

1 ALBUQUERQUE BERNALILLO COUNTY
2 WATER AUTHORITY BOARD
3 VINCENT E. GRIEGO CHAMBERS
4 ONE CIVIC PLAZA
5 ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO 87102

6
7 Wednesday, May 18, 2016
8 5:00 PM

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Present:
Councilor Trudy E. Jones, Chair
Commissioner Art De la Cruz, Vice Chair
Councilor Pat Davis
Commissioner Maggie Hart Stebbins
Councilor Ken Sanchez

1 [Pledge of allegiance and a moment of
2 silence led by Commissioner De La Cruz.]

3 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you. First item of
4 business is the approval of the minutes. I make a
5 motion to approve the April 20th, 2016 minutes.

6 There's a motion and a second. All those
7 in favor say yes.

8 ALL COMMISSIONERS: Yes.

9 MADAME CHAIR: Opposed? Motion carries.

10 [Motion carries 5 to 0.]

11 Are there any proclamations or awards this
12 evening? Thank you.

13 Let's go with public comment. I know we
14 have several people here to speak and therefore we
15 will have -- limit the comments this evening, two
16 minutes, please.

17 Ms. Jenkins will call your name. We have a
18 very long agenda tonight, so please help cooperate
19 with that. Ms. Jenkins will call your name. If
20 you'll come down and speak into the microphone,
21 please. And, again, two minutes. Thank you.

22 MS. JENKINS: Dr. Bill Wolf followed by
23 Mark Jursic.

24 DR. WOLF: Hello. I'm Bill Wolf,
25 New Mexico dentist since 1978. During the past few

1 weeks I have sent you e-mails to assist you in your
2 decisionmaking process about water fluoridation.
3 Some of these are a research article in the
4 International Journal of Occupational and
5 Environmental Health found all samples of
6 hydrofluorosilicic acid, HSF, products tested
7 contained arsenic, lead, barium, and a surprising
8 amount of aluminum. Their conclusion, such
9 contaminant content creates the regulatory blind
10 spot that jeopardizes any safe use of flouride
11 additives.

12 The Journal of Neurotoxicology, 2007, a
13 research article, found that when HSF was added the
14 lead concentrations were four and a half times
15 higher than with just the chlorine disinfectant
16 alone, and the lead concentration is increasing with
17 time.

18 The American Journal of Public Health,
19 1984, research article revealed that skin absorption
20 of contaminants in drinking water has been
21 underestimated and that ingestion may not constitute
22 the sole or even primary root of exposure, therefore
23 everyone that's exposed to a city's water
24 fluoridation, whether they are drinking filtered
25 flouride, free water, or not.

1 I had a phone conversation with Les Hook,
2 the city public work structure, Buffalo, Wyoming, he
3 said that most water schools that he attends say try
4 to avoid adding flouride to the water because it
5 opens the door to potential lawsuits for mass dosing
6 a society with something half of the population
7 doesn't want. I've also provided you with the names
8 of three dental associations that oppose water
9 fluoridation.

10 The decision you are about to make is a
11 very controversial issue of mass medication. Why
12 doesn't the public get to vote on this and decide on
13 this themselves, instead the Board is agreeing to
14 accept responsibility for this decision without
15 consent of the community. Hopefully you will do the
16 right thing.

17 In closing, if dentists feel the teeth need
18 to be treated with the flouride, then they should
19 apply flouride directly on the teeth and not have
20 flouride added to our water so that all of us will
21 be medicated.

22 Oregon yesterday voted no fluoridation.
23 They got to vote. We didn't.

24 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you, Dr. Wolf.

25 MS. JENKINS: Mark Jursic, followed by Glen

1 Cummingford.

2 MR. JURSIK: My name is Mark Jursic. I'm a
3 resident of Albuquerque. I just wanted to make
4 three points. I am opposed to the addition of
5 flouride to our water system.

6 The three points I would like to make is
7 the World Health Organization that publishes a
8 database on tooth decay, and it's true that since
9 the 1950s when people started adding flouride to the
10 water tooth decay rates have decreases continuously.
11 They have decreased essentially the same rate, both
12 in countries where water has been added -- or
13 flouride has been added to the water and also in
14 countries where they add it to salt, and I did bring
15 the data with me. The United States is down here.
16 The lines on either side of that chart, on either
17 side of those are countries that add no flouride
18 whatsoever, so everybody's tooth decay rate is going
19 down.

20 The second point I wanted to make was in
21 July of 2015 the United States Public Health Service
22 revised their recommendations for the optimal amount
23 of flouride to place in water. They reduced it from
24 somewhere between .8 to 1.2 parts per million to 0.7
25 parts per million. Albuquerque water is already at

1 0.5 point parts per million, so we need to really
2 ask ourselves what additional health benefit we
3 think we might be getting by adding an additional
4 two-tenths of a part per million.

5 The last thing I wanted to mention is
6 something that Bill Wolf just talked about, and that
7 is that the fluoridation additive itself, the
8 fluorosilicic acid that's used to fluoridate the
9 water is actually only 25 percent active ingredient,
10 75 percent waste products. Waste product is
11 whatever is in the phosphate rock that they use to
12 make the fertilizer. It could be anything:
13 alumina, magnesia, iron oxides, lead, uranium,
14 arsenic. Whatever is in the rock is what wind up in
15 the water.

16 Thank you.

17 MS. JENKINS: Glen Cummingford followed
18 Brian Beckley.

19 MR. CUMMINGFORD: Good afternoon everyone.
20 I'd just like to --

21 MADAME CHAIR: Sir, if you would, please,
22 would you move over and speak into the microphone?

23 MR. CUMMINGFORD: Oh, I'm sorry.

24 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you.

