERI low-income pilot program would include active RWH systems. Mr. Ransom indicated that the program would include only passive RWH systems at this time, as these systems are well-suited for the free tree-planting element of the program, and are also more affordable.

   Member Lewis asked why low-income program participants must acquire trees from an outlet specified by SERI, rather than from a source of their choosing. Tucson Water Public Information Supervisor Fernando Molina indicated that SERI's grant program requires the organization to partner with specific providers, including Trees for Tucson and a private vendor that receives free trees from other sources.

   Member Lewis asked for clarification on the definition of "low-income" in relation to the SERI pilot program. He asked if this customer group would be the same as those who are eligible for High Efficiency Toilet rebates, or if they are the same group as those eligible for rate assistance. Mr. Molina indicated staff would follow up with a clarification.

   ** Members were later provided with this clarification, as well as additional information provided via e-mail by SERI:

   > The U.S. Department of Labor Income Standards are used in the qualification process for Tucson Water customers who seek assistance. This is consistent for other City departments with low income programs including Environmental Services and Parks and Recreation.

> The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) State Income Limits are used for the Community Home Repair Projects of Arizona's high efficiency toilet replacement program and Sonora Environmental Research Institute's (SERI) low income rain water harvesting project. The HUD Median Family Income for Arizona is established each year, and 80% of that value is the maximum allowed to be considered Low Income; however, the SERI rain water harvesting participants generally fall closer to the level of Very Low (50%) to Extremely Low (30%) Income.

Member Lewis requested confirmation that the Tucson Department of Transportation curb-cut policy allows stormwater harvested from a public right-of-way to be used only for landscape irrigation within the public right-of-way, and not on private property. Mr. Ransom confirmed that this is correct.

Members and staff then engaged in a discussion about Tucson Water's recommendation to extend the RWH Rebate Program evaluation period to the end of calendar year 2017. This discussion included consideration of the original RWH program criteria (reduction in potable water use, number of people attending RWH workshops, and number of customers applying for RWH rebates) and consideration of a timeframe for including additional evaluation criteria, such as effect on urban tree canopy and changes to customer behavior. Staff indicated that the recommendation to extend the evaluation period was intended to identify criteria and to develop projects for collecting and analyzing data related to those criteria.

Member Shipek commended staff on the Memo, and asked if there was a target date for the implementation of an expanded RWH program. Mr. Ransom indicated that the expanded program would take effect on July 1, 2015, and that this date would be included in the Memo.

Member Shipek asked other Members for a motion. Member Murphy moved to vote on the Update, and Member Lewis seconded the motion. Discussion ensued.

Member Lewis indicated that he did not intend to vote for approval. Member Lewis stated that, if he were Mayor and Council, he would want to know more about program evaluation criteria, or metrics. He stated his belief that measurements for success in the RWH program are unidentified, and that spending money on the program in the interim would be an awkward use of rebate funds.

Member Murphy indicated his intent to move forward with approval.

Member Shipek asked Ward 6 Council Aide Amy Stabler for a Ward Office perspective on the Update. Ms. Stabler indicated that Councilmember Kozachik was comfortable with the direction of progress on the program's expansion. The Ward 6 Office acknowledged the work still to be done on the program, and approved of Tucson Water's plans to develop metrics in conjunction with the Office of Integrated Planning.

Members engaged in further discussion about metrics for program evaluation, and whether to amend the motion to include a request that M&C consider inclusion of such metrics in the program. Member Murphy asked Member Lewis if such an amendment would address his concerns; Member Lewis indicated that it would not. Member Murphy retracted his amendment.

Member Shipek called for a vote on the original motion to approve and present the Memo to Mayor and Council. The motion was carried with a voice vote of 2-1, with Member Lewis voting against.

Member Shipek noted that Member Lewis' point regarding metrics was well-taken, and agreed that evaluation measurements are valuable. Member Murphy added his view that reliable evaluation metrics needed to be developed carefully, and that sufficient time should be allocated to do so.

6. **Review of Conservation Program budget and Conservation Fee recommendation** – After brief discussion between members and staff, Member Shipek suggested tabling discussion on this item until the next subcommittee meeting. Member Lewis moved to continue the discussion to a future meeting; Member Murphy seconded the motion. The motion carried with a voice vote of 3-0.

7. **Staff feedback on draft Conservation & Education Strategic Plan** – Staff presented comments on the CWAC draft Conservation & Education Strategic Plan, as well as a draft of the proposed 2015-16 Water Conservation Planning Process, developed by Tucson Water's Public Information & Conservation Office (PICO). Staff indicated that PICO's Conservation Planning Process would incorporate recommendations from the CWAC draft C&E Strategic Plan, and would include elements of PICO's 2011 strategic plan, Tucson Water's Drought Response Plan, Tucson Water's Long Range Plan, and other departmental strategic planning documents.

   Discussion between staff and subcommittee members ensued. Members Shipek and Murphy indicated that the subcommittee had requested staff feedback on the C&E Strategic Plan during several meetings. Members expressed frustration that the process had yielded no feedback and no further progress on the C&E plan. Mr. Molina and Mr. Ransom indicated that the C&E Strategic Plan was considered a recommendation, and pointed out that elements of the C&E plan would be included in PICO's Conservation Planning Process. Mr. Molina indicated that staff viewed PICO's Conservation Planning Process as a programmatic and resource planning document, while the C&E plan was considered a recommendation for operational planning. Staff opinion, as indicated by Mr. Ransom and Mr. Molina, is that a programming and resource plan should be developed prior to an operational plan.

   After further deliberation, Members Shipek and Murphy indicated that the subcommittee would continue the Strategic Plan discussion at the next meeting with Chairperson McCoy present.

   Mr. Biggs informed the subcommittee of Tucson Water's current progress on a Department-wide Strategic Plan. He indicated that the Tucson Water Strategic Plan would include goals, action steps, and measurements applicable to each of the Department's sections. Mr. Biggs suggested that the C&E Strategic Plan might dovetail into the Department's overall Strategic Plan, and proposed a discussion of the topic at the next C&E meeting. Member Murphy agreed, and asked Mr. Biggs to provide additional information at that meeting.

8. Future Meetings/Agenda Items –

- Discussion of proposed new C&E programs
- Decision on Conservation Fee increase
- Strategic Plan discussion
- Drought Response and Preparedness presentation

9. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 4:42 p.m.