

CAP Oral History

Interview with George Renner

Pam Stevenson (Q):

Today is Tuesday, May the 22nd of 2007, and I'm Pam Stevenson doing the interview, and our videographer here is Manny Garcia, and this is an oral history interview for the Central Arizona Project. And I always like to let you introduce yourself. Why don't you give us your full name?

George Renner (A):

Absolutely, my name is George Renner and I'm a former CAP Board member and delighted to have this opportunity to visit with you, Pam.

Q: Start off with some general background about you, starting with when and where were you born?

A: I was actually born in Phoenix, Arizona in 1946. I am a third generation Arizonan. My mother was born in Glendale, my father was born in Douglas, my grandfather was born in the territory, southeastern corner of Arizona before it was a state in about 1885, so been here for a while family wise.

Q: Good family roots.

A: Yes.

Q: Tell me, what was it like growing up in Phoenix?

A: I grew up in Glendale. I was born in Phoenix. There was no hospital in Glendale, so I was born in Phoenix, but I was raised in Glendale. Glendale was the quintessential small town, if you will. Heck, it probably only had 8 or 10,000

people when I was growing up. You walked everywhere, the canals, the laterals were open. Agriculture was a big part of what went on in Glendale. The railroad provided service for all the vegetable farms that were out here. There was vacant ground between Glendale and Phoenix. You would go on Grand Avenue and you would actually drive for a while and there were no buildings. It was much different, of course, than it is today, and in retrospect I think I was blessed to grow up in a community like Glendale that had all of the things that you took so much for granted then, but you think now of what some people deal with and the challenges that are ahead, how lucky I was 50 years ago when I grew up here.

Q: I wonder if we should close that door now for the sake of the air conditioning.

A: Oh, sure. Well, if it gets a little warm, I can certainly turn the air conditioner down.

Q: No, I just thought it might get louder. Also, I'll turn off my cell phone. Your family's been here for three generations. What brought them to Glendale?

A: Actually, on my father's side, we got here just as poor dirt farmers if you will, kind of moving westward from Texas as I understand it. And my mother's father came to Arizona in 1900 from Indiana and just had moved west for a job, for a better opportunity, a better life. So, like, I'm no different than people who come to Arizona today probably. You know, coming, my parents and ancestors came for the same reasons that people come today.

Q: But it was much less settled. That was before statehood.

A: Yes, that's true, that's true.

Q: Did they have any stories about Arizona becoming a state?

A: You know they did, although I never really talked with my...my grandfather on my father's side passed away when I was just six months old, so I never knew him. My grandfather on my mother's side was a wonderful man who participated in local politics to some degree; he was on the school board. In fact, he was the foreman of the jury in the Winnie Ruth Judd trial. So he had some fascinating stories. You know, interesting that his view of all of that was that it was nothing special. It was just happening, and you played your part in it and it unfolded and it was not looked upon as anything other than some opportunities, and you just moved through life kind of taking advantage of those and doing the best you could. Never thought of it being anything special to them. Kind of an interesting perspective they had.

Q: You said they came here as farmers. When you were growing up, were they still farmers?

A: Oh, my Grandfather came and got into the real estate and insurance business, which was a very common combination in small towns. You still see it today in some places where you have a business providing real estate and insurance services, way before the age of specialization that we have today. And he started that business in, goodness gracious, in the late thirties. And my father then, when he married my mom, joined my grandfather in the business, and then I later on joined my father. So we were kind of on the service providing side, if you will, of the farm economy in Glendale.

Q: But not farmers.

A: Not farmers. No, and not smart enough to have bought land, regrettably.

Q: Where did you go to school?

A: Glendale, I went to Glendale Elementary School, which is today called Landmark, it's transformed into a junior high school. I went to Glendale High School, and graduated in 1963, and went then to the University of Arizona, which is where my father had gone to school and my older brother before me. So it was just never a thought that I would go anyplace else. That's just what you did. You graduated from high school and went down to the U of A.

Q: And what did you study there?

A: I majored in marketing, and got out in four years. I had made a decision to participate in ROTC, which in the '60s was, you know, kind of a very big issue, and I did it all four years, made a decision to make a career out of the Army, and graduated, was commissioned, went into the service, and served. Anyway, I graduated from the U of A, took a commission in the U.S. Army, served two years in Alaska and a year in Vietnam, and concluded that a career in the Army was not the way I wanted to go, and left the Army, took a job with Union Oil Company in marketing, worked there for two years here in the valley, and decided for the same reasons I left the Army, corporate life wasn't exactly for me and that's when I then joined my father which was in 1972 and worked there for 33 years. I retired about two years ago.

Q: Long career. So you were in Vietnam in the sixties?

A: Yes, I was there from '69 to '70.

Q: You were an officer?

A: Yes, yes. I was actually an advisor to the South Vietnamese Rangers. Very interesting side of the war, a lot of people who don't know a whole lot about it. There were actually two U.S. efforts over there. One was the Army effort, the regular Army effort, and then there was another side that was called the

Military Assistance Command Vietnam or MacV as it was referred to, which was the "advisor" side of it, that was attempting to raise the Vietnamese Army up to a level, not dissimilar from what's going on in Iraq today, where they could defend and take care of the country. So I was over on the, kind of the non-regular side if you will, over on the advisor side, and had a much different experience than some of my peers, who were, my brother, as a matter of fact, who served on the Army side.

Q: Out in the jungles...

A: Yeah. Well, we were out in that but we were out just with the Vietnamese without all of the backup and logistics and so forth that went with an American unit. We kind of operated and lived with and lived on the local economy, and so it was a different, different experience.

Q: Must have been very interesting.

A: Yes it was.

Q: You decided that wasn't your...

A: In part, yes.

Q: Let's see. When did you first get involved in the local politics?

A: When I joined my father, I had been working just a short period of time and had what I think is probably a very traditional route. I was asked to serve on a Chamber of Commerce Committee and then I was elected to the Board of Directors for the Chamber of Commerce. I was then asked if I would serve on a Board for the City of Glendale on the Board of Adjustment and that then evolved. But, served on a couple of Boards for the City of Glendale. And then

a vacancy occurred on the city council. And I was asked if I would be interested, and I said well, yes, and so I was interviewed and ultimately chosen to fill that vacancy. The city council terms in Glendale are four years so I came on the council in 1976 served two years and ran for election. It was re-election, but I'd never been elected before. Ran for election in 1978, was elected, served two more years on the city council and then kind of concluded that I would run for Mayor, which I did in 1980 and served as Mayor from 1980 until 1992.

Q: So you must've liked city politics then.

A: Well, you know, I did. It was extremely interesting, challenging, rewarding. I'd never been involved in politics to a great degree, and I never thought of myself as a "politician" if you will. Rather it was just, again, kind of one of those community things that you just kind of start down a path and you do a little more and you do a little more, and before you know it, you wind up serving in office. And you look back and you can't really figure out exactly how it was you got there but there you are. It was a wonderful opportunity and I was extremely blessed to be in office at a time with lots of other very dedicated and talented people, both fellow elected officers and staff people, and it was really very enjoyable. It was an exciting time for the City of Glendale. We made the transition really from a small town. We were transitioning, I should say, through the seventies from really a small town into a suburb and then into a city. We went from about, my tenure I started, the city had about 30,000 people in 1975 and by the time I left office, shucks there were 125,000 people in Glendale. So you know, we went through all of those growing pains and the transitions and the challenges and the opportunities and it was just a fascinating experience. I'm very blessed to have had that opportunity. I wish more people could have that chance to participate and understand kind of what went on to bring the city to where it is today.

Q: You were quite young at that time. What were you, 35?

A: Yes. Let's see, I was elected Mayor in 1980, I was 33 years old.

Q: Fairly young.

A: I think I was the youngest Mayor. You know, it was...in retrospect I think I was...just happened to be at the right place at the right time to serve my role as Glendale made that transition. I had been preceded in office by a very active Mayor by the name of Max Class who was a very sharp fellow. Max is still around, and a good friend. But Max was not a native, and Max was kind of progressive before his time if you will. A lot of the "old timers" were less than supportive of some of the things Max wanted to do. Because of my family's history, I was able to wear the old timer label, and kind of was, automatically if you will, a member of the inner circle, so to speak. Not that there was an inner circle, but just of the traditional leadership, if you will. It made it, I think, a little easier for me to move things along because I didn't automatically run into that resistance. Oh you're not a Glendale-ian, you're a new guy, and you don't know what you're talking about. I was very blessed, and just the timing of the whole thing turned out to be extraordinarily, just lucky to be in the right place at the right time.

Q: It sounds like your family had kind of a tradition of public service.

A: They did. You know, it just, again, it's something that I never thought a great deal about. It was just something that you did. It wasn't really an ambition or anything like that. It was just an evolution of participation I guess. Some people's participation takes you in one direction...I apologize, I'm bumping my ring here...takes you in a participation in one path, and participation may take you in a path to be a Little League coach or a PTA president or it may take you in a path to serve on a city board or commission. They're equally

valuable and active; one just gets a little more attention than another one does.

Q: Well, and being the Mayor is really almost a full-time job.

A: Yeah. Back in the old days, in the eighties, it was still considered a part-time job. And I really was appreciative of that, more so honestly now perhaps than then. It was a challenge sometimes to balance all of the time demands you had, your job, your family, and then your avocation of elected office. Everybody that served with me on the council, for probably my first eight years or so during some extraordinarily busy times for the City of Glendale, all of us had jobs. And so we truly were part-time elected officials if you will. I think by being grounded and by having the same day-to-day interests and influences that other people have, you came to the issues with a more immediate, decision-oriented goal. You wanted to find the problem, and solve the problem, and move on and make things better. I don't want to criticize "full time" politicians today, but it seems that sometimes process becomes more important than the actual product or the solution, or coming up with a way to move forward is less important than the discussions about getting there. I think when you have a job and you're coming to a meeting with time demands and family demands, you aren't as interested in process. You're far more focused on what's the issue, what are the alternatives that we have, and let's make a decision and move on. And I was blessed with a city council who, all of us though we came at it from different backgrounds and different political sides if you will, I think we all had that same motivation. It made things much easier than I witness today, for example.