25 MR. CUMMINGFORD: I'd just like to bring

1 attention to this article by Chief Dental Officer
2 Dr. Jesus Galvan. I don't know if he's here today
3 or not, but I just want to make a point here.
4 Everybody here that is in favor of water
5 fluoridation today will speak on one topic and one
6 topic only. The only thing they are concerned about
7 is your mouth, your teeth.

8 Okay. Flouride is a neurotoxin. It is a
9 poise that acts on a nervous system. Flouride is
10 known to effect arthritis, bone fractures, brain
11 effects, cancer, cardiovascular disease, diabetics,
12 endocrine disruption, gastronomical effects,
13 hypersensitivity, kidney disease, pineal glands,
14 skeletal fluorosis, thyroid disease, and acute
15 toxicity. But like I say, everybody here that will
16 speak in favor today will not mention anything about
17 any of this. It effects your body from the tip of
18 your toe to the head of your -- the top of your
19 head; your brain, your bones, every organ in your
20 body.

21 But the only thing that they will address
22 is it is safe for little Johnny's teeth. But what
23 is it doing to his brain? What is -- people need to
24 look into what flouride does to decrease the -- the
25 smartness of the children. It's hurting everyone.

1 And like I say it's -- and anybody who votes for
2 this today, like Dr. Wolf said, you are forcing
3 medication on me that I do not want.

4 Thank you.

5 MS. JENKINS: Brian Beckley followed by
6 Geraldine Amado.

7 MR. BECKLEY: I stand before you in favor
8 of water fluoridation. We all like to feel special.
9 Personally, nothing makes me feel more special than
10 when I'm surrounded by dumb people, and nothing
11 makes more people dumber than forcing them to drink
12 rat poise. By comparison, people with higher IQs
13 feel immensely special, so much so that we can
14 practice medicine without a license. Heck, without
15 even having a mail order diploma, we can treat
16 medical conditions like cavities by wantonly
17 distributing drugs in our water supply with no
18 regard to effect, dosage, or sensitivities of our
19 patients. How freaking cool is that? And we don't
20 even need the Kool-Aid to get them to drink it,
21 though a jet fuel chaser from the local groundwater
22 compliments it nicely.

23 Speaking of medicine, flouride is a seed
24 that will grow a fruitful bouquet of health
25 conditions: Dementia, diabetes, muscle

1 deterioration, rotting bones and teeth known as
2 fluorosis, which the CDC says effects 41 percent of
3 American children, is hard on the liver and kidneys,
4 but wait, that's not all, if you act now you get
5 cancer.

6 The Taylor Study showed that water
7 fluoridation at a level of one part per million
8 increases tumor growth by 25 percent. Quote: In
9 point of fact, flouride causes more human cancer
10 death and causes it faster than any other chemical.
11 That's a quote by Dr. Dean Burke, cofounder of the
12 U.S. National Cancer Institute. He went on to
13 equate water fluoridation with, quote, public
14 murder. Just think how much easier finding a
15 parking spot will be once the eugenics really kicks
16 in.

17 And while I'm not saying this is why it's
18 done, the added benefit or the icing on the cake is
19 that this effects Hispanics and blacks vastly more
20 than whites, on average, about 180 percent increase.
21 Based on these encouraging studies, I fully
22 recommend water fluoridation and want to thank you
23 for helping keep my teeth and Albuquerque white.

24 MS. JENKINS: Geraldine Amato, followed by
25 Deborah Sapuner Jursic.

1 MS. AMADO: I don't know why the agenda is
2 up there, you cannot read it on that screen and it's
3 obscuring the option of reading the words of the
4 speakers here on the other screens. You have an
5 agenda on three of the four of the screens.

6 This nation is not under -- have you begun
7 my time or are you going to start it now?

8 MS. JENKINS: I started it when you started
9 speaking.

10 MS. AMADO: Is it running now? Can you
11 start over? I don't know what you all are doing.
12 I'm starting to ask a question. I'm not getting an
13 answer regarding why the agenda is obscuring the
14 screen from being used with your captions.

15 MADAME CHAIR: Ms. Amado --

16 MS. AMADO: You can't read it from up
17 there.

18 MADAME CHAIR: -- your time will start
19 right now.

20 MS. AMADO: Yes, thank you, Ms. Jones.
21 You're so kind.

22 We're not under a rule of law. We're under
23 the golden rule. Those who hold the gold rule,
24 United States Uniform Commercial Code. The
25 international banksters have a network that have

1 seized the resources of this nation, and water, a
2 vital resource, all of its people, is a mere
3 commodity to those in charge of this economy.
4 Squandering it, toxifying it, polluting it is also
5 useful to the international reprobates, who wish to
6 bring this nation down. You can't prosecute is
7 rebellion without water. That's a vital resource.

8 This state itself can be totally
9 incapacitated and crippled by the pollution and the
10 squandering and the toxifying of its water.
11 Sickening and weakening and killing persons by
12 increments as we are being -- as being done in this
13 nation is useful to those who wish to control this
14 nation. All over the world people who haven't been
15 available to corrupt as we Americans have been are
16 being blown to smithereens because they maintained a
17 spirit of resistance.

18 Here we find that most people are cowards
19 and are willing to be mercenary slaves for the
20 establishment. They're afraid of taking any risks.
21 They're afraid of sticking their necks out. They're
22 afraid of losing this or that creature comfort while
23 our lives are being destroyed. It is no mere
24 coincidence that youngsters are on drugs, that
25 people are committing suicide, that their hospitals

1 are having a flourishing business and we stand
2 around and talk in circles with mason mind games.
3 Everybody's head is on the block and if these
4 scoundrels get total control of this nation there
5 will be a genocide of grand proportions here.
6 They're doing it all over the world today. The
7 people that control Washington D.C. all over the
8 world, claiming they're finding some ghosts of an
9 opposition group when they're actually committing
10 genocide all over the earth regarding folks who
11 maintained a spirit of --

12 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you, Ms. Amado. Your
13 time is up.

