ALBUQUERQUE BERNALILLO COUNTY
WATER UTILITY AUTHORITY
WEDNESDAY, March 21, 2012, 5:10 P.M.

ALBUQUERQUE/BERNALILLO COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER
ONE CIVIC PLAZA, NW
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO 87102

Before: Kelli Gallegos
PAUL BACA PROFESSIONAL COURT REPORTERS
500 Fourth Street, NW, Suite 105
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

A P P E A R A N C E S

COUNCILLOR KEN SANCHEZ, Chair

COMMISSIONER WAYNE JOHNSON, Vice Chair

COMMISSIONER ART DE LA CRUZ, Member

COUNCILLOR TRUDY E. JONES, Member (Excused)

COMMISSIONER MAGGIE HART STEBBINS, Member (Excused)

MAYOR RICHARD J. BERRY (Excused)

COUNCILLOR REY GARDUNO, Member

TRUSTEE PABLO RAEL, Ex-Officio Member

MARK SANCHEZ, Executive Director

ROB PERRY, Administrative Officer, Alternate Member

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: I will call this March 21st, 2012, meeting of the Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility to order. Let the record reflect that Commissioner Hart Stebbins and Councillor Jones are excused and all other members are present this evening.

The next item on the agenda will be a silent invocation, and that will be followed by the Pledge of Allegiance, which will be led by Councillor Garduno.

(Whereupon, there was a moment of silence.)

(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was led by Councillor Rey Garduno.)

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you, Councillor Garduno.

The next item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes. I make a motion to approve the February 22nd, 2012, minutes. We have a motion by Commissioner De La Cruz, and a second.

Any questions? Seeing none, all those in favor, please signify by saying yes.

ALL MEMBERS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Opposed, no.

That carries unanimously.

(5-0 vote. Agenda Item 3 approved.)

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Next item, proclamations and

awards, but before we go through the agenda, I want to acknowledge our community achievement, a very important milestone in conservation. As announced at a media news conference last week, we have reached a usage goal of 150 gallons per person per day, years ahead of schedule.

There have been put in our water bank, I believe it's close to two billion gallons of water for all the water conservation efforts by residents of Albuquerque and residents of Bernalillo County. I think it's a great achievement. Now, I know we need to look at lowering that goal to maybe 140 gallons per individual per day.

It stills sounds like a lot of water use when you talk 150 gallons per day per individual, but that's a milestone and a great accomplishment, and, again, thank you to the residents of this community.

And we will have a detailed update later on the agenda. However, I just wanted to thank our community. And we have a -- we have cupcakes here, celebratory cakes for the public that are in attendance today. So enjoy your cake as you sit through this meeting.

Next item on the agenda is public comments.

Ms. Jenkins, how many members of the public

do we have signed up to speak this evening?

MS. JENKINS: Seven.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: They will be given two minutes to speak, with a warning bell at one and a half minutes.

Ms. Jenkins, you will you please call the first speaker. And once your name has been called, we'll call two or three names at one time, would you please come to the front, we have seating available, and be prepared to speak. Thank you.

MS. JENKINS: Dave McCoy, followed by Henry Messerville.

MR. MCCOY: Chairman Sanchez, Board Members, good evening all. My name is Dave McCoy, I'm the executive director for Citizen Action New Mexico, and a Water Utility ratepayer. I've furnished you with a folder presentation.

And Citizen Action requests basically that the Water Utility coordinate state and federal efforts to bring about an effective and scientific plan to clean up the Air Force's eight million gallon jet fuel spill in our drinking water aquifer.

This has not been a main agenda item since October 2011, and it should be monthly, along with status reports. There needs to be WUA action planning

to minimize the upcoming possible Albuquerque well losses. The Air Force is not displaying a sense of urgency for this emergency. The Air Force has ignored the New Mexico Environment Department's orders on four occasions to produce an interim measures work plan for full remediation of the jet fuel plume within five years.

The Air Force has not removed a single gallon of jet fuel from the groundwater in two years. No soil vapor was extracted for the past seven months. Colonel Conway stated at his March 13, 2012, public meeting that the Air Force has no plans to remediate the dissolved plume other than to shut down the well. The Ridgecrest wells supplies up to 30 percent of Albuquerque's potable groundwater. Is this the best the Air Force can do?

Rather than wait for the shutdown of municipal or private and lawsuits from residents, the authority should demand that the Air Force pay for an independent WUA advisor to review the present plan, pay for design costs, construction of a water treatment plant for the Veterans Administration, and replacement of Ridgecrest wells, relocation of them.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Councillor Garduno.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Mr. McCoy, I had an

opportunity to look at some of the material you handed out to the board members, and you're right, there hasn't been a Kirtland report for quite a while.

Also, I was looking through the material, and it's not numbered, but the third page of your handout, that's the page, and I'm confused because I don't know, these are -- are these monitoring wells -- what are the dots.

MR. MCCOY: Okay. As you look at the star on the sheet, and then you look over to the right from the star, that's the Ridgecrest well field. There's five wells there, and then Charles and Love and Thomas and Ponderosa, and several others.

Now, when the -- if the plume of contamination reaches the Ridgecrest well field, it's also going to ping-pong into those other well fields as well. And that reps about 44 municipal production wells. So you're not faced with just maybe a possible single loss of a single Ridgecrest well. You're looking at potential contamination of the major portion of Albuquerque's municipal wells here. So that's what that is.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Thanks for that, because I didn't know what the dots meant. I assumed they were well -- or at least wellheads.

Another question I had, and this is really for my edification, but maybe other people would be interested, too, I've attended almost every Kirtland Air Force Base presentation on the fuel spill, and it's always been sort of a -- what they call a jellybean form. And, again, on your fifth -- Mr. Chair, if I may ask this -- on the fifth page that you handed out, the back, there's -- I don't know what you'd call that. The shape is much larger than the jellybean that they had, and it extends eastward. What does that mean?

MR. MCCOY: Well, I spoke to a remediation expert about that, and he said what that indicates is when it has gone from the jellybean shape to this kind of shape that it's becoming within the -- you know, like the radius of influence of those Ridgecrest wells, and you're getting this hydraulic movement of that plume of contamination towards there.

So the indication here is that there may not be decades, as some people would like to argue, to wait to remediate this problem. This indicates an accelerating movement of that plume towards the Ridgecrest well field.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Thank you. And the reason I ask, Mr. Chair, and I think it's important that we

do ask Kirtland to, you know, come here more formally and more often to present their position as to what they're doing about this, and I go to every neighborhood association meeting, and this is one of the topics at Elder Homestead, at Siesta Hills, and every one of those neighborhood associations in that area, and I'm hard pressed sometimes to answer the questions they have.

So I would appreciate it if Kirtland Air Force Base were more forthcoming with that information. So I don't know if we can just do this as part -- kind of a pro forma part of the agenda or how we can do that so that reports can be generated.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Okay. We have several other speakers. Our next speaker.

MS. JENKINS: Henry Messerville, followed by Jim McKay.

MR. MESSERVILLE: My name is Henry Messerville. I'm an environmental activist from the East Coast, Boston particularly. I've decided to come here for several reasons. One of them is to work with community people who are interested in the issue of the jet fuel spill.

First of all, there are eight million gallons of jet fuel sitting on our aquifer and moving

towards the Ridgecrest wells, as Mr. McCoy had indicated, and other municipal wells.

Kirtland Air Force Base has acknowledged that all the monitoring wells are contaminated by EDB, a carcinogen with no acceptable limits threatening our water supply.

According to the testimony, I've attended several of the Kirtland Air Force Base meetings, and according to the testimony last week, Colonel Connelly says the Air Force does not have a current plan in place to start remediation. After repeatedly questioning him, he admitted that.

Also, the Air Force is not moving forward with removing the jet fuel. At the March 12th meeting, he was pressured, and, as I said, he did not offer a backup plan. There was no backup plan in place in the event that the wells are contaminated.

The contractor hired by Kirtland Air Force Base, Shaw Environmental, is using a less sensitive method of detection than the previous contractor, so that the plume that Mr. McCoy just showed you is not the plume -- is not the area of the plume -- the area of contamination that Kirtland had shown us last week.

Kirtland Air Force Base was given notice about the jet fuel spill in 1997 by hydrologist Dennis

McQuillen, and they did not alert the public until 2003. James Bearzi, who was the director of the hazardous waste and in charge of making sure that they did interim compliance, was reassigned by the governor, and that was a political move.

We have no representation, and this is why we are asking that the Water Utility's commission come on board and become one of the stakeholders and represent the people of Albuquerque, because this is a tragedy waiting to happen.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you. Your time is up.

MS. JENKINS: Jim McKay, followed by Joe Wechsler.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Mr. McKay, welcome.

MR. MCCOY: Hi. Jim McKay. I've lived here about seven years.

This is the largest spill in the history of the United States that's affected a water supply for population literally. That is a fact. By the complexity of the problem to be solved, it's not being addressed, the volume of water affected and how dependent the population is here on that water. We've been in drought for at least seven years, depending on who you talk to. The federal climate people tell us it's going to get worse. We are not going to be

getting more rain. That aquifer is it for Albuquerque. That's it.

I wanted to say a couple things to you, Mr. Garduno. I was going to say other things. But in answer to the questions that you ask, a couple things. That I'm aware, there have been 32, at least, toxic spills in the United States on military bases. There has not been one single successful cleanup, not one. These things go on for 20, 30, 40 years. They all have the same chronology. And it's not to make the military wrong, but they just aren't good at this. It's not what they're here to do.