Q: You mentioned the growth. Did you ever expect that you'd see Glendale grow like that?

A: You know...again, you would read different projections and you knew the daily numbers. Obviously, people would tell you how many building permits or what the sales tax receipts were and there would be projections, and you could physically see new businesses and new houses being built. I don't think any of us, certainly not me, would have envisioned the rapidity that growth would happen. The acceleration is almost geometrical, you know, and I think all of us expected, if you would've asked, sure the city's going to grow, but it's going to grow in a more deliberate, more conservative manner if you will. But the curve just shot upwards like that. I think that was a surprise to everybody. Even though you were participating in it at the time, you still didn't realize what was happening until time gives you perspective to step back and say, "Holy mackerel, this is incredible." And that's really the way I felt.

Q: When you were Mayor you also served on, of course, a lot of the League of Cities and Towns.

A: Mmm hmmm.

Q: The Arizona Municipal Water Users Association, you were president of that. Was that when you first got involved with water issues?

A: Actually, when I first came on the city council, I was a babe in the woods when it came to water. But the city was going through some real challenges both with water and sewer. To expand our water system because of the growth that was going on in the city, even in the mid-seventies, was clearly something that had to be done. We were facing, in the late seventies, a major crisis with growth because we had some sewer expansion issues. We were behind the curve in providing sewer service. The FHA, at that time, which was the big financier of residential construction, not only threatened, they did stop giving mortgages because we couldn't provide sewer service, and people would have had to have gone on septic tanks. So we wound up making kind

of a compromise with the development community, with the federal government, with EPA. We came up with a method where, for about a year and a half, homes were built with septic tanks but had a dry connection, if you will, to the sanitary sewer system while we caught up and built the actual trunk lines and were able to extend the big pipes down to the sewer treatment plant at 91st Avenue. Well, this was an incredibly hot issue for the city. It was a growth issue, it was a money issue because this was a very expensive, for Glendale at the time, a very expensive undertaking. I kind of walked into that knowing very little about it and it kind of focused me first on the sewer issue and of course almost parallel with that, obviously, was the water side of it. I just began to participate in some of those discussions. In order to be an informed participant, you have to try to come up to speed on the various issues. That led me to the Municipal Water Users Association which is a group of Mayors. I participated when I was on the City Council. The Mayor at the time, Sterling Ridge was, we had a lot of things on our plates and he asked me if I would kind of be the Glendale representative on AMWUA, as we referred to it. So AMWUA at that time, and still does, both water and sewer. The last ten years probably sewer hasn't been quite as much on their agenda because fortunately most of the major sewer issues have been dealt with. In the seventies and eighties, the 91st Avenue treatment plant, wastewater, EPA, these were huge political issues all over the country, and certainly it was true here in the valley. The multi-cities treatment plant down at 91st Avenue was a model, really, for city cooperation. That all started way before I was in office and the people in the sixties who saw the need and came together instead of having a half a dozen sewer treatment facilities came together and built one big one. Without getting into all the details between the water quality issues and the requirements from EPA, and grants and funding, it was just countless meetings and that's kind of where I began to cut my teeth on water issues.

Q: In the early eighties, I think, wasn't that when the groundwater laws were being...?

A: It was, and the City Manager at the time in Glendale, Stan Van de Putte, was kind of an active participant in some of those early discussions. He did not serve on the infamous Rump Group, but one of my mentors, Jack DeBolske did, kind of representing the cities. And of course Jack was kind of taking his direction from AMWUA, who were kind of the back door guidance if you will. Jack would kind of come back and report his perspective of what was going on. He'd be tasked to go pursue certain things. So it was a challenging time. Agriculture was very interested in water, as were the mines. There were a lot of competing interests. At the same time, the publicity about the subsidence and overuse were coming to be huge issues. The decision to place the Groundwater Management Act before the legislature, get it passed and signed by Governor Babbitt, were obviously very critical to the Valley's future. All of those people deserve great, great credit for their courage and wisdom in tackling head on an issue that really other areas in the southwest still grapple with today, some almost 30 years later. We were light years ahead of the rest of our peers in the southwest as far as groundwater's concerned.

Q: In what way? What specific things about the Groundwater Act?

A: Oh gosh, just the primary goal of safe yield. Recognizing groundwater was a finite resource and it was something that you could not mine forever because, as opposed to copper you dig a big hole and the copper's all gone, the mine moves on. You can't do that with water. You can't move on unless you're like the Hohokams. You move on and everybody moves on. I think there was a recognition that water's place in our future was absolutely critical. And you know it seems so obvious today. We live in a desert; there's been a lot of discussion about this. You know 30 or 40 years ago, the growth really had yet to happen. People, it was easy to just say, "Well, gosh, it will be here forever. There's lots of water." And there was lots of water and there is lots of water today, but I think one of the reasons there is lots of water today were some of those early, very hard-fought decisions that lead us to the Groundwater

Management Act and that have put in place a set of laws that will ensure Arizona's water future, hopefully forever.

Q: As the Mayor of Glendale, you were coming from a fairly agricultural community. Were you representing the agriculture side or the city side?

A: Well, it was interesting. Both. Most of, well I should say probably all of Glendale's agriculture was Salt River Project. Their water was provided by their right and membership in the Salt River Project and as a property owner they were entitled to certain water rights. So their water was not a city issue. In fact, as growth would occur, in the early years, growth was occurring within the Salt River Project boundaries. So a farmer would sell his land, he would stop using his water allotment, that water allotment would transfer to the city because we would then be able to use SRP water for drinking water for people who lived there. Honestly, in the early years, there was a net gain, in other words, a farmer might use five acre-feet a year, whereas full development of that same acre would only use three acre-feet a year. So you kind of had a gain of two acre-feet. Some of that helped in providing green areas, parks, schools, and so forth. It was kind a mixed challenge to deal with the early water issues when all the growth was happening.

Q: Any particular issues you can think of that came up at that time?

A: Well, probably one of the larger ones was...CAP was being debated at the time. It had been authorized. It was close to beginning construction. Had the famous hit list where it was going to get dropped off federal funding. We were all, of course, pushing every year. You had the annual migration back to Congress with the tin cup to plead for continued funding of the Central Arizona Project. That was just, you know, kind of a litany that you did. But at the local level, Glendale specifically, we had to recognize and deal with the issue of water treatment. CAP is not like well water that comes up. CAP water had

to be treated. So we were faced with a decision of timing. Do you decide to build your treatment facility before all of these issues are solved, funding of the CAP, timing of it and so forth, because part of the Groundwater Management Act required you to deal with renewable supplies.

Well, pump water is not a renewable supply. We had a considerable amount of our city was going to be off project, as it was called, north of the canal as we used to refer to it. The only way to deal with the Groundwater Management Act in that area was to use some of your CAP water as your renewable supply. Without getting into a lot of detail, the law requires for your assured water supply designation that you show evidence of a means to utilize this renewable supply, which meant you had to build a water treatment plant. So we were faced in the mid-eighties with that decision. And put a bond issue before the citizens, and got, I can remember at the time, I think it was a \$40 million bond issue, which was an incredible amount of money to build water treatment facilities. We started the first one, and it was under construction. I remember going back to Congress and talking to not only our delegation, but other members of Congress, when there was real movement towards stopping the CAP, and pleading with them that as a community, we have accepted as faith this commitment on the part of the federal government and we had moved forward to utilize this resource, and that it would be an absolute breach of faith to not continue and to deliver what was promised. So those were, that's probably one of the earliest I guess real challenges that I recall with infrastructure and the CAP and its impact on Glendale very directly. That, boy if this didn't happen, we had under construction a water treatment plant that would basically almost be dry. Fortunately everything wound up coming to pass as envisioned, and the city has since built another water treatment facility. Those were, that's probably the single most graphic illustration I can recall as how intertwined the water, the authorization of the construction, its continued funding and ultimate completion. Of course, all of this was going on when there was the great debate about Orme Dam and Plan 6 and who was

going to pay for things. You had, it was an issue that was discussed at a number of levels. Down at the local level, you were trying to make sure you had all your regulatory approvals in place, the assured water supply, and evidence that you could continue development and growth, whether it was to have a water treatment plant funded and under construction. Then at the regional level, you were worried about arguing about Plan 6 and where you were going to do it and how much contribution was going to come from the cities so on, and SRP was fighting with people. Then up at the congressional level, you were fighting for just authorization, or not authorization, but funding for continued construction and it was just up and down this ladder that you kind of participated in, and it was a fascinating time for water in Arizona.

Q: You mentioned the water treatment plant. Didn't you have to treat the SRP canal water?

A: We did, but it was, in that time, we had a treatment facility that was...I'm sorry; we had wells which required no treatment. And we were beginning to utilize SRP water, and yes, we had a treatment facility. But you were able to, between your SRP wells and your SRP water; the demands were not as great for the assured water supply rules as we looked forward. And that was why the investment, we felt, had to be made. And we did, kind of get ahead of the curve. Our plant opened just months after Phoenix. Phoenix and Glendale built the first two water treatment plants specifically designed to treat CAP water. And it was, in retrospect, it was a very wise decision at the time. We really wondered whether we were doing the right thing or not.

Q: And when did that open? Do you remember?

A: Oh, golly. Gosh Pam, I can't remember specifically. In the mid-eighties, I think.

Q: Eighty-five was the delivery of water.