14 MS. AMADO: Yeah, why don't you turn up the
15 microphone now, Ms. Trudy.

16 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you, Ms. Amado.

17 Ms. Jenkins, your next speaker is?

18 MS. AMADO: You can turn up the microphone
19 now.

20 MS. JENKINS: Deborah Sapuner Jursic --

21 MS. AMADO: You rude person.

22 MS. JENKINS: -- followed by Sevalin
23 Sapuner Laher.

24 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you.

25 MS. SAPUNER JURISIC: Hi. I'm totally

1 against adding flouride to Albuquerque's water
2 supply for many reasons, and I'm going to address
3 two.

4 First, flouride is a neurotoxin. A March
5 2014 report from the Lancet Medical Journal
6 officially classified flouride as a neurotoxin.
7 This is the same category as arsenic, lead, and
8 mercury.

9 Second, there is no way to control the
10 amount of flouride each citizen will consume. We
11 will drink the fluoridated water, bathe in the
12 fluoridated water, and eat food and beverages we
13 prepare with fluoridated water in addition to
14 processed foods and drinks made with fluoridated
15 water. And don't forget the use of fluoridated
16 toothpaste.

17 A recent national survey conducted by the
18 CDC found about 40 percent of American teenagers
19 with visible signs of fluoride overexposure.
20 Infants who consume formula made with fluoridated
21 tap water ingest 77 to 1200 micrograms of fluoride.
22 That's about 100 times more than the recommended
23 amount by the Institute of Medicine. In July of
24 2012 scientists from Harvard University warn that
25 the developing brain may be another target for

1 fluoride toxicity.

2 There are also conditions that make those
3 in our community more vulnerable to flouride
4 toxicity, such as living in poor neighborhoods,
5 nutrient deficiencies, infant formula consumption,
6 diabetes, and kidney disease. Let's not step back
7 to the 1940s and '50s when fluoridating the water
8 was sought to be the greatest chemical to fight
9 tooth disease. Let us use our current day knowledge
10 and research to realize that fluoridating our city
11 and county water supply cannot keep teeth healthy
12 and can cause more harm than good to the residents
13 of Albuquerque and Bernalillo County.

14 MS. JENKINS: Sevalin Sapuner Laher
15 followed by Jeff Pappert.

16 MADAME CHAIR: Ma'am, your time is up.
17 Thank you. Thank you, your time is up.

18 MR. DE LA CRUZ: I'd like to hear the
19 little girl.

20 MS. SAPUNER JURISIC: This is my
21 granddaughter Sevalin, so she has a letter.

22 MADAME CHAIR: Okay, all right. Thank you.
23 Sorry.

24 MS. SAPUNER JURISIC: She signed up.

25 MADAME CHAIR: I thought she was speaking

1 with you.

2 MS. SAPUNER JURISIC: No, no, no.

3 MADAME CHAIR: Okay, thank you.

4 MS. SAPUNER JURISIC: She signed up.

5 MS. LAHER: So I don't think that it's good
6 that people, you guys will be deciding whether or
7 not there will be flouride in our water because it
8 has to do with our own personal health and we may
9 not want a chemical in our drinking water.

10 Thank you.

11 And -- and I've researched and it says that
12 states that -- it says that countries with flouride
13 in their water do not have less tooth decay than
14 countries without flouride in their water. And what
15 if you're allergic to flouride and you -- that's the
16 only water that you can get. And so I think that we
17 should be able to decide whether or not we get a
18 chemical put in our own water because it has to do
19 with our own health.

20 Thank you.

21 MS. JENKINS: Jeff Pappert followed by Don
22 Schrader.

23 MR. PAPPERT: This board has a tremendous
24 responsibility, and it appears that at least half of
25 you aren't paying any attention. Please let the

1 record show that Mr. Rob Perry, Mr. Pat Davis and
2 Ms. Maggie Hart Stebbins have not paid any attention
3 during the entire first part of this presentation.

4 When fluoridated water is consumed
5 regularly toxic levels of flourine, the poisonous
6 substance from which flouride is derived build up in
7 the body causing irreparable harm to the immune
8 system. The Delaney congressional investigation
9 committee, the government body charged with
10 monitoring additives and other substances in the
11 food supply has stated flouride -- fluoridation is
12 mass medication without parallel in the history of
13 medicine, and I would add without our consent.

14 Meanwhile, no convincing scientific proof
15 has ever been generated that fluoridated water makes
16 stronger bones and teeth. It is known, however,
17 that chronic flouride exposure can result in health
18 problems including osteoporosis, osteomalacia, and
19 damages to the teeth including mottling. Numerous
20 compounds of flourine exist. They are all
21 notoriously toxic compounds, so much so that they
22 are used in rat poison and insecticides.

23 Many ailments and disorders including Downs
24 Syndrome and cancer have been linked to fluoridated
25 water. So let's just review here: Flouride is

1 poison. Flouride has been shown to cause immune
2 system damage, cancers, including cancer of the
3 thyroid, osteoporosis, Downs Syndrome children -- do
4 you really want to cause more Downs Syndrome babies
5 in this county? Is that what this board is wanting
6 to do here? Osteomalacia, I don't know what this is
7 but I don't want my elderly mother to get it.

8 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Pappert.

9 MR. PAPPERT: And hip fractures, which I
10 definitely don't want my elderly mother to get.

11 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Pappert.
12 Your time is up.

13 MR. PAPPERT: Thank you.

14 MADAME CHAIR: The next speaker?

15 MS. JENKINS: Don Schrader, followed by Tad
16 Nimenski.

17 MR. SCHRADER: See the universal symbol for
18 a deadly poison, the skull and cross bones on
19 containers of sodium flouride. Are you sure
20 fluoridation has no unintended consequences? Some
21 drugs developed by highly paid scientists and
22 prescribed for years by many doctors were later
23 recalled and banned because of severe side effects.
24 Are you sure water fluoridation causes no long-range
25 harm to health?