One day passes, a few drops, the next day, a few drops, a week, a month, a year later, it starts seeping down, nobody's noticed. Nobody's noticed. The reason I'm saying this to you now, Mr. Garduno, is you ask questions that need to be answered. And they need to be answered with evidence, convincing evidence that's persuasive as to what's going on here. It's not happening now. People are grossly misinformed as to the severity of this problem, much less what it's going to take to clean it up.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you, Mr. McKay.

Next speaker.

MS. JENKINS: Joe Wechsler, followed by Marsha

Ogilvie.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Welcome.

MR. WECHSLER: Good evening. My name is Joe Wechsler. I'm a civil engineer licensed in New Mexico, which I say every time I come up here. You guys got plenty of problems, and I just want to tell you that there's -- the problem with the pumping into the aquifer, the storage in the aquifer, was just coming up, and the economics of it has not been fully examined, as far as I know.

I'm trying to do my own research and my own thinking and coming up with a cost of the actual amounts of water, averaging between 2500 and 5,000 acre feet a year to be dumped into the aquifer and then pumped out later when we need it. How much is that going to cost us as opposed to keeping it stored in Abiquiu? To do that, we have to know a lot of information about Abiquiu, the water surface area, the evaporation per year, which I believe is 60 inches at that latitude and altitude. And this will be a forthcoming study that I'm making with others, coordinating with others.

It's a big operation and it has to be thought about very carefully before we start putting water into that aquifer, aside from the cost. And

that's all I want to say.

Also, there's a movie playing at the Kimo tonight, The Texas Rangers, filmed in New Mexico in 1937, and it's actually showing -- it was filmed up near Abiquiu, believe it or not. And some people you'll remember from the old days.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Mr. Wechsler, thank you.

MR. WECHSLER: Okay.

MS. JENKINS: Marsha Ogilvie, followed by Elaine Hebbard.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Welcome, Marsha.

MS. OGILVIE: Thank you. My name is Marsha Ogilvie, and I'm a biological anthropologist here in New Mexico. And I'm here today to ask the Water Utility Authority to be my advocate for clean water. I'm concerned about the legacy we're leaving for future generations and I'm thinking that we need a Water Utility plant and that the Air Force should pay for it, because clean water is necessary for our survival. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you for coming down.

MS. JENKINS: Elaine Hebbard, followed by Geraldine Amato.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Welcome back, Elaine.

MS. HEBBARD: Hi. Thanks. My name is Elaine

Hebbard, and I'm an advocate for, I hope, better water sanity. First of all, happy World Water Day. Today is World Water Day, and the theme is water and food security. And congratulations to the Water Utility for achieving the less than 150 gallons per capita per day, but with only two minutes, that's all I'm going to say.

Currently, the customers are facing huge and ever-widening gaps in infrastructure needs, as we've seen by the asset management plan, steeply increased debt obligations and a deficit between expenses and revenues. At the same time, revenue may decline because of conservation, and surface water supplies may also decline due to climate change.

So rather than dwell on what I might say with respect to Mr. Stomp's presentation on the water resources management strategies, to be given at a later date, time, or once again trying to convince the board to not do away with the current drought management strategy protections of the aquifer, I'd like to use my limited time to urge the board to do two things.

One, to refocus attention on non-revenue water. It's currently about 13 percent, according to the GCPD calculator that I was just reviewing of the

water produced. To give you some perspective, the amount that we're putting into the aquifer or proposing through the drought aquifer storage and recovery is .02 percent.

The other point is that I'd like to invite the board to join with me in creating a series of community conversations throughout the service area to discuss rates, revenue, use of the aquifer and all these other good things that I think we need to be discussing. I have covered this with a lot of other folks as well and so I'd like to ask you to join with me to create those. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you, ma'am.

MS. JENKINS: Geraldine Amato.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Councillor Garduno.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Ms. Amato, if you don't mind, I just wanted to ask, on the community conversations, you're envisioning what, that the Water Authority would be the lead or the host or the --

MS. OGILVIE: I was thinking that there would be actually a group. I contacted Bruce Thompson from the water resources program, and he thought that UNM and the water resources program could also join with the water assembly, the Utton Center.

I just thought of it this morning, sorry, so

I've only contacted about five or six groups. All of them thought that it would be a very good conversation for us to try to have a steering committee.

I'm envisioning getting together the week of April 16th and planning for the series of the five. And I'm thinking that each one would be scattered throughout the region so that it would be in various parts of each one of your districts, but it would actually discuss different topics, with the focus on how can we be more resillient fiscally and physically.

And by the way, it does fulfill Policy M of the water resource management strategy, which talks about an informed public contributes to the successful implementation of water resource management solutions. And it is the public that defines the values of the region upon which the policies are based.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you, ma'am.

Ms. Amato.

MS. AMATO: Unfortunately the public is not in charge of how the resources of this nation are distributed. And we also know that this body is a subsidiary to the higher levels, so-called, of the federal levels. So this body has no authority to order the Air Force base to clean up anything. And then you have Sandia Labs, as well, with an unlined

dump that's not being addressed either.

If the good people were in charge, as soon as that plume was noticed, there would be immediate action to remove whatever could be removed, whatever technology was available in the present time.

You see what is happening? This has gone on for years. They're going to hire some contractors to do some more tests, but as far as addressing the issue, that is not happening. Same thing with the dump at Sandia Lab.

As a lower level, the other dichotomies that happen around here, residents are told to water only three times a week, for example, to conserve water. So if you wanted to keep a garden, you couldn't do so on three times a week in this climate, especially during the drought.

Car washes go full force. I don't see a dirty government car anywhere in town at any time. So they must be ordered to take their cars to the car wash on a regular basis. There's other ways of keeping your cars from looking too tacky. I haven't washed my car with water for years and it makes it an acceptable showing and it's not filthy.

Intel and golf courses waste water considerably and also pollute the water. And yet,

people are told with septic tanks in the county, that their septic tanks are a threat to the water, and yet all these other things are going on premeditatedly and deliberately polluting the underground water, as well as the river water.

And it's no wonder that there are more outbreaks of toxic diseases from eating vegetables when you have a sewage plant that needs a great deal of upkeep. And if you throw raw sewage into the river and somebody else irrigates with it downwind, downstream there --

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you, Ms. Amato. Your time is up.

MS. AMATO: Yeah, your time is -- you're so interested in what the public has to say.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you.

MS. AMATO: The most interesting part of these meeting is the public comments here today.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you.

Next item on the agenda is announcements and communications. The next scheduled meeting is April the 18th, 2012, at 5:00 p.m. in the Vincent E. Griego Chambers.

The next item is Item Number 7, introductions, the first reading of legislation.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Mr. Chair, if I could. I rarely correct anyone in public comment, but I wanted to say Elaine Hebbard said March 21st. Actually, it's March 22nd. March 22nd is World Water Day, and it was begun or the first observation was 1993.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you for that correction, Councillor Garduno.

We are back on introductions. WUA R-12-7. And Katherine Yuhas will make that introduction.

MS. YUHAS: Thank you. Mr. Chair, Members of the Board, this is the first reading of the drought management strategy update. I have just a few things to go through for you since there are changes from the previous strategy.

The reason for the update is -- there are several reasons for it, and the first is that the drought management strategy that's currently in place was adopted in 2003, when the utility was a part of the city. So many of the water usage reduction methods that are in the strategy are powers that lie with the city rather than with the authority. And so it seemed appropriate to update those water usage reduction methods to be things that could be enacted by the Water Authority board.

Second, the drought management strategy

calls for updates every five years, so it's time to do that. The new water resources management strategy was adopted in 2007, and Policies C and D of that strategy call for a drought management strategy, and this one addresses that.

And finally, we've had two droughts since the first strategy was adopted in 2003, the droughts of 2006 and 2011. And we've learned a lot from both of those droughts, and those lessons have informed the update.

The customer advisory committee helped us extremely in drafting this update. We met with them in December of 2011 really for a brainstorming session, where they helped us come up with what the criteria would be for defining drought, how we would enter it, and we've met with them again in February of 2011, when we have really drafted the strategy, and they went through it with us and worked through some of the kinks and it's been updated again with their input. We also issued a press release on this. It's on our website, and, of course, it was available with the agenda.

This drought stage criteria chart is really the crux of the update, and so understanding how the changes were made to this is important to

understanding the whole strategy. The previous strategy only had one criteria for declaring drought, and we've updated that. Now it's a dual criteria. And once again, I want to recognize our customer advisory committee. They're the ones who helped us develop this chart. It was at their February meeting that we got out the pens and the white board and really put this together in the way it looks right how.

Across the top is the criteria for groundwater pumping. And down the side is the criteria for our GCPD goal. Both of these criteria will be measured in order to enter into the two drought stages. When more than 50 percent of Bernalillo County is in severe drought, we will be making monthly updates to the board on both of these criteria so that you will know where we are and we can be taking the appropriate measures.

The first stage in drought is a drought advisory. Those are the green boxes. The green boxes, the drought advisory is just what it sounds like. We just increase public education. We're just out there with the public making them aware. And we saw in 2006 and 2011 that that's a very effective way for us to control water usage, and we have a really

well educated public. They respond well to that message.