A: Yeah. We had the plant under construction I think in '84. I think it actually opened and it was treating water... It was a joint SRP/CAP facility and it was treating water before really the CAP delivery began.

Q: I bet you the new plant didn't cost \$4 million.

A: No, they're lots more now. Lots more.

Q: I saw where you were on the governor's Central Arizona Project Advisory Committee? What was that? Which governor was that?

A: There were a lot of advisory committees. The first one I served on was one that Governor Symington put together. It was, I think, created to respond to the very real issue of financing and repayment of Arizona's obligation to the federal government. As envisioned, the CAP was going to be a very real supplier to the agricultural community, to the agricultural economy, and of course to people. When we approached the time that water was really going to become available, and under contract with the federal government, deliverable at "full cost" as it was referred to, the economy, and in particular the agricultural economy in Arizona, had changed and the farmers were not going to be able to afford to take or buy their planned CAP water. And this created both a real and in some cases perceived crisis as to the future of the Central Arizona Project. Very real concern among all of us that, if we weren't able to use our water or there was the slightest interpretation of lack of need in Arizona, thirsty California would rush in and use our unused water. And if that happened for too long of a period of time, we might just lose a good portion, if not a majority of our water to California. And I think it was in that environment that Governor Symington created a group to try and deal with those challenges. What came out of that was a method to basically subsidize farmers' water to continue to bring it to Arizona. The cities and agriculture during that period were at real loggerheads as far as water. A great deal of

competition between the cities and farmers. That was probably the first time that I think there was recognition that, if we fight among ourselves, we are under much greater threat from outside of Arizona to our CAP supply than we are from inside. We have more in common than we have...and we have to recognize that so that we can present a united front against those who would lust after our CAP water. And I think there was recognition after some hard discussion and understanding of the issues that it was in the cities' long term interest to in essence assist in that provision of water at less than full-cost rate, to ensure that agriculture would continue to use it. It would bring that water for Arizona, it would demonstrate that it's being used in Arizona. And that was one of the major, not only conclusions, but actual implemental decisions that came out of Governor Symington's, that first task force on water. I recall going back with Rita Pearson and Mark deMichael. I was one of the three; we went back and pled our case before George Miller who was chairman of the House Interior Committee, who were mucking about a great deal. He was from California, and they were sticking their nose into issues, and he was holding out for more Indian water and trying to really just, I believe, create havoc to make things easier for California to continue to use their water. It was a time I think of great concern over the long-term future of the CAP. It seemed we had just gotten through the issues of first authorization, then funding, construction, finally completion, and here the water was just getting ready to come. And all of a sudden we realized, holy mackerel, the plan to use and then pay for this wasn't going to work. So it was back to the drawing board in a big hurry. But it was a very, I think, fortuitous decision. And in retrospect, I think has proved to be the right decision for Arizona.

Q: I wanted to interject a quick question in there anyway, because it seems...Where did the Native American's situation come in? Did it come in at that point?

A: In the task force, yes. There was, at the time, recognition...oh, sure. There was recognition then that a great deal of the CAP water was going to be for Native American use, for Indian use. The issue was the federal government had taken the position that they were not going to pay what were called O&M charges. We, of course, felt that was grossly unfair. And one of the other major things that came out of this task force was a very unified position on the part of all of the water community and the political community in Arizona that the Federal government had to bear the cost of this water for Arizona. It could not be provided at a rate that shoved onto the non-Native American community a federal responsibility which was determined decades ago in the Winters Doctrine, when the Supreme Court decided that if the United States of America created a reservation for the Indians, with that creation of the reservation came certain water entitlements. And that was a federal responsibility, and the cost of meeting that federal responsibility had to be borne by the federal government, not by the citizens of Arizona. That issue was really vetted and discussed and a position taken then that ultimately led to, after a whole other series of discussions, the federal government accepting that responsibility.

Q: Another issue that involved Native Americans that you mentioned earlier was the Orme Dam proposal and Plan 6. You mentioned the controversy over that. Where did you stand in all of that?

A: Well, that was part of that moving train that I had grabbed onto right when I came into office, first city council and then as Mayor. And it was, the great Plan 6 discussions were what got labeled Plan 6 because Plan 6 was ultimately the New Waddell solution out of a whole series of plans. I think there was great disappointment when Orme Dam was kind of taken off the table. It was the presumed and assumed solution, and would have solved some flood issues, would have solved some storage issues. But I think it was the very practical and pragmatic decision to move forward. A lot of people wanted to continue to

fight that battle over and over. But I think the broader water community recognized that that issue, Orme Dam or a replacement in that area, wasn't going to happen and we needed to move forward. The Plan 6 discussions I think were driven first more by money, and then, as it came to be with the money, how much water you would get back for your contributions. The raising of Roosevelt Dam and then New Waddell. The cities put some money in as did other water interests in Arizona, SRP, the CAP. You look back and it's probably as good a decision as you could have made, in spite of all of the difficulties. It wound up to be I think a very good decision. The location of Waddell for the Valley, gives you the chance with storage, with gravity storage if you will, to serve almost all of the major urban area out of Waddell. Lets the CAP operate by pumping water into Waddell in the wintertime when demands are down, when power costs are lower. You have excess power then available to sell in the summertime to create revenue. You can then just drain Waddell in the summertime to provide water. So it was a very wise and I think very fortuitous decision that resulted out of this real controversy. Sometimes you succeed in spite of yourselves, you know.

Q: Actually it was a better solution.

A: That's exactly right. Yup.

Q: Another thing I saw on your resume was you were on the Governor's Groundwater Commission. Which governor was that?

A: Well, again. There were two of those. I think the first was Governor Hull put together a very large group to see if the groundwater code was working I think was the charge. One of the difficulties of that group was there never really was a definitive mandate from the governor. We were a group that came together with no real objective and it was extremely frustrating I think for most of us who served on that. I think it was valuable in that it got a lot of people

together to focus on groundwater, and there were some sharing of information. I think the realization that we were doing a better job than a lot of us maybe even realized. That safe yield, which was still kind of viewed as a goal in 2025, it turned out we were much closer to safe yield than anyone thought. And so it was valuable from that standpoint. It was probably one of the more frustrating high level groups I've ever been involved with.

Q: And you say you were closer to safe yield. Would that be in the Maricopa and Pima County areas?

A: Yes, in the greater Phoenix AMA. I'm one of those who believe the data support that today we are very near, if not at, safe yield, in this active management area. Certainly there are, and I'm not a hydrologist, there's several minor basins in the Active Management Area. But the amount of recharge that we're doing today, the amount of use of renewable supplies, SRP water, CAP water, the conservation that we have put in place, all of that rolled together. You're seeing groundwater levels actually rising. And I think we are, in some areas of the valley in fact, the groundwater table is coming up very quickly. So it's been a success. I think recognition of that was one of, probably the most valuable thing that occurred out of Governor Hull's task force or committee, I can't even remember, commission I guess it was called. We got several nice notebooks out of it, that's probably the extent of it.

Q: Another one I saw was the Arizona Water Banking Authority. I've never heard of that one.

A: Well, that's something that, if you serve as president of the CAP, by statute, you are on the, you are Director of the Arizona Water Bank. Water Banking Authority is a mechanism that was created by the legislature to allow us to legally recharge Colorado River water. One of the challenges of CAP water for municipal supply was the term firming. There are times, of course, not only

when you don't have the CAP running because of maintenance, but there are times of drought on the river. And your supplies aren't "firm" supplies because you never really know how much water there's going to be. So the cities were always interested in firming their supplies. And this was a commitment that the state made and a commitment that everyone recognized had to be fulfilled. Well, the Water Bank was created as a way to firm those supplies. And it was very simple. You bring water in, you put it underground. It is committed to be available to those cities when Colorado River water is not available. It is a way to prevent you from having to rush to your groundwater supply when there's a time of shortage on the river. And this enabled the creation of water budgets with a long 100-year horizon to be looked at and recognizing that, okay, even if there is a drought on the Colorado, if our Colorado River allocation is cut in half, we can continue to supply the same amount of water because we will withdraw this water we have banked. And there were a lot of legal issues, political issues, financial issues because of course it costs money. CAP basically is a water wholesaler. That water is sold to somebody; somebody has to pay for it. Well, the Water Bank was created as a somebody who would buy water with taxes, recharge it, and it would then be available to sell at a higher rate to the cities when they needed to use it. It was extremely successful, has been, and I think it was one of the more innovative tools that Arizona created to have in our arsenal to deal with water challenges and with growth in our State.

Q: When was it created?

A: Oh, boy, Pam. About 1996, I think, '98, sometime in there.

Q: When did you actually become a member of the Central Arizona Project Board?

A: Governor Symington appointed me in 1992, in April of '92. It's when my service as Mayor ceased. I retired, if you will, decided not to run for re-election. And you can't hold two elected offices in Arizona, the constitution prevents you. So as soon as my term as Mayor had expired, there was a vacancy at the time on the Board and he appointed me in '92. I served and ran for re-election, ran for election I guess, in '94, was elected in '94 and then elected again in 2000. So I served 14 years on the CAP Board.

Q: Six-year...

A: Six-year terms, yes, a long time.

Q: How did you get appointed? Did you let him know that you were interested in that?

A: Yes. There had never been a so-called city person on the CAP Board. The CAP Board, and I certainly mean no disrespect, but was kind of viewed early on as the place where water buffalos and retired governors, I mean at one point I think there were three former governors serving on the CAP Board. And it was not active on a day-to-day basis because the CAP, of course, was still in its conceptual stage, fighting for authorization, then fighting for funding, so there weren't a lot of actual operational issues that include money, politics, and so forth. And the group was viewed as kind of an old boys club, if you will, and unfortunately it had never included anybody that wore a city hat. And when I had decided not to run and that vacancy was there, I was encouraged by some of my city peers to let the governor know that I would be willing to serve and that it would be a valuable thing to have that perspective, municipal perspective, brought to the CAP Board. He agreed and I got handed the opportunity. It turned out to be one of the more enjoyable and yet challenging educational opportunities of my public career. It was absolutely fascinating, my tenure on the CAP Board.