1 Decades ago a leading medical journal
2 advertised cigarettes, and some doctors recommended
3 cigarettes, but eventually we found out the deadly
4 truth. Some experts introduced non-native species
5 in many places but they did not foresee the massive
6 environmental harm they were doing. Are you sure
7 that all the scientific studies, all the articles,
8 all the books the past 50 years damning fluoridation
9 are totally wrong?

10 Why is fluoridation not legal in Sweden,
11 Denmark, and Holland? Why have France and Norway
12 never fluoridated? Why did Germany and Belgium stop
13 fluoridation? Are you sure beyond all reasonable
14 doubt fluoridated drinking water poses no health
15 dangers to anyone? If you vote to fluoridate will
16 you someday discover how deceived and diluted you
17 were?

18 MS. JENKINS: Tad Nimenski followed by
19 Christine Nathe.

20 MR. NIMENSKI: Thank you. My name is Tad
21 Nimenski. Yes, Maggie Hart Stebbins, over two years
22 ago we went through all these multiple meetings.
23 I'm not going to drill on this meeting tonight. The
24 answer is very clear, look at two years back. Now
25 I'm going to be talking about what's going on with

1 water utility contract and contractors and water
2 utility stuff. I cannot get any answer from the
3 mayor, that mayor no way to be around, mayor this --
4 this representative, not answering either. I'm
5 sorry he's not here. Now look at west side. Look
6 at east side, all these constitutions going on on
7 the west side. If you remember 12, about 12 years
8 ago, million dollar was spent. Now during this
9 administration now look at what's going on, very few
10 trees, dying trees remain on the median.

11 Well, I'm sorry, shame on for you all, the
12 crews Sanchez, Pena and -- and others. So now
13 what's happened, they'd made so many passways
14 through median. Well, and what's he done, instead
15 they're supposed to -- supposed to replace back with
16 the build, landscaping, no, they paid -- they made
17 driveway through businesses. What BS. Who you
18 lying? I'm sorry, you all involved. I understood
19 also you city is under court jurisdiction now. Yes,
20 you all represented city right here and --

21 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Nimenski.
22 Thank you, Mr. Nimenski. Your time is up.

23 Next speaker?

24 MS. JENKINS: Christine Nathe followed by
25 John Beshley.

1 MS. NATHE: Hi, I'm Christine Nathe. I'm a
2 dental hygienist. I've been a hygienist for 30
3 years. I'm in support of community water
4 fluoridation as a safe and effective way to reduce
5 dental cavities. It's been hailed as one of the 10
6 best public health achievements in the 20 century,
7 and I think the best thing about water fluoridation
8 is that it has the ability to impact all people
9 regardless of income or ability to access dental
10 care. Thanks.

11 MS. JENKINS: John Beshley followed by
12 Jesus Galvan.

13 MR. BESHLEY: Hi. I gave you guys a paper
14 from the Harvard study, and it shows that there's a
15 15 percent DV -- or 15 number deviation in the IQ of
16 children on this study. We're last in everything,
17 and I don't know how we can get any lower. I mean,
18 you know, flouride might bring us even lower as far
19 as our -- our children's health. I -- I have
20 physical problems and it was really hard for me to
21 get down here physically it was important enough for
22 me to come here.

23 I have a water filtration system to get,
24 you know, poisons out of there, but I can't do it
25 for my bass and stuff. And your skin, it's absorbed

1 through your skin, and it's the largest organ and I
2 don't want it in my bathing water. Do any of you
3 guys have water filtration systems in your house? I
4 bet every one of you do because you're afraid of the
5 water. Whose idea was it to -- to add the flouride
6 in this committee? Can anybody -- who decided? It
7 just popped up? I'm asking a question. Can anybody
8 answer me?

9 MADAME CHAIR: Sir, this is not an
10 interactive. This is your opportunity to speak to
11 us. This is not a question and answer period.

12 MR. BESHLEY: Well, I would like to know.
13 And where is the mayor? I thought the mayor was
14 part of this committee?

15 Yeah, it's -- there's no good reason for
16 it. It's right up there with lead, so why don't we
17 add lead to the water too.

18 MS. JENKINS: Jesus Galvan followed by
19 Barbara Parker.

20 DR. GALVAN: Jesus Galvan. I will just
21 respond quickly to a couple of comments that have
22 been made so far. One to sort of clarify the
23 relative difference between the existing level of
24 flouride in Albuquerque's water, which is at .4
25 parts per million or .4 milligrams per liter. The

1 recommended effective optimal level is .7. When
2 studies were done in the early part of the 1900s on
3 what is the optimal level of flouride, it was
4 observed that for every .3 milligram drop in water
5 fluoridation, the effectiveness in preventing dental
6 care dropped 75 percent.

7 So right now the water in Albuquerque,
8 instead of optimal .7 X value of prevention we have
9 one-third of X as far as the value of prevention.
10 And just as to remind all of us that the whole
11 concept of water fluoridation, trying to do water
12 fluoridation was put before the voters decades ago
13 in this city and all of us as citizens voted yes on
14 that proposition.

15 Thank you.

16 MS. JENKINS: Barbara Parker followed by
17 Rudy Blea.

18 MR. BLEA: Good afternoon, ladies and
19 gentlemen. On behalf of the Department of Health
20 Services I'm here to speak to you in the
21 administration support for community water
22 fluoridation. The department's focus is to prevent
23 diseases such as tooth decay, diabetics diabetes,
24 heart disease and other chronic diseases.

25 Preventing disease requires a number of

1 approaches, and in the case of oral health community
2 water fluoridation, brushing, flossing, seeing a
3 dental provider, learning about the disease process
4 and healthy eating contribute to a healthy mouth.
5 As we know, over 70 years of research has shown no
6 evidence that flouride is detrimental to a person's
7 health and in the past decades no one in Albuquerque
8 has reported any illness from fluoridation.