Then we move into further stages that start to make mandatory measures important and required for our customers if we're not able to achieve the savings we want with just those voluntary measures.

I would say about the two criteria, as you go across the top, when we are less than 120 percent of our groundwater pumping goal for the year, then we're in good shape. When we move into being between 120 and 130, that starts to move us into some of the drought stages. And then we go to 130 to 140 and then more than 140 percent of our goal.

As we go down the side of the chart, when we're under -- when we're less than two GCPD over our goal, then we're in good shape. And, again, it moves down. When we're between two and four, that moves us into Stage 1. When we're four to six, that's Stage 2. And so they work together and you find where you are across the top and where you are down the side, and you meet in the middle to see what drought stage it is.

Are there any questions about how these two things work together?

One of the reasons we added in the criteria

for the GCPD for a customer behavior and usage is that all of the methods for controlling water use lie in the hands of our customers. And so by putting this into our drought management strategy, it gives our customers a lot of control about what's happening in terms of mandatory drought restrictions.

The drought advisory, as I said, is the first stage that we enter in the drought management strategy, and we enter into that whenever the majority of the Bernalillo County is in severe drought, regardless of what water usage patterns look like. And this is important. We can do that without approval from the board. And the reason for that is not to take control away from the board, of course. It's to make us able to respond immediately and get the message out to the public when we are in a drought. And hopefully, by getting that message out as soon as possible, we will avoid having to move into some of the further strategies, the methods that are mandatory.

First we have a Stage 1 that we'd into if a drought advisory is not sufficient to keep water usage under control, is a drought watch. The green that you see on the screen, that's the public education piece that came from the drought advisory. The two yellow

boxes show the drought reduction methods, water usage methods, I should say, for this stage. The first is to double fees for water waste. Water waste is whenever customers are putting water out into the street or watering at the wrong time of day.

And this is unique in drought management strategies. At every drought stage, we have an incentive for our customers that we are offering as a positive way to help them do the right thing during drought. At this stage what we're going to do are offer drought smart classes. Customers who attend this one-hour class would receive a $20 rebate credit on their bill. Right now, we offer a class called water smart that offers a $20 credit on the bill. The structure for offering these classes already exists and we have thousands of customers attend the classes every summer. So we know this is something our customers will do.

If a drought watch is not sufficient to control our water use, we move into Stage 2, which is a drought warning. Again, you know, there's the increase in public education, there's the pieces that existed from the drought watch, but now we're moving into some much more stringent mandatory measures. Surcharges would double. Surcharges are those

increases in the water bill that customers see when they are increasing their use above their average winter water usage. We also have the Water by the Numbers program become mandatory. Right now, it's just voluntary. So we would select the days of the week that even customers would get, we would select the days of the week that the odd customers would be allowed to based on their address.

The time of day watering restrictions would change; they would be expanded. Right now from April 1st through October 31st, there is no watering from 11:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. That would be expanded; no watering from 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. There would be no variances granted to the time-of-day watering restrictions. Right now, if you are putting in turf or reseeding your turf, you can ask for a variance to the time of day restrictions so you can keep that grass wet so that it will grow. Obviously, during a drought is not the appropriate time to be putting in new turf. So there would be no variances granted except for athletic fields. We worked with the parks department and APS and talked with them and there are safety considerations if you don't have, you know, the turf properly maintained on athletic fields. So that would be the one exception there.

Finally, the positive incentive that we're offering at this level will be a distribution of low flow shower heads and shower timers and educating about the need for five-minute showers. If you have ever side to do that, a five-minute shower is not easy, especially if you have long hair. But educating our customers about this would be a great behavioral change to bring about during a drought. It might not be something we could achieve all the time, but we could go for this.

And finally, if all of those measures are not effective, we would enter a drought emergency. Again, this keeps all of the other measures in place, but now surcharges would triple. We would reduce the Water by the Numbers program by one day per week. So if it's July, and normally we would be saying water three days per week, it would become mandatory to water just two days per week. And, again, you know, if we moved into October, when we're advocating watering two days per week, then we would be cutting people back to just one day.

And finally, the positive at this level is that we'd offer a 20 percent reduction rebate. And that's a rebate for signing up to voluntarily reduce your usage by 20 percent. Exactly how that would be

structured would depend on what time of year we were enacting this part of the strategy. But what I hope is that our customers will do a great job and we will never be in the position of dealing with this drought emergency.

Finally, my last slide, just quickly, looks at the anticipated savings from each water use reduction method at the various stages. And you can see that, you know, we have an increase as we move through the drought stages. There is a difference as we move through the drought stages. There is a difference in the blue block, which represents education. That drops off in the drought warning and drought emergency. It's the bottom block and it's kind of a royal blue color. And the reason it gets smaller when we move to the drought warning and drought emergency is that we have already increased public education at the drought advisory and drought watch stages. And if public education didn't work for us at those two levels, then we don't think it's going to work particularly well for us in the future. We've already given the customers the message very heavily and now we're not expecting such big savings there.

For all of these savings reduction methods, we've looked at other cities and the savings that they

were able to achieve and we've tried to be as conservative as possible in making our estimates so that we will be pleasantly surprised when we save more.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you, Ms. Yuhas.

Are there any questions?

Let's go ahead and proceed to the consent agenda. There are no items on the consent agenda this evening.

And we move next to approvals. And the next item is going to be WUA R-12-8. That is authorizing a grant with the State of New Mexico for security surveillance at south side water reclamation treatment plant.

Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: Mr. Chair, quickly. We were notified that we were eligible for a Homeland Security grant in the amount of $200,000, which we applied for. We anticipate receiving it. It is basically to enhance security at our south side reclamation facility. It would basically allow us to buy a camera system for the perimeter.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: I'd like to move WUA R-12-8.

COMMISSIONER DE LA CRUZ: Second.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: We have a motion and a second by Commissioner De La Cruz.

Councillor Garduno.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Mr. Sanchez, so this will be connected to what entity, the county sheriff, or how's it going to be -- I know it's going to be monitored, but how would people react?

MR. SANCHEZ: Mr. Chairman and Councillor Garduno, we have our own security monitoring system, so it would be integrated into that system. It's simply enhancing the security we have currently at the south side reclamation facility.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: And tell us why that's important. I mean, I think I know what you said it's for.

MR. SANCHEZ: It's basically to avoid a terrorist attack or something of that nature.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you, Councillor Garduno.

Okay. We have a motion and a second on the floor. All those in favor, signify by saying yes.

ALL MEMBERS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Opposed, say no.

That carries unanimously.

(5-0 vote. Agenda Item 9 approved.)

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Next item is other business, Item 10. The first item is water conservation update.

Ms. Yuhas.

MS. YUHAS: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board, since you have cupcakes and commemorative glasses, you already know what the good news is, that we achieved our water conservation goal three years early and have an extra two billion gallons of water in the aquifer as a result of that, which is fabulous for our customers. I wish I could give all of them a cupcake.

What I would like to go through with you, and this is a little tedious, to please bear with me, is why we achieved the conservation savings that we did this year. As you know, there's a census done every ten years. This is the year that we started using the updated census data from 2010. The new way in which we calculate GCPD, according to the office of the state engineer, means that every ten years we will have a correction year, like this year.

The way we calculate GCPD is we take the amount of water we produce, which is all of our system wells, all of our non-system wells, non-system wells are those that are at golf courses and parks, water that's being used by our community but isn't going

through our pipes, the northwest service area, our surface water diversion and our shallow groundwater reuse, so truly, all of our production added together, and then that's divided by our population. And there's a change in our population figures for this year. And that's for two reasons that were in the census data. And that is that the 2010 census showed us that vacancy rates went down from 7.7 percent in 2000 for a single-family residential homes, to 6.4 percent in 2010. So that's a big reduction. Less people buying new homes. People are moving into the old houses.

The other thing that we saw is that the people per household went up, which is unique. Usually in censuses what you see is that number continuing to go down as the economy expands, less people per household.

In the 2000 census, which is the data we had been using, there were 2.4 people per household. That's been increased to 2.45. So those two factors caused us to have an increase in our population of about 27,000 people 2010 and 2011. Now, really, those people have existed, you know, for that whole decade that we haven't been counting them because we were using the old census. But the state engineer's method

requires us to use the census data, so that's why this happens.

Are there any questions about the calculation, how that works, before I move on?

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Councillor Garduno.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Katherine, I'm not that good at math, but it seems like you have a lesser number of gallons produced in 2011, greater number of people, and yet the number is less. How does that happen?

MS. YUHAS: All of those things are correct. We produced about a hundred million gallons less water in 2011, and then we divided that by a greater number of people, 27,000 more people. And so that results in a lower GCPD.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: But for my -- of course we're talking what, six points?

MS. YUHAS: It is. It's about six gallons per person per day different.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: I guess you're right. I don't have a calculator in front of me, so I'm going to have to defer to your calculator.

MS. YUHAS: Oh, thank you. I appreciate that. I used the calculator from the office of the state engineer, so really, I'm pretty sure they're correct.

Now that we have achieved this goal of 150 gallons per person per day, our plan for 2012 and going into 2013 is to hold neighborhood meetings and town halls to talk with our customers about where we should go from here.

And so I was very heartened to hear Ms. Hebbard saying that that was something she was interested in doing. So it's great to know that we'll have an interested community when we get out there.

We'll also have an online survey for our customers who aren't able to get to any of the meetings. And I am going to be meeting with stakeholder groups in particular, separate from these neighborhood and town hall meetings, to get their input.