Q: What were the issues when you joined the Board?

A: Wow. In '92, we were just beginning to deal with the issues of repayment. And again, we talked a little earlier off camera. There's a term of art in the Central Arizona Project called substantially complete, and that has to do with though the system was operating, had not yet been deemed substantially complete. Those magic words in the law caused Arizona to have to start repaying the federal government. This goes back to some of that crisis when Governor Symington put together that task force. The pending declaration of substantially complete. We had on Arizona's side and on CAP's side in particular, a different view of what we owed the federal government than the U.S. did. Much of these issues, like anything, if they're far enough down the road, you don't worry about them. You know they're going to be a problem, but gosh that's next year's problem, let's focus on today's problem. As this declaration of substantially complete got closer and closer everyone began to realize, holy mackerel, this dispute is approaching a real-time dispute. And so discussions with the Bureau began about defining what repayment meant. Fine, we know we have to repay you for our share of the Central Arizona Project. How much is our share? Well, in a nutshell, the Bureau kind of thought, well gosh, your bill is \$2.3 billion dollars, here's the bill, pay us. We thought, and I certainly was not one of the experts, but those who were versed in the law, and whose responsibility was that, felt the obligation was more like \$1.6 or \$1.7 billion, a difference of about a half a billion dollars, which is a lot of money. A lot of money. And that dispute became all-consuming for probably five years. We made a decision, we the CAP Board, when it became apparent we were not going to move the Bureau into any meaningful discussions about this dispute. We made the decision the only way to do that was to sue the federal government, which is something, believe me, you don't do lightly. And it's a daunting prospect because you're dealing with an adversary who has a bottomless wallet and literally thousands of staff and people available. And in this case, much of the data was hidden, if you will, in Bureau of Reclamation

files and so on and so on. Anyway, the Board made I think a very courageous decision, and thought right is right. The CAP was a multi-purpose project. It was to serve certainly agriculture, it was to serve municipalities, it was to serve Native Americans, it was to serve flood control, even some recreational purposes. And what's fair is fair. You should pay your fair share. And we felt we were being asked to pay way more than our fair share. So we sued them. Then began a fight that went on for a long time. Unfortunately it got complicated because the federal government early on insisted that this repayment fight was going to be, not only about money, but was going to be about water. And they brought in to this discussion the issue of...sure.

Q: We're out of tape...okay. You were talking about I think the repayment.

A: Yes. The federal government, specifically in this instance, the Department of Justice and the Department of the Interior, demanded that the repayment discussions include the issue of Indian water, and attempting to ensure that, from their perspective, any repayment agreement would also include agreement and resolution of some of the Indian water claims, which obviously complicated the issue tremendously. There had been a couple of small Indian water settlements previously in Arizona's history. The Gila claims, which were far and away the largest in terms of quantity, were as yet unresolved. It was an extraordinarily complicated issue that involved all of the water users literally, and most of central Arizona because the Gilas claimed not only water from the Gila, they claimed water from the Salt and Verde systems and they claimed groundwater use harmed some of their surface water rights. It was an incredibly, is an incredibly complicated issue. It affected not only cities, it affected agricultural districts, SRP, Roosevelt Irrigation District, it affected any other water user that you can imagine. So dragging that whole bucket of worms into what we thought was a very narrow issue of delineation of what was legally and rightfully an Arizona responsibility to repay a financial issue, got stuck with this tar baby of Indian water rights. Those discussions began and

went on and on and on with a couple of false hopes, and actually we were set, had publicized an agreement that we had reached. And Secretary Babbitt who was the Secretary of the Interior at the time, I guess in the simplest way I can say it, stiffed us. We had an agreement and he failed to show. He decided literally at the last minute not to sign the agreement. And back to the table we went. And another two or three years elapsed. Finally, agreement was reached. It's been much publicized. All of the requisite legislation that needed to be passed has finally been passed, not only on the Federal side, but on Arizona's side, on the state's side. It finally delineated the amount of water that was going be available from the Central Arizona Project to resolve the Indian claims. It quantified for SRP, it quantified for the cities, it quantified for Roosevelt Irrigation District, it resolved some issues other places in the Gila, all the way upriver as far as Safford. I mean, it was an incredibly complex settlement, and I think to Arizona's credit, it was a settlement. It was agreed upon finally by all the parties, as opposed to a judicial decision forced upon us or a legislative decision mandated by Congress. It was an agreement among the affected parties. And I think it speaks well to Arizona's ability to solve our own problems, as thorny and difficult as they can be sometimes. Anyway, that issue just consumed the Board of Directors from probably 1993 or '94 until I think it was 2000 when we actually got the final agreement. And then, we went through a whole 'nother, a whole multiple-year process of implementing this agreement with the legislation and other arguments that would pop up. Like any major issue, it takes a long time to get it solved. That was the all-consuming issue in the nineties for the Central Arizona Project.

Q: Seems ironic that Babbitt would have been involved.

A: Yeah.

Q: Was it sort of a conflict of interest there for him with his federal responsibilities?

A: You could... And I think he was acutely aware of that, and in fact because of that maybe argued too hard against us for not wanting to appear to have some preferential treatment, because, while not affecting anybody but Arizona, water is such a complicated issue, particularly the Colorado River, that this decision in Arizona was being watched closely by California, by Nevada, by the Upper Basin states, and other Indian tribes across the country, so he was in a very difficult spot. Once again, kind of in spite of ourselves, I believe the agreement we wound up with was a better agreement. We got a better deal for Arizona, because Babbitt walked out on us and blew us off. We were ready to agree to something that would have given away more than we ultimately hung onto. It was to the credit of all of those involved in those negotiations on all sides really, not just on our side, but on the federal side, recognizing that this needed to be done. It ultimately was, and I think to the ultimate benefit, still has critics, but to the ultimate benefit and long term benefit of all of the State of Arizona, not just the Central Arizona Project.

Q: You said it was wrapped up in 2000, which would have been the end of Babbitt's term. Did he make a point to make sure that happened before he left?

A: Perhaps. I think it was really an issue that, from the Indian aspect of it, I think it was driven far more and I compliment the federal government for this. They really finally got out of the way and let I think the affected parties really try to solve these problems. I think it was, again, a recognition that the moment was right, the time was right to resolve these very thorny and interrelated issues. All of those involved I think stepped up to the plate at the right time and recognized that this just had to be done. It entailed some very significant compromises on many, many parties. But it was the right thing to do and I think everyone recognized that.

Q: Isn't Arizona kind of unique in dealing with the Indian water rights?

A: I think we are. I'm not a student of other Indian disputes in other states. I know we have one of the largest, if not the largest amount of our state in percentage of land is in reservation trust. Some very valuable land in Arizona from natural resources, in location, and in water. As Arizona grows, it was inevitable that you would begin to have those non-native issues bump up against the Native American issues. They have and they will continue to do that. But I think Arizona has had a history of settlement rather than litigation, or one party or the other running to Congress and trying to get a bill passed that then forced some outside external decision on the State. I think other states have recognized and have emulated what we have done here in Arizona. I think we should take great pride in our history of solving some of these really, really difficult issues.

Q: It seems like those Indian water rights are going to be very important for the tribes in the future.

A: Oh, absolutely, absolutely. And will continue, I'm sure, to be a point of real dispute. Though the issue is settled, there are still those who say the Indians got too much water. Others who say they didn't get enough water. I think what was recognized as a basic tenet in those negotiations was, and I think recognized by the Indians, we talked awhile back about the cities and agriculture recognizing that they had more in common and a greater threat to each other from outside Arizona than from within. I think the Indian communities have recognized that, that they are part of Arizona. Arizona water includes cities, farmers, mines, recreation, and it includes Indians. It is all Arizona water. When threatened, we have to be unified in the face of that threat. I think that the basic tenet was this water was going to be Arizona water, which meant even though it might be allocated to the Indians; it could never be used outside of Arizona. The Indians resisted that initially because they had ideas of perhaps selling this water or trading this water to California or Nevada or Colorado. Fortunately, that issue was agreed upon and became

one of the founding pillars, if you will, of that agreement. So that has helped us, I think, recognize that our problems are critical enough to us that we must solve them to the agreement of all of us rather than having a decision made externally, forced upon us.

Q: The Indians can still sell their water within Arizona.

A: Within Arizona, absolutely, and have done so and will continue to do so. I think that was one of the consequences, some say intended, some say unintended consequences of the decision is the Indians are legally able, and many users, cities in particular are counting on using that Indian water, whether it's short-term use or long-term use through leases, short-term leases or long-term leases. That is expected and in fact will be part of the long-term water plans of cities and growth will be assisted by that Indian water. I think most people believe the amount of water that the Gila tribe received in that settlement could probably never fully be utilized on the reservation. As a result, it will be available for use, but again, the key as you pointed out, Pam, it will be used within Arizona, for Arizonans, and that's what's important.

Q: During your 14 years on the Board, were there any other major things you can think of? Challenges?