9 Community water fluoridation is the best
10 practice health approach to reducing the incidents
11 of tooth decay in all populations. The science has
12 shown that tooth decay among populations is reduced
13 when providing fluoridation to its customers. The
14 department alone is not -- the department is not
15 alone. The e-mails, letters to the editor, personal
16 letters from your constituents with group
17 signatures, local dental providers, ABQ
18 organizations such as the UNM dental staff and other
19 organizations in New Mexico support community water
20 fluoridation.

21 A yes vote means that you are fulfilling
22 your oath by providing your community with needed
23 health resources to maintain healthy living
24 lifestyles and implementing a good health policy for
25 your customers. As members of representing the

1 county and city you are safeguarding the oral
2 healthcare of your constituents.

3 In FY '14, 2,685 emergency room visits were
4 made to Bernalillo County hospitals. Unfortunately,
5 an ER visit means only temporary care. Where did
6 the other people go? Community water fluoridation
7 would help support reduce the incidents of tooth
8 decay and reduce the number of those ER visits to
9 Albuquerque hospitals.

10 MS. JENKINS: Rudy Blea followed by --
11 Glinelle Bueler.

12 MS. BUTLER: I hope that -- I hope that
13 says Butler. Glinelle is right for the first time.

14 MS. JENKINS: It may say Butler.

15 MS. BUTLER: Okay, I'm sorry. I would like
16 to speak for part of the population that hasn't been
17 totally addressed yet, and it's children that do not
18 have access to dental care. And it's true if a
19 dentist thinks they need flouride they can put
20 flouride applications on their teeth, but not all
21 children do not have dentists, and that is a very
22 big problem because those children would go from
23 having a small decay and it could go on to an
24 abscess which can effect their total health, and the
25 same with the elderly as well that don't have --

1 that need medicaid and they don't have dentists to
2 provide that care.

3 And this population could certainly benefit
4 from the addition of flouride, which we had in our
5 water for years and years and years and then all of
6 a sudden it was just discontinued, therefore we're
7 back addressing it now. Thank you.

8 MS. JENKINS: Joe Martinez followed by
9 Dr. Ron Romero.

10 MR. MARTINEZ: Well, a very good evening to
11 you. I'm Joe Martinez. I work with Health Action
12 New Mexico and I'm a resident of the International
13 District. I've been there 32 years. First I want
14 to leave with you 140 signatures of families from
15 all over the district, all over the county, all over
16 the county, and these are families that have one
17 statement to offer to you, and that is I fully
18 support the use of community water fluoridation to
19 improve the oral health of my family and my
20 community.

21 Second, I want to thank you, as members of
22 the Water Authority, for safeguarding, for being so
23 observant to make sure that there is a solid
24 oversight for the best practices in delivering
25 quality affordable water to all residents of this

1 community. You're doing an excellent job.

2 Lastly, I want to say 75 percent of the
3 U.S. population lives in communities that do
4 community water fluoridation, 75 percent of the
5 population of the United States live in those
6 communities. They know the benefits. Please take
7 the action this night tonight to resume community
8 water fluoridation. Then you can go home feeling
9 good that you have done something wonderful for so
10 many children, families, and all residents of this
11 community.

12 Thank you.

13 MS. JENKINS: Dr. Ron Romero followed by
14 Dr. Phil Eaton.

15 DR. ROMERO: Thank you for this -- for your
16 time. I want to say fluoridation saves money in two
17 ways: Basically by -- for families it'll save money
18 because without fluoridation is dental bills are
19 going to go up for families and it also saves money
20 for the taxpayer because there's public insurance
21 coverage. I see that going up, and that system is
22 already challenged as it is.

23 Fluoridation is safe. Numerous studies and
24 reports have reenforced the safety of fluoridated
25 water as experts in the sociology of toxicology have

1 explained, medical scientists have agreed that
2 concentrations of flouride have health benefits that
3 vastly exceed any hypoethical health risks. A 2015
4 report by the Water Research Foundation examined
5 nine common concerns that critics raise about
6 fluoridation. These water experts concluded that a
7 balance of scientific studies show that none of
8 these issues pose a risk to public health at
9 fluoridation levels.

10 U.S. fluoridation practices are held to
11 high standards of quality and safety. These
12 additives, the quality and safety are ensured by
13 standard 60, a set of guidelines developed by the
14 request of the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA.
15 I also have a letter from the American Academy of
16 Pediatrics New Mexico Pediatric Society.

17 The New Mexico Pediatric Society strongly
18 recommends community dental -- community water
19 fluoridation for Albuquerque. Thank you.

20 MS. JENKINS: Dr. Phil Eaton followed by
21 Dr. Brian Flamm.

22 DR. EATON: Madame Chair and Members of the
23 Committee, thank you for the opportunity to speak.
24 I'm a maritus physician at the University of
25 New Mexico and have spent my last 47 years studying

1 chronic disease and I want to tell you that the
2 challenge of the nutrition and health of our
3 children is a huge challenge for all of us.
4 Fluoridation is one way in which we can really
5 impact the nutrition of the children because care is
6 an enormous problem, and its success in this country
7 has been demonstrated over and over again.

8 The science of how to make a difference to
9 an infectious disease, which is what this is, is
10 always challenging and we always look for better
11 ways. But at the moment the -- the scientific
12 evaluation in this country has certainly established
13 that fluoridation is one of the crucial ways to
14 improve the health of our children. Thank you.

15 MS. JENKINS: Dr. Brian Flamm followed by
16 Elaine Hebbard.

17 DR. FLAMM: Thank you for your time this
18 evening. You know, all vitamins and minerals and
19 varied nutritional supplements sold in health food
20 stores have one thing in common, they're all part of
21 our human biochemistry. Flouride is not in this
22 group as a nutrient because it does not exist in
23 human biochemistry. It's therefore a medication, a
24 drug that by definition should be approved and
25 regulated like any other therapeutic.