So what we'd like to do is have this big public process take place and bring to you a new water conservation plan in early 2013.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Go ahead and proceed, Councillor Garduno.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Ms. Yuhas, so what you're saying is you're going to go out to the public and outreach to them. But this is going to be more than just showing them what has happened. Rather, it's going to be an interactive or inclusive meeting, as

Ms. Hebbard talked about. Folks, not only experts in the field, but folks who are just curious and want to know and may have some really good ideas.

So is that the process you're talking about also?

MS. YUHAS: Mr. Chair, Councillor Garduno, that's exactly what we're looking for, is that public input, public response, what do we want Albuquerque to look like, how do we want to get there, what kind of savings do we want to achieve, how quickly all of those things, and I think our customers are going to have great input on that. I know they will.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Go ahead and proceed.

MS. YUHAS: I just have a couple more slides about the drought so that you're updated on where we are. The slide you're looking is the U.S. drought monitor from March 6th. That has since been updated last week, but the update looks exactly like there slide.

If you look at Bernalillo County, what you'll see is that it is about half yellow and half tan. The yellow is the part of the county that is in D-0, which is about normally dry conditions. And the tan part is the part that is in D-1, which is moderate drought. Both of these are drought conditions that we

enter into fairly easily during the spring when we have such dry, windy weather.

This next slide shows our water production in comparison to 2011. The blue bars are 2011, the green bars are 2012. The important thing to note is that the green bars are shorter. We're actually producing less water this year than we did last year, by about 9.3 percent for the first two months of the year. I don't have all of March's data yet, but the preliminary data that I've looked at seems to track along with this. We are continuing to use less water in the month of March than we did in March of 2011.

What these two pieces of data are showing us is that the drought is easing, water use is down. The drought advisory is due to expire on April 1st. I just got an update on predictions for the La Nina conditions from the National Weather Service this afternoon. And predictions are that La Nina will end sometime in April or May and we will be back to neutral conditions. Neutral conditions are what bring us our average precipitation and average temperatures. And so predictions are that by the summer, we will be back to our regular weather patterns. So maybe we'll actually have a monsoon season this year.

So with that, I'm not recommending that you

extend the drought advisory.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you, Ms. Yuhas. And thank you for all your work. I appreciate all your effort and energy. And also the staff at the Water Authority.

Okay. The next item is going to be water resource management strategy update. And Mr. John Stomp will present that.

Welcome, John.

MR. STOMP: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board, tonight I want to give you just kind of a history of where we were 25 years ago, it's hard to believe it's been 25 years, an update on the activities that we're doing today and some of the challenges we're going to have into the future. It's hard to imagine, but back in 1987 -- and I'm going to move as quickly as I can with the slide, so I appreciate your patience. Back in 1987, one of our groundwater hydrologists started looking at the aquifer and comparing what the state engineer had predicted would happen to the aquifer related to our pumping, as compared to what was actually happening. And that's when the first signs began to show that our understanding of the aquifer and relationship to the river were wrong.

Back then, we used to think the river was directly connected to the aquifer so that every drop that we pumped from the aquifer would be resupplied by the river. And now we only know about half of what we pump from the aquifer is being resupplied by the river. And we also know there's going to be a point at which we draw down the aquifer, and that land that's being supported by both the dirt and the water, once you take away the water, the land begins to sink. And that's called land surface subsidence.

And that's a real phenomenon that's happened in places like Tucson. Downtown Tucson, for example, has sunk about 6 inches in the last 20 years from their pumping. And there's other areas in the southwest. We obviously don't want to get to that point, which is why we're doing all of the unique things that we're doing. And Katherine talked a little bit about conservation.

So if you took a picture of the underground water table and you connected the lines of equal elevation underneath Albuquerque, this would be a picture of what the aquifer looked like back in 2002. And so you can see that there's a cone of depression that's been created on the east side of Albuquerque, centered somewhat around Los Altos Golf Course on

Interstate 40, and we also have a pumping cone of depression on the west side. And in that far northwest corner, you can see those elevation contours coming close together. That's the effects of Rio Rancho's pumping in the middle valley.

And so obviously this is not a sustainable strategy. We're lowering the aquifer and we're getting close -- we were getting closer and closer to that land surface subsidence.

Back in 1963, we signed a contract for San Juan Chama water, and this is a picture of the actual San Juan Chama project in a GIS form. The San Juan Chama water is imported Colorado River water, so it's not native to the Rio Grande. And it's actually brought into this basin through a series of tunnels underneath the Continental Divide, the largest tunnel being a 12-foot diameter tunnel going through the mountains, 12 miles long. And the water is moved to Heron Lake. So Heron Lake stores water from our San Juan Chama project, and then that water is released down the river, the Rio Chama, to Abiquiu, where we store that water.

So this -- we've been paying for this water since 1971. We have a 50-year repayment contract, so that contract for construction repayment ends in 2021,

but our annual obligation to pay for the cost of this project to continue operating is in perpetuity. We get 48,200 acre feet a year from this project, so it represents a very large percentage of our water resources portfolio.

This is the drinking water project, where we actually put that San Juan Chama water to use. It began operation in 2008, and it represents the future of Albuquerque. This is our primary water supply. And it takes water from the river, I'll have a picture of that, just south of Alameda Boulevard. It treats it at the water treatment plant and then it's distributed throughout Albuquerque. We've been using this since 2008, and as I said before, this is our primary drinking water supply. So people ask us a lot of questions: You have a lot of debt in your portfolio. Why do you have a lot of debt?

Well, we had to pay for this long term water supply project and so it was an investment into our future. This project itself cost about $450 million, and it's being paid for by our rate payers. And so this provides the background and the supply that other entities in the southwest, and specifically in the middle Rio Grande, do not have.

So what is the strategy? It's a picture on

the following slide that shows it's a combination of conservation, reuse and recycling, and then transitioning to our surface water supplies. And the whole point of this strategy is to reduce our effect on the aquifer, to preserve and protect the aquifer for future water supply. That's the entire intent of what we're doing and what we're investing in. And so conservation is a large part of it, reuse and recycling, I'll talk a little bit about that. I showed you to drinking water project. And then there's that little triangle there called "new sources of supply."

So even though we meet all our conservation goals, and now we're talking to go beyond that, there still is some component of new supplies that are needed way out in the future. In this picture, it's shown in 2050, but as those conservation goals go lower and lower, that triangle will move out further and further. But the need is still there.

This is a picture of our water conservation strategy. And in terms of where we've been, it started actually in 1995. I know Katherine talked a little bit about reaching the goals. But we were the largest water user in the southwest. We used more than 250 gallons per person per day. In 1995, we

actually pumped 40 billion gallons in 1995. Katherine showed you that we pumped about 34 billion last year. So 17 years later, we're using a lot less water with a lot more population, and that's what's shown on this picture here. The red shows if we would have continued to increase our use as we had in the past. The black actually shows our usage, and then you see kind of a breakdown of what that usage represents in terms of reuse, surface water and groundwater, the green being our strategy goal. And as Katherine said, we've met our goal and we're going to be establishing a new goal.

Some of the reuse strategies, we already have two different reuse projects that are in operation since 2003. One uses a little bit of chip rinse water from the Sumatomo company, and then that's blended with San Juan Chama water, and that provides all of the irrigation supplies in the Northeast Heights and the North Valley. We have the south side reuse project, which I'll show you a little picture. That's coming online in about a month actually. And then we have other reuse projects where we're looking at the West Side. But reuse is a big component of our strategy because obviously it's one resource in our portfolio that we already own, and just continuing to

put it to reuse, again, takes the pressure off the aquifer.

So these are the sites that will be served in the south side reuse project. We have the UNM Championship Golf Course, Mesa del Sol, Puerto del Sol Golf Course, Albuquerque International Sunport, a whole host of other parks and golf courses, UNM sports complex and so on. This project is under construction and we're finalizing the construction at the south side plant and it should be in operation in just a very short period of a few weeks now. It's been under construction for about a year.

We've also looked at reuse potential on the west side of Albuquerque. We purchased land by the bosque school to build a reuse wastewater treatment plant in the future, and there's a whole host of sites on the west side, like Ladera golf course, Desert Greens Golf Course, and now the new APS facility that's going to be on the West Side. That also is a target for reuse into the future. So we need to continue to move forward with this reuse, and we're looking for federal opportunities to get additional funding for this reuse, West Side being the primary goal right now.

This is an aerial picture of the surface

water treatment plant. And I just wanted to highlight. We've been kind of criticized for not having operational goals for the drinking water project, but we did establish operational goals. And the idea was that initially we would ramp up the project very slowly, and that would be because of potential water quality concerns and also learning about how to run the plants and the staffing and the training and all the stuff that goes with it. And then in 2011, beginning last year, it's basically our primary source of supply. So we run the water treatment plant as our primary source of supply and when we reach a point at which the surface water is not enough, then we start to supplement with groundwater.

But as you know, and Katherine talked about the drought management strategy, there's now a prevision in the drought management strategy where we would come before this board and we would present those operational goals on a year-by-year basis. And Katherine showed the relationship between the use of groundwater and the drought management strategy. So those operational goals will provide the foundation for you to make decisions about how to move forward on droughts, for example.