A: Well, oh yes. In addition to the whole repayment issue and all of those financial challenges that we dealt with was I think a conscious decision on the part of the Board to recharge water. We recognized, even with the Water Bank, and we talked about that a little bit, there was still not the ability to bring our full allocation. By ours I mean the CAP's and we thought of it as Arizona's full allocation. Arizona gets 2.8 million acre-feet off the Colorado a year. A little more than half of that, roughly 1.5, is the Central Arizona Project annual allocation off the river. In the early and mid-nineties, we were not taking our full allocation off the river. It was being used by California. California was

becoming dependent upon that water. It was clear that we were at risk because California is the 300 pound gorilla. In a political fight, in an economic fight, even in a legal fight, you are the, you're in the minor leagues when it comes to fighting with California. And so we recognized, I say we, the Arizona community recognized, we had to come up with a way to get all of our water every year off the river, as we called it, off the river and into Arizona. Well, we talked a little while earlier about the farmers were unable to pay their full share. They were being subsidized. It was difficult enough to deliver them 400, 500, 600 thousand acre-feet of water. The cities at the time were only using a couple hundred thousand acre-feet of water. What are we going to do with the rest of it? Well, it didn't take a genius to figure out we're going to have to recharge it. We'll bring this water in, we will recharge it. We don't know for sure what we're going to use it for in the future, but we're going to do something with it. We, the CAP, made a very conscious decision to locate, construct, recharge facilities as we called them. We had to make sure they complied with state law, to get the legal and political issues solved as far as ownership of that water, what kind of class of water it was, we had to locate them in hydrologically sound areas, we had to figure out a way to pay for them. Internally we realized this was something we had to do to help keep our Colorado River water, is how we see it, our water, our water coming to Arizona. We made that decision and I think it was an extraordinarily appropriate decision to have made. It was not without some criticism. There were those who felt it was perhaps unnecessary, way too expensive, debatable in its long-term prospects to recover the water, a lot of issues with recovery and quality that were left unsolved. But we felt, I think the Board and others on staff who believed this was, if not the only solution, clearly a solution, and a very good solution to this problem. And so we did it. It was an issue that then the Board had to deal with. Where are you going to build these facilities, and so on and so on. It was a path we embarked on, we started down this. I remember there was the kind of backhanded description that the Central Arizona Project was

just a ditch company. Basically we ran the ditch, we ran a big ditch from the Colorado River to central Arizona and that's what we did. I think the Board made a very conscious decision and realized we had a greater role to play. There was an opportunity. There was a need to deal with issues that went beyond just a ditch company. That went to issues of ensuring the reliability of our Colorado River water, defending it against those who may lust after our water. We began to insert ourselves very consciously and deliberately into broader discussions, into discussions within the state, into discussions with California, with Nevada, discussions with the entire basin. I think that in the nineties, and into this decade, the Central Arizona Project has evolved into being one of the most articulate and influential participants in the Colorado River discussions. And I think it is to Arizona's benefit, because the CAP advocates not just for CAP's share, the one and a half million acre feet, but in so doing, we are advocating for Arizona's share. We have the ability to do that in addition to the Department of Water Resources, who is advocating for the entire state. That was one of, I think, a real transition for the Central Arizona Project as an organization, that it moved from more narrowly defined on just operations into a broader mission of water policy that encompasses everything from seven basin states to the amount of uranium that is going into Lake Mead from the wash in Nevada from the old mine tailings. It is a breadth and depth of issues that is just almost incomprehensible sometimes. The Central Arizona Project has been involved in all of those, and I think rightfully so.

Q: Talk about the recharge. Where did you finally locate and how many recharge areas are there?

A: Wow, there's...We began the early ones, the first couple were down, on kind of a temporary test basis if you will, in Pima County along the river. Let's see, one was near Marana, there was another one in City of Tucson. These were the early ones and were really located very close to the CAP canal. Water

was just taken and put in large spreading basins as they're called. The water percolates down into the ground, and it's held there by geology until you decide to pump it up again. That's the theory behind a recharge basin. They proved to be very successful both in operation and impact. We actually measure the rise in the groundwater table. So then we began to look at areas outside of Pima County. The first one, probably most significant I think, we built on a larger scale was the Agua Fria recharge facility which we had an opportunity to do something significant, and actually do some in-stream recharge. As opposed to having the water come directly by a cement ditch into the recharge basins, we put water in the actual Agua Fria River bed and it flows down for about five miles to these recharge basins. So you get what the experts call in-stream recharge. That was exciting and I think is proving to be a very successful project. We built two in western Maricopa County, a very large one called the Tonopah Recharge Project out in the desert on the very edge of western Maricopa County. There's another one called the Hieroglyphics project which is a little closer in. One of the older ones is, and more visible though most people don't even realize it, is GRUSP which was built early on, even before the Water Bank, in partnership with Salt River Project to recharge water. The project is looking; the District is looking at building one too in eastern Maricopa County. They have been many, they have been successful. I think we are learning as a state that recharge is a very valuable tool to have in this arsenal of weapons to fight drought and to fight to maintain our water, to fight to ensure we create a system of water supply that will last forever.

Q: Wasn't there some concern about possibly polluting the groundwater with CAP water?

A: Oh yes, and particularly in Tucson. That was a great debate. And in fact Tucson had a local election where they decided in essence they weren't going to use CAP water. Well, after a short period of time, they reversed that decision because it was based in large fact on a great deal of misinformation

and a lot of what I call scare tactics and frightening people. But clearly, Colorado River water is different than groundwater. It's different than Salt River water. It has different minerals, different solids, different turbidities, and it is an issue for water treatment. Tucson's solution, and it's one that meets their local political needs -- they take their water and they first put it into the ground. Then they bring it back up and treat it, as opposed to the Phoenix metropolitan area. We take our water right out of the CAP canal and treat it. Tucson politically decided that was something they couldn't do. So they have this system where they put it in take it out. In the future, who knows. Maybe they'll get to, as it's called, direct use, taking it right out of the canal. But right now, goes into the ground, comes back out.

Q: Seems like the groundwater recharge you described in the Agua Fria, using the actual riverbed, makes a lot of sense, doesn't that recreate the riparian area?

A: It does, and I think it's one of the hopes all of us had. It's still a little early. It's only up and running for probably four years maybe. But that riparian habitat brings with it, of course, some problems. You get grass and trees and things that might use the water more than you're trying to get it to go in the ground. So it's a bit of a tradeoff. But I think the impact has been overall very beneficial to that stretch of the river. Though we don't recharge seven days a week, 24 hours a day, the recharge occurs at certain times of the year, but even that intermittent flow is valuable to the creation and maintenance of a riparian habitat along the Agua Fria. I think hopefully in the future might be a model that could be used in New River, perhaps in Salt River. There's opportunities I think every place that I think need to be examined to see if in-stream recharge could be utilized.

Q: I know in Colorado there's a real movement to keep the year round flows. That hasn't been an issue in Arizona?

A: Well you see our flows, very few of our rivers are year round anyway. They're all really intermittent flows. You read the old books. Clearly the Agua Fria used to flow most of the time. Clearly the Gila flowed most of the time. The Salt flows almost all the time. But even before dams, you could read of times where the Gila would never make it to the Colorado during the years of an extended drought. Certainly the Agua Fria, New River, those are all intermittent flows. So I don't think that's been an issue for us in Arizona the way it has in Colorado or mountain states where they're used to the water flowing year round.

Q: Overall when you look at the issues that you've dealt with over Central Arizona Project, are there particular groups that you consider your allies?

A: That's a good question. 'Cause it implies there's some who aren't your allies who might...Well, clearly, you know, the age old antagonists, the cities versus the farmers, the cities and farmers versus the Indians, the state versus the federal government, those were real delineations of interests. Some of those have been mitigated, but they're still existing today. I think the allies in the water communities early on consisted of...the cities interests were clearly one area. And I think cities saw that mines and what was called, you know, non-municipal water, not that it was agriculture but it was used by mines, were more or less allies because the interests tend to converge rather than diverge. Early on, ag was clearly across the table, but as we've talked, I think in the nineties, everyone began to see we needed to be on the same side of the table. So they have become allies, I think. Agriculture and municipal interests have become allies, much I think as the environmental community was in days past not necessarily considered an ally by anyone. And I think the environmental community considered themselves as having no allies. But I think as the public's awareness of water issues and resource issues that have become prevalent about everything from global warming to the lack of water to drought; it's a higher recognizable issue on the common person's discussions, that the environmental community's interest in water is becoming

more aligned with municipal, agricultural, Indian use. I think a perfect example of that are the discussions that led the startup of the Yuma Desalting Plant. Recognition that, again, here is an issue and a potential problem that you can either continue to fight about it while the problem is never solved and an opportunity is missed or you can come together and recognize that we must solve this problem. It is too critical to be left unaddressed, and I think that was the first real recognition that...

Q: Back up a little and explain about the Yuma Desalting Plant.