1 Even the FDA stated decades ago, quote,
2 used therapeutically to treat or prevent tooth decay
3 makes it a drug. I can't explain why it hasn't been
4 regulated as such but that's where we are today.
5 Ask any biologist, cell biologist, biochemist, how
6 do you stop an enzyme or a hormone reaction, a
7 biological system? Drop a little flouride into it.
8 It just stops it stone dead. That tells me
9 something.

10 We've heard this evening that water
11 fluoridation began in the '40s and the '50s when it
12 was believed at that time that drinking fluoridated
13 water would help prevent tooth decay. Well, back in
14 those days too we also believed lead was a good
15 thing to put in gasoline. Well, later we learned it
16 wasn't. You know, it took years to get it out of
17 some gasoline but it's still in the environment with
18 problems of flint. Let's not go down that road
19 again.

20 In the years since we've learned more about
21 flouride and how it effects the tooth, one needs to
22 treat the tooth directly. So this is already common
23 practice by brushing the teeth with flouride
24 toothpaste, topical treatments by a dentist. It's
25 impossible to monitor flouride in this community

1 because it's available in Teflon pans, in
2 pesticides, from crops, from coffee, from juices,
3 from sodas, from alcoholic beverages, and babies are
4 disproportionately effected by flouride presence in
5 baby formula. They're getting -- they're getting
6 overdoses and showing -- showing fluorosis of the
7 teeth. So do the right thing, please, don't mass
8 medicate a society. Thank you.

9 MS. JENKINS: Elaine Hebbard followed by
10 Bill Jordan.

11 MS. HEBBARD: Good afternoon. I'm not
12 going to talk about flouride. My name is Elaine
13 Hebbard, and I'm going to talk about a subject that
14 I've brought up before, goals and objectives. I
15 know they're important. They're important to you.
16 You have a budget ordinance which requires that the
17 budget be consistent with goals and objectives. Is
18 it?

19 Also to maintain uniformity other
20 legislation and policies are to be consistent with
21 goals and objectives. And furthermore, to adopt the
22 goals and objectives process that encourages active
23 citizen participation -- I'm reading this from your
24 ordinance -- that is linked to the budget process
25 that encourages performance measurement and that is

1 consistent with the designed conditions of -- of the
2 Authority, it shall coordinate its goals with the
3 city and the county. Furthermore, do they line up
4 with tonight's presentation on the public's
5 priorities?

6 Those of you on city council are likely
7 familiar with the Indicator's Progress Commission.
8 It's going to have a goals forum in July. Why not
9 link and coordinate the goals and review the goals
10 of the ABCWA along with the city's goals at that
11 time?

12 Also four quick comments about the Water
13 Resource Management Strategy update on the agenda.
14 One, obviously those policies should be consistent
15 with the goals and objectives. Second, that the
16 groundwater management plan, which was proposed to
17 you in January represents a major policy change and
18 I believe should be something that the Board looks
19 at. I would hope that it would do so, make a
20 decision one way or another with hopefully some
21 input from outside of staff such as counsel services
22 provides input to -- and advice to the city staff.

23 So other than my two minutes, you rarely
24 hear much about other input. Thank you.

25 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you. That is the last

1 speaker.

2 MS. JENKINS: No, I'm sorry. We've got one
3 more, Bill Jordan.

4 MADAME CHAIR: Okay, I'm sorry. One Mr.
5 Speaker. And the name again, Ms. Jenkins?

6 MS. JENKINS: Bill Jordan.

7 MADAME CHAIR: Bill Jordan? Okay. That is
8 the last of the speakers.

9 The next scheduled meeting will be June
10 22nd, 2016 at 5:00 PM in the Vincent E. Griego
11 chambers.

12 Commissioner De La Cruz?

13 MR. DE LA CRUZ: Thank you, Madame Chair.
14 I move that we adjust the agenda a little bit and
15 move item 9-E, R-6 -- R-16-4, which would be
16 appropriating funds for operating the Albuquerque
17 Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority fiscal
18 year beginning July 1st 2016 and ending June 30th,
19 2017. There are a lot of people that are here
20 specifically on this flouride issue, and so I think
21 that we ought to move this up and get this done so
22 people don't have to hang out for a bunch of things
23 that they may not be interested in. I think it's a
24 matter of courtesy.

25 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you. Is there a

1 second?

2 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Second.

3 MADAME CHAIR: There's a motion and a
4 second to change the agenda and add B and C, 9-B and
5 C to the next items. All those in favor say yes.

6 ALL COMMISSIONERS: Yes.

7 MADAME CHAIR: Opposed? Motion carries.

8 [Motion carries 5 to 0.]

9 Therefore we will be hearing R-16-4,
10 appropriating funds for operating the Albuquerque
11 Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority for the
12 fiscal year beginning July 1, 2016 and ending
13 June 30, 2017. Mr. Stan Allred will be presenting
14 both at the same time.

15 MR. ALLRED: Madame Chairman and Members of
16 the Board, what you have before you is the operating
17 and capital improvement budgets for fiscal year
18 2017. Just real quickly, some of the
19 accomplishments we've done in FY '16, we've received
20 a Knock Well Award for -- the gold recognition award
21 for excellence in management. We've also received
22 the award for public information education award for
23 our elephant in our grease ad campaign.

24 We've received awards from the Government
25 of Finance Association for both our CAFR and our

1 budget for excellence in reporting for both. And
2 we've received from a May opp, the vision award for
3 some things we've done this year.

4 The FY '17 budgets and assumptions, there
5 is no rate increase for this fiscal -- upcoming
6 fiscal year. Nominal growth in the service area, we
7 used FY '15 consumption levels of 100,000 -- 130
8 gallons per person per day. There's a 5 percent
9 growth in operating expenses which includes only
10 essential items.