Why aquifer storage and recovery? We've had a lot of meetings and discussions about why ASR is so important for us. And it's a huge, huge benefit for Albuquerque to use our water, for us to use our water, to store it underground and to preserve and protect it from future evaporation and loss. And so some of the policy goals are outlined there. But it does provide us an opportunity to meet that future need. And then when droughts come about, we can count on the water that we've put in the aquifer during this ASR program to help make up for that offset of that additional pumping that we might incur during the drought.

We have a couple of projects that we've already implemented. I think you guys are aware of the Bear Canyon project, which is up on Spain and Wyoming, where we're putting nonpotable water into an arroyo and letting it soak directly into the ground. That project was very successful. We did that for a couple of years. We were able to store about 1100 acre feet of water. It's a small amount of water, but still, really important. The next step is to implement a large-scale project. And we have a large-scale project planned right at the water treatment plant.

But how is this going to operate? So this

is a picture of our actual usage. And you have time on the bottom, so January through December. And you can see that our usage increases in the summer months and decreases in the winter months. People understand that. But in terms of the capacity of the water plant, we have gaps where the demand is less than our capacity at the water plant. So we want to take that additional capacity at the water plant, treat that water and then store it in the ground during the wintertime. We can pump it out the following summertime, or we can hold it into the ground for a period of time to make up for that pumping that occurs in the summertime. So it's a way of balancing our supplies without having to build huge excess capacity at the water plants. That's one reason.

So this would be like a typical operating schedule. And you can see from left to right we have the capacity of the plant and the facility capacity, in the bottom, and you have the recharge. So over time, as population increases, and basically that winter demand increases, we have less and less water in those shoulder months, in the winter amongst, to put water into the ground. And so this is just a depiction of how that would change over time.

So why ASR? Well, there's a lot of reasons

to do aquifer storage and recovery, and one is to reduce evaporative loses. And so here's kind of technical drawing but it's kind of nice looking, too. But in this scenario, we're that we had 10,000 acre feet of water. And if we had that 10,000 acre feet of water sitting in Abiquiu, and we are letting it evaporate in Abiquiu, and we imagine that evaporation over a period of time, that's what the squiggly lines are. And so Abiquiu evaporates about 6 feet a year, but that's based on how much water is actually in Abiquiu. So the less water in Abiquiu, a little bit less evaporation, more, there's more evaporation. So you can see how much we would lose in just a short period of time is the squiggly line. So you start with 10,000 acre feet, if you imagine the blue line, and over a course of about five years, we've lost 4,000 acre feet from that same amount of water sitting in Abiquiu. If we put it in the ground, we have that initial loss as it makes its way to Albuquerque, we treat it and then we put it in the ground, and we have about 9,000 acre feet. So just in this simple scenario of starting with 10,000 acre feet, we've saved 3,000 acre feet of the water or 30 percent of the water by not storing it in Abiquiu and putting it into the ground, where it's not going to evaporate.

And so it's a simple concept but the idea is that use the aquifer as a storage reservoir, as it really is a storage reservoir, as opposed to aboveground storage that continues to evaporate.

Again, this is a picture of the surface water plant. And the idea would be to drill a couple of wells at the plant. We did get a lot of feedback at the December 3rd public forum that we had that was sponsored, and Commissioner De La Cruz led that effort, and we talked about what particular ways should we do it. We have a direct injection where we're going to actually put -- drill wells all the way down to the aquifer, put that water directly into the aquifer.

One of the comments that was are brought forth at that meeting is, well, infiltration provides additional treatment. So there is kind of a combination well that you can do where you can put an injection well but only go about halfway down, and then let the water soak into the ground, as it would if you used an infiltration pond. That was one of the comments that was brought forth at the December 3rd meeting. We're looking at that concept because it has potential benefits for cost savings, but also some treatment benefits. That may be one of the things

that we implement that came out of the public meeting, and there's other issues that came out of the public meeting, too, that were very beneficial for us.

Mr. Wechsler talked about the economics of the aquifer storage and recovery. And this is just a very quick picture of what that would look like. This is in no way, shape or form supposed to be a complete cost benefit analysis, but just a simple analysis. If ASR cost us $5 million, a one-time cost, and we were able to put in about 2,500 to 5,000 acre feet of water into the ground a year, over about 20 years, which is about the life of that well, that cost to us would be about $100 an acre foot.

If we had to buy that same amount of water rights in the open market, assuming a value of about $12,000 an acre foot, which is significantly lower than what we've been paying, but just assuming for conservative purposes that's the number, that same amount of water rights would be about $600 per acre foot. So it's not intended to balance all the costs, but it does know that there's a clearly a benefit for us to use our water and to put it into the ground as opposed to continuing to buy and rely on other's water rights at the same time.

As I said before, this is a picture of the

diversion damn in the fish way. You can see that's just south of Alameda Boulevard. This is where we take the water out of the river, and then we allow the fish to move freely about the damn there, which is the fish way on the outside, this is for those of you that have never been there, have never had an opportunity to see it from the aerial. You can sort of see the diversion damn, it's a light white line across the page right in front of the intake structures. But just a nice picture of that.

And then, our wastewater treatment plant treats about 55 million gallons a day. And it is a water resource and it is part of our water budget and part of our portfolio. A lot of people would like to think of effluent as just something you need to clean up and get rid of it as quickly as you can, but in fact, this becomes a very huge part of our portfolio in the future.

I showed an aerial picture there, that's the plant that we're going to be upgrading. And I think you guys aware of the upgrades that are going to be done there. And then a picture of the effluent channel. But the idea is that we have a huge portfolio of water rights and water resources. Effluent coming out of the plant is part of that.

So in terms of the water strategy, the strategy was originally adopted by the city council in 1997. You adopted a new strategy after a town hall meeting in 2007. And now we're talking about how do we fill in that triangle, how do we get future water supplies. Water conservation is going to continue to be there. Katherine talked about the drought management plan. We're going to need to evaluate the effects on climate change and what that's going to do to the surface flows in the middle Rio Grande and the impacts on the San Juan Chama project, more reuse. And so the idea is, let's develop is a water budget model that allows us to use dynamic simulation in an effort to try to balance all of those different needs to figure out where we're going for the future.

So we get contacted by T-bone Pickens about once every year or so, wants to pipe in water from Amarillo. He continuously gives us a call and says, "Hey, I got this water, buy it from me. It's this value." And we have no way of really actually comparing that value of that water rights from Amarillo. Of course, people on the Ogallala would really upset if they found out he was doing that, but he's doing that on a regular basis.

And so the idea is, how do we use this water

budget model as a tool to compare these different alternatives that we're faced with when people come with us, and should we continue to purchase our pre '07 water rights and at what cost does that cost to us that it's too expensive and maybe we don't need to do that anymore.

So the purpose of the model is look at the timing of available supplies and compare all the challenges that we have like global climate change and what effect does that have on our future needs and how does it affect that future triangle that I talked about earlier. Should we do more ASR? Should we use this as a way of actually doing our reporting?

And we have developed a draft model, which represented to the customer advisory committee, and we're using a dynamic simulation approach so that we can look at all the interrelationships between supply and demand and the uncertainties that go with it. And we're trying to develop a model that's easy to use and something that's part of our daily use so that we can make sure that we use the model in the future. These are just a couple of slides of what the model looks like. And at some point in the future, we'll need to do a presentation when we think the model is up to a point which you would like to see a picture of that.

Finally, I'd like to show a picture of kind of where we were and then some of the things that are happening. This is a picture of that same aquifer that I showed you before. There's little red dots all over the place. And that's the network that we've created to monitor the water levels in the aquifer. We've spent about $30 million installing these networks of wells throughout the middle valley to try to make sure that we can monitor the changes over time and what the effect of our work and other people's work are on the system.

We also modeled with this the USGS to try to figure out if the drinking water project is implemented over a period of time and based on the simulated hydrologic scenario, what would the aquifer change. And this picture shows that we believe the aquifer is going to rise as much as 25 feet and could rise as much as 40 feet in the middle of Albuquerque as it relates to our conservation reuse and getting off the aquifer with the drinking water project.

Well, the next slide shows what happens in some of these wells. And as I talked about this network of wells, I just took a snapshot of some of these wells to kind of show you what's happening over time. The Nor Este well is located right next to La

Cueva High School, Montessa is near Montessa Park, and so on. I'm not going to tell you where all the wells are, but the point is, you can see a little picture of how the gradient has changed over time. You can see a downward gradient, and then when the drinking water project comes online in 2008, you start to see a change.

And the next slide is another representation of where these monitoring wells are. And you can see, and we picked out some of these wells where you've seen significant changes in the water level underneath Albuquerque. One of the wells that I showed you before, Nor Este, has jumped eight feet in elevation. And so the aquifer was at a certain elevation; now, as we begin, it's starting to rise.

And so what the USGS model predicted and what we were hoping was going to happen is actually happening. And it's happening very rapidly, actually. Some of the monitoring wells, we talked about Kirtland Air Force Base jet fuel plume, some of those monitoring wells, we've seen the aquifer rise as high as 3 feet in the last few years. So what we're doing is working, and the huge investment that this board and a few previous boards have made to our future water supply is actually working. And it provides for

our sustainable supply for the future.