A: Oh, sure. Well, there are others who could do it much better than I. The Yuma Desalter was the federal solution to a problem with supply of water to Mexico. Mexico has a claim on the Colorado River. It is recognized in treaty, goes back I believe to 1942. Somewhere in that very complicated treaty is an assurance that the water delivered to Mexico will be of a certain quality. The biggest quality issue is salt. Salt is an issue not so much for municipal use but salt for agricultural use is a real problem. Most of the Mexican Colorado River water is used in an area that is, has a lot of salt in the soil already. So when you add salty water to salty soil, you affect the crop yields. So Mexico was very concerned about this and the United States agreed in the treaty they would maintain a certain quality of water going to Mexico. Well, how do you do that? Well there were all sorts of solutions to come up with. One simple solution is you put fresh water, non-Colorado River water, into the river right before it goes to Mexico and that dilutes the amount of salt. That was one of the solutions, and that was kind of done. Another solution was we'll take some of the extra salty water because some of the irrigation on the U.S. side had what's called return flows to it. Water gets flood irrigation; it picks up salt, more salt, was returning to the Colorado, putting in even more salt than it had. One solution was we'll divert that. So we'll just intercept that water we'll direct it down into Mexico and we'll dump it in the Colorado River Delta right before it flows into the ocean. That was a temporary solution. In the midst of all of this

arose what was called the Yuma Desalting Plant, which was a desalting plant. It would take the salt out of the water and allow the water quality to be maintained. The plant was designed, the plant was built, it was accepted as the federal solution to this problem. It came on line in 1992, which just happened to be the year of a series of floods. It was the last, well I won't say the last, one of the more significant flood events in the last 50 years occurred in '92 on the Colorado. And filled up Lake Powell. I mean, if you remember, it was an extraordinary year on the Colorado. And it made the issue of water quality kind of mute because you had this excess water. To make a long story short, the federal government never fully operated the plant. As often happens with major problems, when you don't really need it, you focus your attention someplace else and it just sat there. Well, what that meant was over-deliveries of water to Mexico to make up for this water that was being diverted, this return flows that were going to be treated that were being diverted to Mexico. We were giving Mexico average every year over 100,000 acre feet of water, which is a lot of water. That's about seven or eight percent of our annual allocation that was being delivered to Mexico, more than they were entitled to. Well, when you've got a surplus on the river, nobody really paid attention, you didn't care. What happens when you don't have a surplus? Now we begin to pay attention. Several of us, and I think the Central Arizona Project kind of led this fight of trying to create recognition that there is a treaty obligation to be met. It is a federal responsibility to meet it. Meeting it by giving Mexico more water than they're entitled to during a time of drought is stupid. It makes no sense. And we began to stir the pot, and we stirred it vigorously and with little effect for the first couple of years. But we stirred it more, and the more we stirred it, we began to get a little more attention. The environmental community became involved because this diverted water goes down to an area that's called the Santa Clara Slough, the Cienega de Santa Clara in Mexico. It had become an area that was utilized by birds as a flyway. This water wound up in a kind of natural depression that had naturally some water

in it, but this had added a whole lot of water. The environmental community was loathe to even considering the prospect of reducing that bypass flow because it would then reduce this area and impact the bird population that used this. So you had a great deal of opposition to starting up the Yuma Desalting Plant because that would then stop this diversion. I think the long and the short of it was, we were able to I think create an environment, no pun intended, where you could discuss the realities that the existing situation was not the best solution, and recognition that we could, all of us, come up with a method to solve this issue in a better way than we were solving it now and maintain this environmental ecological area. We could maintain that. How this will happen...they are now test running the Yuma Desalting Plant. The whole purpose of this is to begin to see how we can do this. The solution was supported by most of the environmental community. There are some who don't support anything, of course. When it comes to, you know, birds and fishes are the only animals that deserve water, even before humans, in some peoples' mind. But the major environmental interests, I think, support what's happening now. I think those of us who were not perceived to be part of the environmental community recognize that the Santa Clara, the Cienega was something that needed to be preserved. It was going to have to be addressed and addressed in a way that would ensure that it could continue in a viable, long-term way while solving this issue of water quality to Mexico. So, like a lot of water issues, very complicated. It involves money, it involves politics. In this case it involves international issues, the State Department, the International Border Commission. It got tied up with the Rio Grande dispute between Mexico and the U.S. It was and continues to be a problem wrought with issues from all sides, but one that I'm proud to have been a very small part of this discussion to operate the Yuma Desalter.

Q: So it's in a testing phase now?

A: It's in a testing phase right now. It began in March and the last thing I've heard, and you can talk to people more up to it than I, but the last thing I was told so far it's operating successfully and doing what we think it can do, what it was designed to do. One of the opportunities that will be there is to provide water perhaps out of this treatment facility for other than agricultural use, perhaps municipal use. This is going to be high quality water, and perhaps too valuable to dump back in the river. Perhaps you can give some to Yuma. Perhaps you can give some to the communities in Mexico for actual domestic, potable use. So there's lots of opportunities in the future to deal with this issue in a way that will, I think sustain everyone's long-term interests.

Q: This is only a small part of the plant that they're testing.

A: About ten percent is my understanding. Ten to fifteen percent of its total capacity is what's being tested today.

Q: Now is it being operated by the Central Arizona Project?

A: No, it's operated by the federal government. That's a whole 'nother issue. We debated that. In fact there were some of us, myself included, you know the old adage if you want something done, do it yourself. And we considered that. But, once again, it is a federal responsibility. And it's just, as frustrating as it is to deal sometimes with the federal government, and to think well gosh we could do it, quicker, and easier and maybe even cheaper, we would still be assuming a responsibility that is not rightfully Arizona's to pay for. Hopefully, what will result out of this will be something that will provide, not only a long-term water supply, but very possibly a revenue stream with that water supply from the potential domestic use of this water that could ensure long-term funding of the facility.

Q: If the drought continues...

A: Becomes even more important. Absolutely, Pam. Absolutely.

Q: With a good desalting system, we could desalt it all.

A: Exactly, exactly.

Q: Another area of water agreements, you mentioned is Nevada, and I guess part of the Arizona Water Bank...Nevada agreement? (Transcriber could not hear the entire question.)

A: Yes. There's actually been a couple of agreements. Interstate water banking is something that Arizona recognized as an opportunity to assist in stabilizing the Lower Basin discussions about Colorado River use. The Lower Basin gets half of the Colorado River annual supply. So you have inherent conflicts. The Lower Basin fights with the Upper Basin. And then you have, it's like a family. You fight the neighbors but then you also fight your brothers and sisters. And in the Lower Basin, our brothers and sisters are California, Nevada. We already talked about California being the 300 pound gorilla. Nevada is, while they don't have the amount of water, either allocated, they only have 300,000 acre-feet is their share. They're not that great in population, they are a 300 pound gorilla when it comes to money. They have a lot of money. They have experienced tremendous growth, particularly in southern Nevada. They have, of late, had some significant national political influence, some say because of the money, some say other reasons. The reality is that they are a major player, probably more so than their 300,000 acre-feet would prescribe. The opportunity for mischief is very great when it comes to water policy, and Nevada always threatens to make great mischief on the river. And great mischief usually means litigation, and litigation usually means tying things up in the Supreme Court, potentially for decades, and that is not a good thing. So, Nevada needs more water. Arizona was in a situation where we were not using our full allocation directly and we had the opportunity to assist Nevada in bridging

some water needs they had. They are developing renewable supplies, as you've probably heard, they're developing, bringing water in from other areas in northern Nevada, they're developing some stream supplies, diverting some rivers, to meet their long-term needs. They had a shortfall of 10 to 20 years, where, until they could develop these other supplies, they could possibly have some shortfalls in their water budgets. Interstate water banking was seen as a way for them to help bridge this potential shortfall. They would pay to put water in Arizona. If they...need be, we would forego taking some of our water off the river, leave it for Nevada and we would take this water stored in Arizona and use it. That's an easy description of how this would work. It was and remains today wrought with political opposition, those who think it's a dumb idea, those who think it's the wrong thing to do, that it's selling out Arizona's water. I am one who happens to believe it was a good decision for Arizona. The benefits that have accrued to us thus far, and will continue to accrue, not just the financial benefits, but the alliances. We were able to solidify some alliances between Arizona and Nevada. And I think even has been recognized by California now that this partnership between Nevada and Arizona, while originally viewed as threatening by California, because if you have three people involved in an issue, anytime two get together, the odd man out automatically assumes you're conspiring to do something against them. I think even California has recognized now that this is a good thing to do because stability and long-term ability to forecast your water supplies is a valuable thing and it is extraordinarily helpful when it comes to resolving issues of drought on the Colorado River. And I believe, absent that interstate water banking agreement, we would not have had the ultimate basin states agreement on how to deal with the drought on the Colorado because these other issues would have disabled any discussions from reaching this major decision point. You would have still been arguing about the minor ones down here. So, very important.

Q: The division of the water that you referred to between the upper basin and the lower basin states all comes out of the 1922 Water Compact. There's been some discussion, particularly by Nevada, that they would like to re-open and renegotiate that compact. How do you feel about that?

A: Personally, I think those are empty threats. They are Nevada throwing their weight around, like they like to do. The risk to all parties, and I mean all parties, even the parties that were not a part of that, which is the environmental community who, in 1922 no one thought about the environment. You just assumed everything would always be okay, and so there were no real environmental considerations given. If you were today, in today's political, legal, financial environment to attempt to re-open something as complicated as that, it would be a nightmare and it would bring confusion to an issue that is just now beginning to have some certainty about it. I think it would be chaos, and I think Nevada recognizes that. I think they are just thumping the beehive to try to get some bees to buzz around and maybe they can rush in and steal some honey while everyone is preoccupied.

Q: It does look like, though, that Nevada wasn't at that meeting, and Arizona did pretty well.

A: We did alright, we did alright. I've not been a part of those discussions for the last six or nine months. My term ended in January. But what I understand hopefully will be agreed upon, the seven basin states alternative to the drought issues that are facing the Colorado River today, the basin, I think are extraordinarily beneficial to the State of Arizona. We have emerged again to be a very major policy participant in those discussions, as we should be.

Q: Our forefathers were very active in 1922.

A: Oh, yes, yes. Very much so.

Q: How did you see or do you see your role in finding solutions to the water problems that the Board dealt with?

A: Well, I think anybody that serves in an elected position, you have certain responsibilities, and different times bring different responsibilities and different issues. You are faced and I think you have the clear responsibility to try to solve those problems in a way that is beneficial too, not just the narrow interests of the Central Arizona Project, but in the broader interests of the State of Arizona, and by the State of Arizona I mean the broader interests of all of Arizona, whether it's the Native community, cities, the farmers, the developers, the environmental community. It's all part. One of the real recognitions that have occurred in problem solving in the public arena is acceptance of the reality. You may not like it. But acceptance of the reality. If it's to actually work, it has to be accepted by all the players. In my early career, you could steamroll one group or another. And it happened. And it still does today, probably, but much less so than it did say 25 years ago. And again, you can argue whether that's a good thing or a bad thing, but the reality is if you're to have a meaningful decision to a very challenging public issue like water supply or water quality, you have to come up with a solution that is supportable by everyone affected. Otherwise those who feel disaffected will continue to pick and pick and sue and cause problems that you will never be able to implement the solution you thought you had unless you get everybody to buy in.