11 We increased the rate reserve by \$2 million
12 bringing that balance to 8 million, and we will
13 bring the fund balance to one-twelfth of operating
14 expenditures.

15 Some of the things, the highlights in the
16 budget, we do propose in the budget \$250,000 in the
17 operating for the addition of supplemental flourides
18 to the drinking water as well as an additional
19 250,000 in the capital budget to provide the
20 facilities, and -- and the capital needs to put that
21 into the system.

22 In asset management implementation we'll
23 continue to do work at the water reclamation plant
24 in this next fiscal year. In customer services, one
25 of the things we're pretty proud of, and

1 Commissioner Hart Stebbins kind of recommended to us
2 last year is to be able to take online payments for
3 the Living River Fund, and that will go into effect
4 on July 1st. We're hoping to do a presentation on
5 how that actually will work at the next board
6 meeting, but that will be up and running in the next
7 month and a half.

8 And we are continuing work with the
9 automated meter infrastructure, and we will begin
10 phase four and 50 percent of our system will be on
11 the AMR network.

12 We are doing -- as far as IT goes, we're
13 doing upgrades to our maximum work order and
14 inventory system. That work will be done by the end
15 of the fiscal year. We will start an RFP process to
16 do an upgrade to our customer care and billing
17 system, which is what we use to bill our customers
18 for water and sewer rates, and we will go live with
19 our Lab Advantage System that allows our compliance
20 group to automate their lab results and provide
21 those things to the regulatory agencies. And we
22 continue to invest interim employees, their
23 development and upward mobility.

24 Real quick, on the -- just on the revenue,
25 we budgeted about 216, \$217 million in revenue,

1 55 percent will be coming from the water rates with
2 an additional 37 percent coming from wastewater
3 rates. We have the franchise fee, and then transfer
4 to CIP in this miscellaneous revenue.

5 Our working capital balance started out of
6 with a negative \$8 million in fiscal year '16. It
7 will be upwards over 4 million. It may be even
8 upwards over 6 million. The projections for FY '17
9 is that we'll be in at one-twelfth of our
10 requirement. And then we've increased our transfer
11 to CIP by \$6.2 million. So our expenditures for
12 fiscal year 2017, the primary 33.3 percent for debt
13 service, 26.7 percent for wages and benefits for our
14 employees, and 24.4 percent for the operating of
15 such things as power, chemicals, and those types of
16 things for the utility.

17 Highlights for the CIP: \$67 million
18 appropriated for next fiscal year, 59 million will
19 be for the basic rehab program. Most of that will
20 be for the Water Reclamation Plant, reconstruction
21 of the South Soliz Water Facility. We'll continue
22 to put an additional \$2 million for the automatic
23 meter infrastructure. We'll dedicate \$1 million for
24 steel line replacement, and we will probably do more
25 than that but there's that much dedicated for that.

1 We have \$350,000 set aside for renewable energy
2 projects. A big one coming online will be the solar
3 array at the water treatment plant. They should
4 come online by January of 2017. We have 4 million
5 for growth projects. We move all our water supply
6 charges that we generated this last fiscal year,
7 \$474,000 to pay for water rights enhancements, and
8 then we have the \$250,000 for supplemental flouride.

9 So just real quick, just to do a graphic
10 about the CIP spending, the 88.6 percent is for
11 rehab for our system.

12 And then this last graphic just continues
13 to show our commitment and what we have done as far
14 as increasing our CIP spending. As we ramp up our
15 CIP spending we have actually, along at the same
16 path, increased our transfer from the operating
17 budget to pay for that and in limiting bonding
18 capacity.

19 So I stand for any questions.

20 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Allred. Are
21 there any questions? Councilor Sanchez?

22 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: Thank you, Madame
23 Chairman. My first question is in regards to the
24 rates going up. There is no rate increase this
25 coming fiscal year; is that correct?

1 MR. ALLRED: Councilor Sanchez and Madame
2 Chairman, that is correct. There is, what we will
3 discuss on the other approvals is the rate
4 ordinance. There is an increase, as mandated by the
5 rate ordinance for the water supply charge and the
6 utility expansion charges to be updated by the E&R
7 index. That's 2.9 percent. We can discuss it when
8 we get there, but that's basically an impact for a
9 three-quarter inch meter which our residential
10 customers would use between \$86 for water, \$44 for
11 sewer and an -- or for a water supply charge, and
12 \$64 for sewer, and that's the only increases that we
13 have with the rate ordinance.

14 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: And the other
15 question I have is regarding the issue of the
16 flouride, what is going to be the additional cost in
17 the budget? Because I think I heard the number
18 250,000 plus 250,000 for equipment.

19 MR. ALLRED: So in the budget there's
20 \$250,000 appropriation for the operating for the
21 maintenance of providing flouride. There's a
22 transfer of \$250,000 from the operating budget to
23 CIP to pay for the capital improvements in CIP, and
24 there's an appropriation in the CIP budget of
25 \$250,000 which comes from the transfer of operating

1 to pay for the facilities to provide flouride to the
2 system.

3 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: And I'm not sure who
4 can answer this question, but Dr. Galvan made a
5 statement that we are right now at 0.4 per million.
6 The packet is saying that it is 0.5 per million and
7 we are looking at going up to 0.7 per million; is
8 that correct?

9 MR. ALLRED: Councilor Sanchez and Madame
10 Chairman, I would probably defer that to Mr. Kelly.

11 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: Thank you.

12 MR. KELLY: In 2014 when we did our last
13 sampling through the state, the levels were 0.5
14 parts per million throughout the system. When we do
15 factor in the sampling that we do that is
16 supplemental to that, that that required sampling is
17 a small subset that we publish in the CCR that is
18 done by the state, which is 0.5. When we include
19 the sampling that is done on a voluntary basis our
20 monitoring indicates it's right around 0.4 to 0.5,
21 so that's the reason for the different numbers.