This is a snapshot, the next two slides are just -- the question that we get asked all the time: What happens to the downstream users? You guys are using your water. What's happening in that reach? And so we have the diversion that happens at Alameda Boulevard. We return the water back at the Southside Water Reclamation Plant, and then we have our continuing effects on the river. And this first slide is just a simple depiction. If we just continue to use groundwater and only groundwater, how much depletion would occur downstream of Albuquerque, and that's the dash line. And the blue line represents what happens in 2020 by implementing the drinking water project. And the picture shows that there's going to be more water in the river as a result of our using our San Juan Chama water than if we didn't. And that makes a lot of sense, because we're substituting our native water use, which is the groundwater, with imported San Juan Chama water, the water that doesn't come from this basis.

And the next picture shows a huge difference in the flows and -- in the river, and you can see by 2040, you're going to see a huge change in the amount of water that's available in river downstream of

Albuquerque. And that, again, is the blue line. And the difference between the blue and the dash line is 15 cfs, so that's like 30 acre feet a day. But even during times of drought, which is the red line, when we're not completely off the surface water, we're going to begin to see even more water in the river during those times of drought. So the drinking water project, doesn't -- not only does it not have an impact on the river downstream, but it has a positive impact on the user downstream because we are transferring our depletions and our uses to our imported San Juan Chama water, which is, again, was started back in 1963. So we're just implementing the plans of dreams that people had back in the 1960s, and now you guys are realizing the benefits from that work.

I'll be glad to answer any questions, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Are there any questions?

Councillor Garduno.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Since you mentioned the San Juan Chama water diversion and the fact that it comes from another aquifer, another watershed, how long -- remind me here again, tell me, when does that end, that arrangement?

MR. STOMP: The contract the a perpetual contract, there's no end date to it. It's all based on the available amount of flow, so there may be years that we don't get the complete amount that we had contracted for, but that's no end date.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: But there could be a time when folks in that watershed say, "Sorry, we can't supply you any more because we're needing it here"?

MR. STOMP: Well, Mr. Chairman and Councillor Garduno, there's certain legal protections that the San Juan Chama project has. It was authorized by Congress in conjunction with the Navajo Indian irrigation project. Those two projects are actually congressionally tied, where they share in the available supply and they share in shortages.

So I think there's been protections that were made by Congress, and it is part of New Mexico's share of the Colorado River. And so from a legal standpoint, New Mexico gets 11.25 percent of the Colorado River. This is part of that. So from the Colorado River standpoint, we're entitled to this water, as all the upper basin states are, and we're just using our share of that water. It comes from San Juan River, and there's been a lot of people that have been upset about that over the years, but the project

is needed and it's served its purpose for which it was authorized for back in the '50s.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: And that's Colorado River available to New Mexico?

MR. STOMP: Yes, it is.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Not Albuquerque or --

MR. STOMP: Mr. Chairman and Councillor Garduno, no. The Colorado River is for the State of New Mexico.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: So someone else in the state can claim part of that 11 percent?

MR. STOMP: Mr. Chairman and Councillor Garduno, they do. There are other allocations of that Colorado River to other users, including the Navajos, the Jicarillas and other users on the San Juan River, and now there's going to be a pipeline that's being built to move water from the San Juan River all the way down to Gallup. So the majority of the water that New Mexico gets flows in the San Juan River, and there's a lot of the users that depend on it.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: So there could be a diminishing return in the sense that more users want more of that 11 percent? The drought reduces that 11 percent to a less amount, so there could be a time when we get considerably less than what we're getting

now?

MR. STOMP: Well, Mr. Chairman and Councillor Garduno, this hydrologic studies that were done for the San Juan Chama project predicted that there would be times of shortage, and, in fact, in 2002, we saw less water come through the tunnel than in the history of the project. So we're going to see ups and downs with the project, and there may be times that there's no water in Heron Reservoir, and there's why these conservation and reuse and making sure the aquifer stays in shape is so critical to us, because it becomes our drought strategy for the future.

So whatever surface water we get, we will use. If we don't get our full allotment, we have other opportunities to, you know, reuse some more conservation. And, of course, if we have to go to the aquifer, we will. That's not what we want to do, that's what we're trying to avoid, but if that's what we have to do in the short term, then we will do that.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Mr. Chair, but there -- I guess I need to ask it again so I can understand.

There will be a time when drought, shortages, allotment, all of these things, there will be a nexus where Albuquerque or the Water Authority here will be at a really diminished position?

MR. STOMP: Well, Mr. Chairman and Councillor Garduno, that's going to happen on a yearly basis. I mean, the hydrology changes in the southwest all the time. Heron has several years worth of water stored in it, so we would have to have a really long period where water never -- where we never had any snowfall in the San Juan basin. That's never really happened, but that doesn't mean that it can't happen.

Our purpose of our strategy is to make sure that we have a drought management in place with the aquifer. Our previous estimate was for a ten-year-long drought, and I think the water resources management strategy policy allows us to look beyond that ten years at what -- how much water is actually in the aquifer, how much could a sustained drought actually be now that we understand a little bit more about climate change.

So yes, the answer is we could get less surface water, there could be years we get no surface water. But in general, I don't think the hydrology is such that we would never get any San Juan Chama water unless there's some renegotiation of the Colorado River compact and New Mexico doesn't get any share of that at all, which I don't really envision that happening.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Well, and I think that would be an important topic maybe to talk about in these public forums, conversations, discussions, because some of the things that I hear, you know, and you can pay as much attention to that as you want, is that there could be a time when the Colorado compact becomes null and void or at least changes significantly, so that the Colorado River now is being diminished by other users that haven't been traditionally using it are going to cut down on the 11 percent that we get.

And I think that we ought to have some of those discussions to make sure that perpetually we do have some use of that water. There may come a time when the downstream users of the Colorado, like Mexico, might say, "No," I mean, "we need water to flow into the Sea of Cortez, and you folks aren't allowing it," and, yeah, that sort of thing. So those are discussions that I think need to happen.

MR. STOMP: I agree.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you, Mr. Stomp.

Thank you, Councillor Garduno.

Commissioner De La Cruz.

COMMISSIONER DE LA CRUZ: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

John, the assumption is it's a good thing to recharge the aquifer. Have you found that there's any problems with recharging it and the water rising to a level that -- or is there a level that would not be necessarily good?

MR. STOMP: When we're actually injecting -- I'm sorry. Mr. Chairman and Commissioner De La Cruz, when you're actually injecting water into the aquifer, you actually begin to see a mounding effect, and that is because you're putting more water into the aquifer than the actual dirt will allow, and so it's kind of like your faucet being clogged over a period of time, it just doesn't drain as quickly. And that's what happens with the wells.

But over time, that mounding effect subsides, and so it gets into the aquifer. And so you've got to be very concerned about that. You don't want to be injecting water where you have a potential problem where you could get into somebody's basement or something like that with the mounding. So that's why you put the monitoring wells in place, to do that.

We're never going to reach the pre-basin levels that were in place long before we ever started pumping. That's hundreds of feet and billions of

gallons of water that have been take out of the aquifer. And so I don't see a point at which we own enough water to put into the aquifer that's really going to change, you know, the dynamic. Most of the recharge comes from the river and it will continue to come from the river as long as the river has water in it.

COMMISSIONER DE LA CRUZ: Have you heard that there may be a problem at Atrisco Little League because of the groundwater being too high at this point?

MR. STOMP: Mr. Chairman and Commissioner De La Cruz, I did hear that there was a situation with a pond that was maybe dug a little bit deeper than it should have been that got into the water table. We are seeing rising water tables, but the water tables I'm talking about is really the deep aquifer.

The shallow aquifer, I think, is where you're talking about. And the shallow aquifer does go up and down depending on pumping and irrigation season and so on. It tends to rise in the winter and drop in the summer. But our pumping levels in the -- what we're talking about is really 500,000 feet below the aquifer. So I don't think our pumping had anything to do with that. I think that's just the local shallow

groundwater effect, and maybe they just excavated the pond deeper than they probably should have.

COMMISSIONER DE LA CRUZ: The pond was put in sometime in the middle to late '90s, and I was director of park and recreation when it occurred. It was put in by the City of Albuquerque. And I can tell you that there are two lower fields, they call them the lower fields because they are in that pond area, and they were to become wet basically if you had a significant rain event. And the notion was that within 24 hours, any water that would be put into that pond would be drained within that time frame. And, of course, to dry naturally thereafter.

I can tell you that there's never been water on those fields outside of those rain events, but now there is water on some of those fields. And I think there's an idea that because maybe the Water Authority has been pumping a well nearby that it's saturating some of that lower fields, some of those lower fields, I should say. And it's a problem for the children obviously, because Little League season is about to start, and if those fields are too wet then it's a problem.

And so I don't know if anything can be done, but I'd like to ask that you look into it a little bit

and see if there's something that can be done, and if there is a well that maybe for the season could be activated, to drop that just a little bit. If you would look into that, I'd really appreciate that.

MR. STOMP: Mr. Chairman and Commissioner De La Cruz, I'll look into that and I'll report back to you.

COMMISSIONER DE LA CRUZ: Thank you. The families and the children of that Little League, and there are about 700 children that use that -- it's going to be a problem to take two fields offline. So we've been out there with our county public works, city folks, public works, and everybody seems to think that it revolves around the idea that we've been -- we haven't been pumping, which is a good thing, but can be a problem for the children and the parents and families.

MR. STOMP: I'll take a look at it, Mr. Chair.

COMMISSIONER DE LA CRUZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you, Commissioner De La Cruz.

Mr. Stomp, thank you very much.

The last item on the agenda is Item C, ten C, that's the water protection advisory board, the 2011 annual report. And to present that report will

be Lawrence Barela.