Q: Is there any accomplishment related to CAP that you're proudest of?

A: Oh wow. I'm obviously proud of the whole 14 years that I served on the Board. I think the repayment is probably one that I'm very proud to have been a part in that. I really am thrilled that we were able to save the citizens of Arizona a half a billion dollars. That was a very wonderful thing to have been a part of. The Yuma Desalting discussions are another that I'm proud to have been a

part of that, and pushing that issue back to the forefront and having it considered as a viable part of dealing with drought on the river, of shortages on the Colorado, and I think that was a real deliberate thing we did in the Central Arizona Project. Proud to be a part of the recharge decisions that we made, recognizing that we needed to be more than a ditch company. We needed to be out there in the water resource arena as a participant advocating for things, not just advocating but in the case of recharge, actually doing something. It was a time of real activity, not that today isn't, but I will always feel very proud and really thankful to have been involved in some of those discussions and hopefully contributed just a little bit to the progress of providing a solid water supply for the State of Arizona.

Q: Looking back, is there anything that you would've done differently?

A: Sure. Personally I was one who fought bitterly in the repayment discussions for the inclusion of the Indian water rights. The federal government as I mentioned before early on was pushing, pushing, pushing. And I was one of those on the Board who pushed back and who said no. I think that, had I that to do over again, I probably would have recognized that the only way, as distasteful to me as it was, the only way you were going to get a solution to this issue was to at the same time solve this issue. Even though it was unfair, it was the only way you were gonna have it. So, I probably would have, that's one significant thing I know on my own that I would probably change.

Q: Serving on the Board is really a volunteer, it's elected, but it's really a volunteer.

A: It's kind of a unique position in Arizona. As I say, when it was first created as a Board, I don't think the legislature gave a whole lot of thought what the Board of Directors of the Central Arizona Project would do or would be. It was created really legally to have a body that would contract with the federal government to construct and then repay our debt to the federal government.

We were given certain authority, most of which is to collect a property tax, to set and collect a property tax within certain limits, use that property tax to help repay the federal government. That was the real reason for the creation. Constitutionally the way property taxes are set, you needed to have a special district to do that, so that's what we are. I think at the time of its creation in its early years, it really wasn't thought of as much more than a very single purpose governmental entity. As water policy in Arizona has developed, I think the Central Arizona Project has evolved to be far more than a very narrow special purpose district. It has evolved to be a participant in the broad water policy discussions that affect Arizona. That with it then brings a greater responsibility to the Board, and to the management and employees of the CAP. It brings greater public attention, greater public focus. There are some who have argued that it should change and perhaps be a paid position, others who say no it shouldn't. I think the reality is that what is happening today has been a valuable evolution in the CAP's responsibilities and roles, and I think a credit to present and past Board members who have recognized that evolving responsibility and risen to accept those challenges.

Q: It does seem like this last election brought a major change. In the past it had been, like you said it was a lot of retired governors and congressmen...not really a contested election.

A: Probably the last ten or twelve years, I think what changed is that recognition on many people's part that there was more there, more responsibility, more opportunity than there had been 25 years ago. Water policy was becoming a critical part of Arizona's future, even more than it had been in the past, if that's possible. You live in a desert, water is always a critical part of your future. I think that the opportunity for Central Arizona Project has become greater to play a significant role in those discussions. Regrettably, the manner in which the elections to the CAP Board occur place it on very lengthy ballots. Most people have very little knowledge of the Central Arizona Project. The average voter

doesn't know what it is, doesn't know really who they're electing or why because it's a non-paid position. You're not going to spend money to run for election, to make advertisements, or mail contact, or anything else that a candidate does to run for office. Placement on the ballot by statute, you kind of come at the end of the ballot after you vote for everything else. I'm not a political scientist but I think that it translates into very unpredictable elections for Boards such as the Central Arizona Project. Different from a school Board where locally you have some real interest in a school Board election. In something as large as the CAP, we run county-wide. There are ten people from Maricopa County that serve on the Board. I would be astounded if you stopped a hundred people at the shopping center, I would be astounded if one of them could name one of those ten people. I guess I would say it's regrettable, others would say it's just a fact of life. That's just the way it is. Certainly in the short-term, it's not going to change. From a political science standpoint, you could argue that there could be a better way to determine governance of something as important as the Central Arizona Project. You could argue that like angels on the head of a pin. The reality is you're not going to change the constitution. It is what it is. And so this unpredictability that exists for Board elections is simply going to continue. You just have to have faith that people who are elected into the position at the end of the day will do the right thing for the right reasons, and that water will continue to be recognized as an absolutely critical part of Arizona, critical part of our future, and the decisions that are made by the Central Arizona Project Board of Directors are a very, very important part of that future.

Q: What do you see as the most critical issues that they're dealing with right now?

A: The critical issues when I left the Board, certainly this drought initiative that hopefully will be approved by the Secretary of the Interior and accept the agreement that was obtained through the seven basin states. I think that will bring some real certainty to the potential impacts of drought on the river. I

think an issue before the Board that they need to grapple with is what some define as the next bucket of water and where that next bucket will come from. Recognition that, even though we're not using our full supply today, soon in terms of water, we will in the next 30 or 40 years and we need to be looking out beyond that, beyond the year 2050. We need to begin looking for "another" Central Arizona Project. Whether that might be the Gulf of Mexico, the Pacific Ocean, some other supply. That's what we need to begin today to think about, just as people in the twenties began to think about water for Arizona, though no one could predict where we would be today. We need to pass to our descendants, those who will come after us, the same gifts that we were given by those who preceded us.

Q: Almost out of tape. I still have a couple questions. Okay. This is tape three with George Renner. What has been the greatest surprise for you regarding the CAP and Arizona?

A: I suppose from the time I first began, surprised as to how complicated water policy is; how many issues that influence what we're trying to do are outside of our control. It's a very frustrating process at times because you are impacted upon by other factors, whether they're other states, whether they're other political interests, whether they're other financial interests, that you have absolutely no control over them. And not even an opportunity to participate in the development of their position. Nonetheless, that position affects you. We mentioned allies earlier. It's kind of a shifting, constantly shifting situation where you never know for sure what issues there might be, you never are fully confident that you've got agreement on anything because, by its very nature, it's a dynamic process that involves, in the case of the Colorado River, involves seven states. Each state has its own internal issues from, the full spectrum, from environmental to political to financial to growth to non-growth, you name it. Each state has its own deal. They then bring all of those to the table. Within the seven states then you've got the lower basin versus the upper basin, you've

always got the federal government on the outside, you have the Indian communities, you have now the environmental communities, you have questions of water quality, you have question of endangered species, you have habitat issues. And just when you think you've got a handle on something, something is inserted that you knew was lurking out there but you never thought of it before. We didn't even touch on the endangered species act and the solution that, the multi-species conservation plan that was agreed upon by the Lower Basin as a way to mitigate the claims against endangered species, not the claims against, the threats against endangered species. And the law requires certain mitigation to occur. And after a long, long debate, that agreement was reached between the parties that would be accepted as a solution by the government and to eliminate the possibility of threat or closure of the Colorado due to the endangered species act. That could be the source of a whole 'nother tape, but those are surprises I guess that you run into. You knew that issue was out there but you had no idea as to its complexity, or the impact or frankly the importance that it would have. Not just in and of itself, but as it ripples through everything else that you're doing.

Q: You say it's also international.

A: Absolutely, absolutely.

Q: Did the growth surprise you? Did you expect to see this kind of growth?

A: No. I would have to say in all honesty, what has happened in my city, in my state, during my lifetime, certainly is greater than anything I would have anticipated, than I did anticipate. I recall going to different meetings with people who claimed to be future forecasters and gurus about the future, and you would be, by the year 2000, you'd go to these meetings in the seventies, and by the year 2000, we'd all be, if we were driving cars, they'd be electric cars but we'd probably be flying around and we'd be doing this and we'd be

doing that. They would talk about millions of people. I don't think any of us, I know I can't speak for more than myself, but I recall in discussing with my peers, no one anticipated what has happened today. Probably you might have found, I might have been able to be persuaded that yeah, there might be five million people in this valley someday, someday. But never in my wildest dreams dream that might happen by the year 2010. If you'd have asked me in 1975 you know, when I kind of first became involved in politics, how big do you think the City of Glendale would be someday, I might've said in well, maybe someday there might be 150,000 people. Blew past 150,000 ten years ago. The surprise I think, to me in growth, is that it's just happened as quickly as it has. But in spite of that, rapid points we've hit going up the graph, we've dealt with all of the problems that come with that growth. We've dealt with it extraordinarily well. I think we as a state, we as a community, we as an area of interest don't spend enough time patting ourselves on the back for the manner in which we have dealt with the unbelievable challenges that come with having this many people live in a desert and live here in the relative comfort and security that we do, without giving a thought to watering our lawn or washing our car or flushing the toilet. We just assume it's there. And it is there, and that reality is there because of the work of countless number of people generations ago who had the foresight and the wisdom and the courage to press water solutions and hopefully going into the future I think as I mentioned before, those of us who have been involved and those who will be involved will see the responsibility to continue to provide the same opportunities and gifts that those before us provided for us. We have to work to provide those same things for the people that come after us.

Q: What about the challenge of the drought that we're in right now. Was that a surprise?

