

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Technical Advisory Group Meeting #4

Date: Wednesday March 18, 2008
8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.

Location: Pinal County Government Complex;
31 N Pinal; Building F; Florence

Purpose: Water and Energy Elements

Handouts: Agenda, Meeting Summary Notes

Participants:

Greg Bernosky, Arizona Public Service; Brian Davidson, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality; Randy Edmond, Arizona Department of Water Resources; Jordan Feld, Arizona Department of Commerce; Don Gabrielson, Pinal County; Russ Haughey, Arizona Game & Fish Department; Jim Nelson, Salt River Project; Thomas Poulson, Bureau of Reclamation; Terri Sue Rossi, Central Arizona Project; Charles Russell, Salt River Project; Joan Scott, Arizona Game & Fish Department; and David Wilson, Electrical District #2

Staff Present: Curt Dunham, Peggy Fiandaca, and Audra Koester Thomas, Partners for Strategic Action, Inc.

Meeting was called to order at approximately 8:05 a.m.

Welcome

Peggy Fiandaca welcomed the group and provided an update on the Comprehensive Plan.

Alternative Presentation and Workshop Results

Curt Dunham and Audra Koester Thomas presented a PowerPoint on the alternatives presented to the public in February and the subsequent results of public input to the alternatives. Curt then presented a draft Preferred Alternative developed based on the input received from residents during the February workshops. TAG members offered the following comments on the alternatives and draft Preferred Alternative:

- Tourism corridor is great
- Can we trade development along SR 79 and move it to west County?
(answer: development within MPAs in west County to be considered in next iteration)



MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

- What is the position of the County on encouraging development in municipalities versus within unincorporated County? (answer: Comprehensive Plan to define role of County)
- Can the plan talk to what the market holds in 10-15 years? Is the role of the plan to define short-term carrying capacity? (answer: the Growth Element in the Plan will address 10 year growth areas)
- What are we envisioning for the ecotourism corridor? (answer: a wide range of businesses and services, from day-spas to wildlife guiding and more)

Curt then asked, from the perspective of participants representative agency, what were their top concerns/priorities/considerations related to the Plan or Alternative:

- Arizona Game and Fish Department—connectivity of wildlife corridors and open space; corridor-focused the best alternative; try to wait on SR 79 development as long as possible; disruption of San Pedro corridor diminishes ecotourism possibilities of east County
- Arizona Department of Water Resources—corridor-focused option best; water concerns/constraints along SR 79 corridor (no groundwater)
- Salt River Project—San Pedro River a concern for San Manuel development (and overall concern for lack of water in area); from a utility perspective, density is better (and thus, corridor-focused better); you'll need a 4000 megawatt power plan to produce enough power for 2 million (Palo Verde currently produces 3600 megawatts)
- Central Arizona Project—concern about dependency on groundwater in general; population growth shouldn't or isn't constrained by water—if people are willing to pay for it, getting water to the people isn't a problem; we should maximize reclaimed water in the Plan
- Department of Commerce (Smart Growth)—plan looks great!
- Arizona Public Service—we need to ensure Plan talks to infrastructure needs and incorporates consolidation policies on utilities, etc.
- Arizona Department of Environmental Quality—need to be realistic about available resources and related infrastructure costs (show constrained growth figures); need to address waste management facilities/infrastructure
- Bureau of Reclamation—cannot depend on groundwater, need renewable sources; water quality issues exist in western County; additional power plants means additional water needs (cooling); ASU-branch in Pinal County good idea
- Pinal County Air Quality Control District—air quality should be addressed in Plan implementation; need to address transportation needs south of Oracle Junction; SR 79 set-back (context corridor) a good concept



MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Comprehensive Plan Elements: Water and Energy

Curt noted that two subcommittees would be formed in regard to the Energy Element. Participants were asked to submit participant recommendations to sit on those particular subcommittees.

Next Steps

The next round of public involvement activities is the Pinal Preferred Alternative Workshops in April and the Comprehensive Plan Forums in May-June.

The next TAG meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, May 29 at 2:00 p.m. in Florence.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately noon.

These meeting summary notes reflect the notes taken by Partners for Strategic Action, Inc. during the meeting. If corrections are needed, please provide those recommendations as soon as possible, preferably within two weeks of receipt of these notes.

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy A. Fiandaca, AICP
Project Manager