Welcome, Mr. Barela.

MR. BARELA: Thank you.

Okay. My name is Lawrence Barela. I'm the chairman for the water protection advisory board for 2012. I'll be giving you a status briefing of our work for 2011. This briefing is going to be a status briefing, it's not going to be a technical briefing. I'm not going to show any equations, any charts, any flows. I'll give you an idea of what we did for the year, what we've accomplished, what our plans going forward will be. So I have some slides, and then I'd like to give you some other things that we would like you to consider, and then I'd like to conclude with staff kudos.

Let me go back to this first slide. Just to refresh your memories, we're all volunteers, none of us are paid. We have regular assignments, regular jobs. We show up second Friday of each month. We do what's called a review and comment process. So the PIC, policy implementation committee, assembles a series of agenda topics, to include groundwater protection, surface water protection, point source contamination events, storm water events, the Los Conchas fire, Laundromats, a lot of the point sources.

So our -- to give you a framework, what our board meetings are like, they're a review and comment on technical matters. Our product would be either no comments or perhaps a letter to the Authority.

So on behalf of the other nine members, we'd like to say thank you again. There are nine of us that are appointed to this board, three from the city, three from the county, two from the authority, one appointed jointly by the county and the authority and the city. So let me get started.

The board was formed in 1993. We have a couple of charters that we'd like to go over. One of the charters is -- I'm going to keep it really simple, past, present and the future. So we're looking at things that occurred in the past, we're looking at things that occurred in the present and we're looking forward as to what could harm or threaten our water supply.

One of the major documents that you guys had established prior to me getting involved in this is the GPPAP. When I read it, it looks like it was a groundwater document and a surface water document. Apparently there were two of them. I think you guys wanted to have one report, hence, this report.

Earlier I mentioned there are nine of us.

We're fully staffed. Everybody shows up to our meetings. We've only had one cancellation, so we're pretty effective in assembly and in reviewing and commenting.

Our goal is to look at the groundwater issues, surface water issues, provide some -- be the advocates for the citizens of Albuquerque and to promote interagency cooperation.

Our charter -- our basic charter is to study and advise, give you an opinion. It could be technical, it could be an opinion from a private citizen, it could be a disagreeing opinion, favorable opinion, a dissenting opinion. But we are your advisors from the perspective of the City of Albuquerque, the citizens that live here. All of the board members live in Albuquerque. A few, I think, live in the east mountain areas; they show up. They're the advocate for that part of the city, as well as the South Valley, North Valley and the surrounding community.

The other purpose of our charter is to oversee the plan, make sure that plan is being adhered to. We'll view it and advise, and if we think there's a deficiency, we'll point out that deficiency to the Authority.

The other component of our charter is to promote consistency, make sure that the left hand knows what the right hand is doing. We monitor that activity. We've looked at org charts, we've looked at the state org charts, we've looked at the city org charts, the county org charts, making sure that any changes to those org charts, that everybody that would be affected by that change understands that change.

The last bullet is we're your advocate. We're the advocate for the citizens. So pretty much anything is fair game at our meetings. Topics are technical, health related. What we don't address is sustainability issues. We're focused on water quality.

2011 activities. Let me do a quick timeout here and get prepared a little bit. So we kind of broke it down in a couple of areas. Emerging topics, interagency, interbasin, collaboration efforts, rules and regulations, surface and storm water quality issues, and then contamination type of activities. So with regard to emerging topics, one of the things that we've been looking at is Chromium 6. The state of California is looking at the concentration levels there. There's a move afoot to kind of understand how that would impact City of Albuquerque. There's a

sample program looking at pharmaceuticals and seeing how that -- those materials are entering into the system, so we've reviewed several presentations in that area.

In terms of the interagency, interbasin collaboration efforts, EPS established a permitting requirement based on some scientific studies with members from the National Academy of Science. It's involving 20 entities. We endorse further cooperation with that permit.

There's a mapping project. I think it's being conducted by Bernalillo. We endorse that as well. There's the PIPE program, looking at making sure those people who are of low income can hook up to the city sewers. We encourage that as well.

With respect to rules and regulation, I think one of the most notable ones is the septic tanks, the 30-year requirement. There was a deadline of 2015, I believe some residents on the east side of Albuquerque had voiced their concern at several council meetings saying maybe you should change that. I think there's some changes with the 2015 deadline. As far as the board is concerned, we think that there should be a deadline, and there should be some activity associated when the property changes

ownership and then make sure that those septic systems are working correctly, and if not, then it should be corrected.

Surface and storm water quality, PCBs is something we're looking at. We've had several presentations there. I think the county put together a fantastic presentation, giving us an idea and flavor of what's actually occurring, where that contamination is coming from. So we've looked at that.

Everybody, I think, is well aware of the Los Conchas fire. So we had the forest service in, USGS staff. I'm not sure if some of the -- a staff member from the Authority or the county, but we had numerous presentations as to what that fire could possibly do to the water supply here in Albuquerque. Forest Service did an outstanding job in articulating the threats. Mr. Stomp gave a fantastic presentation on what he would do if a contaminant was coming our way. So we feel that prudent action has been taken on behalf of the Authority, so we're not concerned about that issue at the present moment.

Groundwater sites. Obviously there's been much discussion about the Kirtland plume. We've had numerous presentations. We've had technical presentations talking about vertical, horizontal,

lateral size of the plume. I think at the last -- or several meetings prior to this one, there was some presentations about the technology, the treatment systems, the remediation, calculations used to assess that plume. As far as the board is concerned, we think there's a lot of work that needs to be done in that area. And at the end of my presentation, I'll give you some things to consider in that regard.

Accomplishment, continued. MS-4 permanent storm water, I think we -- well, I know we sent you guys a letter saying, hey, we'd like you to make sure that you support that effort, make sure that all the entities within the government here in Albuquerque, city, county, the Authority adhere to that plan. It's something we endorse.

The wastewater ordinance systems, you had that old septic systems, that issue. A number of studies again have shown that that is a significant contributor of pollutants to the water supply. It's pretty basic in large communities where you're geographically dispersed. Septic systems make sense. As the population density starts shrinking and collapsing in on itself, it doesn't make sense and it doesn't make sense when you have septic systems and you have access to city sewer. So it's something that

we'd like you guys to continue to monitor; as well, we will continue to monitor that.

Kirtland is another activity. It's -- I'm not going to do a lot of details. We're going to continue to meet with the base. The board is also considering elevating the level of participation. From the management, there's a two-star general that is the highest ranking officer there at Kirtland. Administratively, the colonel runs the base, but in terms of public interaction and authority, and for the board's benefit, in the military, rank is king. Rank is how things are established. That two star can speak on behalf of the U.S. Air Force and he can also speak on behalf of the plume. So something to consider there is possibly coordinating with him. And perhaps that would help us reach a quicker resolution on this issue.

Looking forward, our 2012 priorities, pretty basic. Again, we're a review and comment. We develop our own agenda. In a minute I'll give you some statistics how we do that. But the number one priority, stated again, is Kirtland. We're going to aggressively look at that. We're going to perhaps write a letter to the general and say we don't want to talk to a colonel, we want to talk to a general. We

want to get his perspective, his opinion, as well as the colonel's opinion, and his staff and the technical director that's managing this problem.

In terms of the surface protection implementation insurance, we are going to be looking at some storm water surges and some best management practices to address that. That's on our agenda topics for the upcoming year.

Intergovernmental coordination, again, we're going to watch the MS-4 permit, make sure that people when engaging in that activity, that all agencies that are responsible not to just include the City of Albuquerque proper, if you will, but the other agencies that are feeding into this basin, so we want to continue to monitor that activity.

Data sharing, we want to make sure that those people and those agencies that have data, that they have given that data, they share that data, the data is transparent. We would like to encourage cost effectiveness where you can, make sure that if there's information dealing with point source flows, contaminant or past best management practices, that other agencies know about it. So we encourage that data sharing.

The last slide is basically a thumbnail of

your website. And the little arrow there is just pointing to the two reports that we've published. I've brought a copy. This is our report here. Unfortunately, it doesn't have a signed cover letter, but in the future, we're going to post a signed cover with that as well.

That concludes what I would call the formal presentation and the summary. So I'd also like to just close with a couple of comments, things that we'd like you to consider. In fact, I would say 50 percent of the things I'm about to say have been fully vetted with the other board members. But the Kirtland fuel spill, most of you have been to all of the technical meetings. You've got Shaw Environmental, you've got New Mexico EMD, or the environment department. You've got our own hydrologists, your own scientists.

What we're starting to sense is there's a lot of energy being focused on remediation. Great. That's okay. What we need to start thinking about is worst case. What if this stuff gets into our system, what if these calculations are wrong, what if they've made the wrong assumptions.

I've sat, in my career, over hundreds of technical briefings. And I guarantee you, something always doesn't pan out the way we'd like. So with

that said, if you look at worst case, and I'm going to make a stretch here, there could be a filtration system, some type of neutralizing agent, but the point I'm trying to make is we need to start thinking in worst case. We could look at models all day long. We could look at formulas all day long. But we need to start looking at a comprehensive, cohesive strategy to solve this challenge.