A: Well, yes and no. I mean the drought has been on the horizon now for, shoot, probably depending upon which experts you talk to...You can talk to people

who say we're in the fourth year, the sixth year, some say literally we're in the eighth year of the drought. What has surprised me I think as I learn more is the potential for a long drought period, mega drought as they call it. I can't say believe, I am persuaded by the facts I've seen that we may well be in one of those mega drought periods on the Colorado. This having nothing to do with the issue of global warming. Five years ago, before global warming became an area of some discussion, you had hydrologists and people down at the U of A and other climatologists saying that, looking at tree rings, looking at runoff charts, Colorado has roughly a 100-year chart on it, we were coming into a period that has all of the potential to be a very long and extended drought. Looking back as they develop this data, 500 years, a thousand years, and they attempt to overlay these tree ring studies and calibrate all of this stuff, it's frightening to think that we could be not yet in the middle of a 20 to 25 year drought cycle. I'm persuaded to believe that is a real possibility. And I think it is remarkable that we find ourselves capable of dealing with such an historic climatological event. If you just think about it, there have been some recent articles trying to liken, and almost in a fear mongering way, you know, the Hohokams had to leave. Well, you know, gosh we're all going to have to pick up and leave. Well...

Q: It mentions the Anasazis...

A: I think that, thanks to the foresight of those who came before us on the political side, the financial side, the developmental side, the environmental side, all of the things that have happened that enable us through alternative supplies, through dams, through groundwater, Colorado River Water, we are in a position today, in this valley, in this state, to deal with a potential thousand-year drought cycle. I'm confident we're going to be here. At the end of this drought cycle, we're going to be here. We're not leaving like the Hohokams did, like the Anasazi. We're staying. And the reason we will be able to stay is because of the foresight and hard work that has gone before us that has

brought us to this point today, and hopefully we will be here because of the right decisions made for the right reasons by those who will follow. I have the utmost confidence that as a state, we will continue to deal with our water challenges in a way that will ensure that there won't be any articles written about us 500 years from now saying that they left because they ran out of water. We won't leave. We'll be here.

Q: We have technology...

A: We have technology, we've got, I think we have more innovation. We've got the wherewithal to ensure that we will wisely use and protect our water supplies in a way that the Hohokam, the Anasazi, simply lacked the ability to secure, to safeguard, to store, to recharge, to conserve. They lacked the innovation and the abilities to do then what we can do now.

Q: Some people are saying that maybe in 1922 when they estimated the flow of the Colorado to divide it up, they were way off.

A: Oh, I think history, everything I've read clearly states that they, at the time, thought they were using the best data they had. Well, as it turned out, they were using the best data, but it was data from an extraordinarily wet period on the Colorado. You can turn that argument around. What if they would have made the decision when it was a dry year on the Colorado? You would have had then historically way more water than that agreement would have allowed for or would have anticipated. Therefore you would have imposed on that agreement a whole different set of issues. Not what do we do when there isn't enough water. What do we do now that we have extra water? So you know, you can turn that ball to me any way you want to turn it. The time frame in which those decisions were made were made with the best data that you thought was available, just as we're doing today. We're making decisions based on what we think we know. There's no question 50 years from now

somebody will look back and say, "Man, those idiots, look what they did." But they will know things 50 years from now that we don't know today. They may know a way to magically get salt out of water with little need for power, or with little waste involved to somehow have something that, at the atomic level somehow, you can do something and the bonding between salts breaks down and it just disappears, and it's not an issue anymore. Well, that would be a wonderful thing to happen. But if we knew that...you know. We have no understanding that such a thing might happen today. You're always going to be able to look backwards and impose your knowledge backwards and criticize decisions made when, in fact, they were doing the best they could just like we're doing the best we can.

Q: Somebody ought to be working on that since they say that the sea level is rising. If we could pump the water out of the ocean and de-salt it, we could solve that problem.

A: Exactly, that's right, that's right.

Q: What advice do you have for the people operating the CAP today, particularly the new Board members?

A: I think that anybody that deals in the water policy arena in Arizona, I firmly believe you have to have a passion about water and it's not something that you can necessarily learn. Knowledge helps, but I'm convinced that, to be successful in dealing with water issues in Arizona, and by successful I mean to become educated and knowledgeable, and simply sit around for enough meetings and participate long enough. In order to do that, you have to have a passion for water itself, for water in the desert. If you don't, then those meetings will become boring, the stuff you have to read will become mind-numbing, the issues will just become just forbidding in their complexity, and you will not be a real contributor to the debate. And so I would encourage

anybody, whether they're a CAP Board member or anyone who is considering joining water policy as an active participant, you really have to ask yourself if you have a passion for the game. Because, if you don't, then perhaps your talents and abilities and time are better utilized elsewhere. I think secondly, after the passion, you really have to understand that it is a complex arena in which to participate and the complexities are constantly changing. You never will know all there is to know. You will always be learning something. There will always be surprises. It is a fascinating area and public issue to have been involved with. As I said earlier, I am just deeply grateful that I was, by my life's experiences wound up with the opportunity to participate in the discussions, the debates and the issues for water in Arizona.

Q: Do you consider yourself a water buffalo?

A: I've been called a water buffalo. I've been called worse. I guess by the definitions I use, I probably now am a water buffalo. I used to laugh and point at those old men and call them buffaloes. And I guess as the saying goes, I am one now. You hang around long enough and you become one.

Q: How did that term ever come to be used?

A: You know, I first heard it in the seventies, and it was not a derogatory term. It was always kind of a complimentary term. But it carried with it, I guess, a conservative, old Orme Dam kind of water attitude that you were set in your beliefs and that, by God, this is the way it's going to be and this is our water and on and on, and that was it, and there could be no challenge to it. I guess at some point someone thought a buffalo, specifically a water buffalo, was a descriptive personality that you could attribute this kind of an attitude to, and that's where it came from. It's been around a long time.

Q: Up in Colorado they actually give an award.

A: We've done that on occasion here too. We've done that.

Q: It's an honor. You mentioned that people don't understand about water. Do you think we should be doing more or could we be doing more to educate?

A: I do. I do, and I think that as an organization the Central Arizona Project has tried. I think others are trying continually, to provide understandable information to people who know nothing about water, and I think that is a laudable effort, and I think it's a very necessary effort. It's such a common sense fact that this is a desert, and it is a common sense fact that water is scarce and therefore what we do in our daily lives in a desert, the use of water is important to us. So, whether it's conservation or utilization, looking at ways to be smarter about water, ways to not only conserve it but to make sure that we have an eye on the future, those are attitudes that I think it's very important those who are involved in the development of water policy to try to communicate to the public at large. It's difficult because, as an average person, we're all deluged with information in this day and age. There are so many issues that cry for our attention, and it's very hard to get people to pay attention to public issues like water. I think we have better education today, I think there are programs underway, sponsored by not just the CAP, the cities, SRP, lots and lots of people, groups, organizations are providing information to elementary schools, high schools, college, that I believe will make a better water educated public 25 years from now than we have today. That's a hope I have anyway.

Q: I think I've covered most of the questions I had. Was there anything you wanted to talk about that I didn't ask you about?

A: Oh gosh, you've done a great job, Pam. No, I don't think so. It's an issue that I am, again, really blessed to have been a part of. I think that what you're doing, CAP is doing in trying to record for, not record on tape, but record for

the record, for history, for posterity, is really important. I know in some of the issues I was involved in, I would love to have been able to have more information available about the discussions that led to some of the decisions 40, 50, 60 years ago. Whether it was the Colorado River Compact, whether it was the CAP legislation. Not that you would think you could develop a better solution than they did, but just to more properly understand the context within which those decisions were made, so that hopefully you might be able then to better understand the context you're in today to make the decisions you have to make. So I applaud this effort that the CAP's funding, I'm delighted they've got people as qualified as you and Manny to do it, and I look forward to seeing the finished, I know it will be an ongoing effort, it's never finished, but to see the product that you've developed today. I think it's a wonderful effort.

Q: One other question that I always like to ask people that I do these interviews with, is looking back over your life, what advice do you give young people trying to decide what they want to do with their life and choose a career?

A: I've talked to my own children about that. Well, it always sounds trite, I'm certainly not the only person to ever say it, but first and foremost you have to like what you do. If you don't enjoy, and I mean really enjoy, what you do then you're not going to want to get up in the morning. Life is way too short to not really like what you do. That's not to say that you have to live 100% of your life for your job or your occupation, or your pastime. But I just think everything that makes up your life, your occupation is clearly part of it, your family's part of it, your avocation, your outside interests, your hobbies, all of that go in to give you the reason to wake up in the morning. If you're not happy with what you're doing, then you need to change it. You need to find something else that makes you happy. Otherwise, you will, I believe, be a very unhappy and miserable person to yourself and to all of those around you. So enjoy. Find something that brings you not just satisfaction, but happiness. Then the only other I guess, advice I like to give my kids is to just to pay attention. There's so

much going on around you and so much in life to be aware of and to learn about, that if you just kind of open your eyes and pay attention it's just a marvelous, marvelous place we are right now in this time, in this world, in this state, in this city. I'm excited about where we are and if you just look around and pay attention to what's going on, you can't help but be enthusiastic and if you then pay attention, then you have the opportunity I believe to contribute. It kind of follows each other. If you don't pay attention, you don't know what's going on, you can't really contribute to finding solution to what the issues may be.

Q: It's like so much of what you've done in your life has been what you would call public service.

A: It's what it used to be called. I don't know what they call it today.

Q: Did you pass that on to your children?

A: I hope so. Two of them are in education, they're teaching, which is, I believe, very laudable public service. I hope all of our children pay attention to what's going on. If not, none of us can pay attention to everything but at least to those areas that make you happy. If you are involved, whether you're involved by going to meetings, or you're involved by simply following the issues, understanding what's going on, being able to, if called upon to participate, that's the kind of attitude I hope to have passed on to my children.

Q: Okay.

A: Thanks! Sure.

--- End of Interview ---