The other thing is you guys have an org chart on your website: taxpayers, the board, the executive director. What I think is missing, this is just an observation for your consideration, is to include the two advisory committees in that org structure. I don't know if there's some legal issue associated with that, but the point there is that I think Mr. Garduno you had some questions about a town hall meeting and how we engaged the public, if it would be the proper forum for this board, the board that I represent, to host a town hall meeting of that nature.

I think we started with what I would call baby steps and letting people know that these advisory boards exist. It's on the website, but I think it needs to be highlighted so that people can see that it's there, it's part of the organization and it's --

I don't want to use the authoritative party of the organization, but it's a part of the organization and it has a vote. And it does represent the citizens of Albuquerque.

With regard to a town hall meeting, and I apologize if I sound like I'm putting you on the spot, we all gather and we all talk and we talk about the meetings that occurred at the city council, and it was expressed to me that you had a concern about how we get information out to the community. I don't think the board is ready to do a town hall meeting, and I want to tell you why.

Our board meetings are technical, technical presentations with questions and answers and questions and answers. As the board, we deliberate as to what topics we think need to be elevated to the authority. If we put that in the town hall meeting context, I think it would be too hard for me to manage. We will look at some options to help address that, and if you give us some time, we will report on that later.

The other thing I'd like to throw out there, or I'd like to tender for your consideration is obtaining the opinion of the medical professional here in the City of Albuquerque. And it goes back to my other comment about thinking worst case. You have the

University of New Mexico, which is one of the best medical institutions in the country, and I'm not saying that just because I went there, but it is. We need to start engaging those folks, getting them in, getting their perspective. Start that now, start it early. Bring them on board. You've got a lot of smart people there, we should use them. And it's their community as well.

I skipped a little bit here. I want to give you some statistics. We did 11 out of the 12 meetings. So that's good thing. The plan, the WQPPAB, is 43 pages long. I have encouraged what I called the other board members to read it. Some have read it and some have not. We're going to reengage that activity and make sure it's doing what it was meant to do.

Interesting tidbit, 56 percent of the current board members hold Ph.D.s, that's a good thing. Most of those individuals are environmental scientists. 67 percent hold technical degrees. We had 22 presentations which resulted in review and comment, which resulted in four letters to the Authority. We're fully staffed. The 2011 report is online.

And I wanted to highlight one of the

presentations that we had from the CDC. They have a subagency called Agency for Toxic Substance and Disease Registry. My understanding is they're the arm of the CDC that handle RCLA, CERCLA issues associated with health effects associated with contaminants. The connection we're trying to make here is that there's another government source that we can leverage to help solve this Kirtland challenge that we're faced with.

The last thing I'd like to do is give some kudos. And without the names of the following people, my job would be a lot harder. So I always think it's prudent to recognize the staff that contributes to the success of the board.

First, Barbara Gastian does a great job for us. Jane De Rose Baman, Katherine Yuhas, Allen Porter, Kevin Daggett, Mary Lou Leonard, Billy Gallegos, Alex Mora, George Schroeder, Sarah Holcrum, Bart Faris, Katherine VerEecke, Mary Murnane, Dan McGregor, Anita Steed, Doreen Johnson and Veronica Carrillo.

And I saved the best for last. Rick Sheen has done an outstanding job for us, helped me get prepared for this, helped me understand the technical issues. He's timely, very good at what he does. He gets us prepared for all of our meetings. So I want

to acknowledge him as a special kudo. He does a great job, so I'd like to acknowledge that.

That concludes my presentation. Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Are there any questions?

Commissioner De La Cruz.

COMMISSIONER DE LA CRUZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Not necessarily a question, but I just want to thank you, Lawrence, for your service and, of course, the service of all the other board members. They're an absolute important piece that keeps us connected not only to the community, but you function as a technical as well as a facilitator and coordinator with the large community. So thank you so much for your service.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Councillor Garduno.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I also wanted to thank you for being at a lot of those meetings that Kirtland Air Force Base has had, and also at the Coalition 6 meetings that we hold quarterly. Kirtland does come and talk to us, and you've been present at those I think every time. Thank you for that.

But let me ask you a couple of things that you brought up in your presentation. One of them was septic tanks and how that's -- other folks have said it, too, that they're a threat to groundwater, they're a threat because of the nitrates. And I thought that the county was looking at helping with that. Is that something that you've heard or -- and Mr. De La Cruz can maybe weigh in on that, too.

MR. BARELA: In terms of understanding the threat?

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Ameliorating the problem, maybe finding some kind of funding to get rid of those septic tanks or bring them up to code or whatever needs to happen.

MR. BARELA: It's my understanding that bringing up the septic system would be the responsibility of the homeowner.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Right. But some folks can't afford it, so hence the problem.

MR. BARELA: Are you talking about the incorporated or unincorporated?

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Unincorporated.

MR. BARELA: Okay. I think that --

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: It's mostly I think Tijeras and Carnuel and --

MR. BARELA: Actually, there's two different issues. There's the one issue about septic tanks within the city, within the -- in the incorporated and then the unincorporated. I believe there is some funding available to help those individuals. Unfortunately I don't have access to that data, so I can't give you a good answer on that.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Right. Well, and it's one of those interesting situations where like you say, it's an individual responsibility, but it's affecting the larger community, if you will.

MR. BARELA: So it's a question of equity fairness?

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Well, yeah, and also availability of funds for those people to be able to correct that. And I'm not saying that the WPB should be doing that, but what would be a suggestion to ameliorate that? Has the board talked about that? I know this board hasn't.

MR. BARELA: Give me one second. I have some notes there. The only thing that we did talk about is something -- what we termed equity fairness. There's obviously a group of socioeconomic backgrounds where some people can afford it and some people can't. It's something I think that hinges outside the scope of the

board that I'm leading.

Well, I take that back, in terms of the financing, it's a little bit -- it's border lining on the scope of what we're looking at. Obviously we'd like them to hook up to city sewer. How we get them to do that is a different task. Our only endorsement would be to encourage that they do that.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: And, Mr. Chair, I think sometime back, Councillor Harris introduced some legislation that -- I don't know if it was mandate, but it was a strongly suggested policy that everyone get rid of their domestic wells and start getting service from the utility. And that's in the city.

And I'm wondering if we can do that if we can't do the other, and tell people you can't have septic tanks unless they're up to code, or if they're not up to code, come kind of funding needs to be found. I don't know how the board would interact with that, but...

MR. BARELA: Quite frankly, I wouldn't know how to address that issue. I can bring it up to the -- as an agenda topic at our next board meeting and get their opinion. There's nine of us that have a better sense of what the mechanics would be to address that.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Right, and it seems, I

don't know if appropriate, but since you do have some technical folks on the board, I think that would be a great place to have this discussion, because they would know more about it than lay folks that are even on this board. So I would appreciate it if that were a topic that was brought up.

MR. BARELA: Certainly we can do that and I'll make it a point that we address that question.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: And I don't know if this falls under your purview or under whom it falls, but storm water monitoring, apparently we don't do that, neither the city nor the county. And that apparently is a tremendous source of contamination to the river because there's no catch point at which --

MR. BARELA: That also will be another agenda topic for us to look at. It's my understanding that somebody was looking at the storm water.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: And this is not to say that it's been a neglected point on the part of the board. But I think everybody has sort of dropped it and sort of said, "Well, it's not our fault. You know, it just came from the sky and we don't get to monitor that." And I think we should.

MR. BARELA: Agree. And as far as the board is concerned, pretty much everything is fair game if it's

threatening the water and the quality of that water, and we will address it. So that will be another thing we look at.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: And I would appreciate just from an edification point of view, if that could be discussed, and why we don't have a monitoring system. City, county, Water Authority, I don't know, and it's just a question that's been asked of me and I can't answer it because --

MR. BARELA: We'll certainly look at it and obviously coordinate with the authority.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Great. And, again thank you very much for the work at Kirtland Air Force Base. I absolutely agree with you that it's a danger, it's is a cause that all of us need to be thinking about. And it's not only going to affect the Southeast Heights, which is an area that I represent, but it's going to affect a lot of things, and heaven forbid that it extends to a larger extent than we even think today.

As you said, we need to start kind of closing in on how we're going to address this, really, if not dangerous, certainly, you know, an issue that's been going on for a long, long time that we have not dealt with. And I really appreciate your strong words

about that.

Mr. Chair and Lawrence, thank you so much for the presentation and the advocacy.

MR. BARELA: If there are no further questions, I'll conclude.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Councillor Garduno, it looks like you set up the next agenda for the water protection advisory board meeting.

And, Lawrence, thank you very much for all of your work, and also your board members. I do agree with you that this should be part of the organizational chart for the Water Authority. You know, I think you've got some really good, quality people on that board that understand, you know, many of the issues, the technical issues, and we can work on that inclusiveness and bringing you in as part of the organizational chart.

MR. BARELA: Great.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you for all your time.

MR. BARELA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Are there any other questions? If there's no further questions before this board, this meeting is adjourned.

(Proceedings adjourned.)

STATE OF NEW MEXICO

COUNTY OF BERNALILLO

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Kelli Gallegos, New Mexico Provisional Reporter, No. P-409, working under the direct supervision of Paul Baca, NM CCR #112, do hereby certify that I reported the foregoing proceedings in stenographic shorthand and the pages are a true and correct transcript of those proceedings and were reduced to printed form under my direct supervision.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither employed by nor related to any of the parties or attorneys in this matter and that I have no interest in the final disposition of this matter.

_____

KELLI GALLEGOS
Provisional License P-409
License Expires: 9/7/12