22 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: And by going up to
23 the -- going up by two-tenths of a percent, what
24 difference will that make in the water? Do we have
25 some scientific studies that it's -- they're saying

1 it's the optimum amount; is that correct?

2 MR. KELLY: The CDC has provided that as
3 the number that they recommend. So it's not a
4 requirement from them, but it is a recommendation
5 from them. The number that we cannot go above is 4
6 milligrams per liter set by the EPA, which we're
7 very much below. But the CDC set that 0.7 parts per
8 million as a recommended target.

9 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: Thank you.

10 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you. Are there any
11 other questions? Thank you.

12 Mr. Allred, will you go ahead with R-16-5
13 also and then we'll discuss both?

14 MR. ALLRED: Madame Chairman and Members of
15 the Board, as I stated before I use the rate
16 ordinance, the only thing in that ordinance is
17 basically updating the dual expansion charges for
18 water and sewer and the water supply charge by the
19 engineering news report index. We use the building
20 and construction cost index as -- and that's
21 2.9 percent. And we did some clerical modifications
22 just to clarify the language for our water meter
23 process.

24 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you. Are there any
25 questions?

1 With that, I would like to introduce
2 amendment, floor amendment number one to R-16-4.
3 This is on page -- I'll let you hand it out. This
4 is to the budget on R-16-4 on page 2. Delete lines
5 14 and 18. Line 14 is \$250,000 for the supplemental
6 flouride, and line 18 is the transfer to capital for
7 flouride of \$250,000. This basically takes out of
8 the budget the additional fluoridation that we're
9 discussing here this evening.

10 MR. DE LA CRUZ: Did you move that?

11 MADAME CHAIR: I did move that.

12 MR. DE LA CRUZ: Second.

13 MADAME CHAIR: That's been moved and
14 seconded. Is there any discussion?

15 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Yes, Madame
16 Chair.

17 MADAME CHAIR: Commissioner Hart Stebbins.

18 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Thank you,
19 Madame Chairman. I would like first -- since we
20 have Dr. Galvan here in the chamber, I'd like to ask
21 if he could answer the question about -- that
22 Councilor Sanchez raised about the difference in
23 efficacy between .5 and .7, if that's allowable,
24 Madame Chair.

25 MADAME CHAIR: It is indeed, Commissioner.

1 DR. GALVAN: Commissioner Stebbins, Chair
2 Hart, Chair Jones, the -- the figure that I was
3 using, which was -- you know, which was mentioned,
4 the .4 to .5 milligrams per liter or parts per
5 million, those two measurements are completely
6 interchangeable, in the early studies that went on
7 before fluoridation was actively introduced in the
8 mid 1940s, the different levels of flouride were
9 evaluated as far as efficacy, and it was observed
10 that -- and I threw out the .3 milligrams change
11 because that seems to be the difference between what
12 is currently occurring naturally in our city's water
13 or our county's water and what would be optimally
14 achieved through supplemental fluoridation.

15 So a change in .3 milligrams liter
16 downward, in other words from .7 to .4 results in a
17 75 percent loss in efficacy of supplemental
18 fluoridation. In other words, the gain in reduction
19 of dental carries is decreased by 75 percent. Is
20 that -- did I make that clear enough? I'm not --

21 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Yeah,
22 absolutely. That does answer my question.

23 DR. GALVAN: Oh, okay.

24 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Have you
25 looked at the CDC report or the CDC recommendation

1 that was released last year?

2 DR. GALVAN: Yes.

3 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: What was the
4 reasoning for the .7 recommendation?

5 DR. GALVAN: Actually, .7 has been the
6 recommendation since the mid '40s. .7 was always
7 the ultimate goal that we were to reach in order to
8 try to assure that, you know, the average citizen
9 was ingesting .7 parts per million. Or let's use
10 then different measurements, was ingesting
11 .7 milligrams per liter of water consumed, knowing
12 that the average person drinks a certain amount of
13 water in cooler times or in warmer times in
14 different parts of our country.

15 The range that was established at the time,
16 .7 to 1.2 was to try to accommodate the difference
17 in temperatures and water consumption patterns that
18 existed across the country, across the geographic
19 country, and across the different seasons. So that
20 was a range that could be moved up and down with the
21 ultimate goal of establishing .7 milligrams per
22 liter as the optimal dose. So the CDC's
23 recommendation of last year merely reaffirmed what
24 it had been saying for 70 years.

25 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: All right

1 thank you.

2 DR. GALVAN: Thank you.

3 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: And I guess
4 I've got a question maybe for John Stomper, someone
5 on the Water Authority Board.

6 MADAME CHAIR: Commissioner, is --
7 Mr. Perry has a question of this gentleman.

8 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Oh, of course.

9 MADAME CHAIR: Maybe ask -- would you come
10 back, sir?

11 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Dr. Galvan? Thank
12 you, Madame Chair, thank you, Commissioner Stebbins.

13 DR. GALVAN: Yes, sir?

14 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Dr. Galvan, I was
15 interested in your comments as well that said that
16 reducing it from the .7 to .04 reduces the
17 effectiveness of the flouride as a tooth decay
18 fighting agent by about 75 percent.

19 DR. GALVAN: Uh-huh.

20 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Is that the point you
21 were kind of making?

22 DR. GALVAN: It was. And it was .4, not
23 0 -- not 0.04.

24 COMMISSIONER PERRY: .4. And I wasn't
25 quite sure like where that science came from because

1 from what I understand that -- you mentioned the
2 1940s, and from what I understand the history of
3 flouride is that it really started in the United
4 States in, what, Grand Rapids, Michigan in 1945.

5 DR. GALVAN: 1945, yes.

6 COMMISSIONER PERRY: And I think that the
7 scientists started conducting empirical studies and
8 analysis basically back in the 1930s?

9 DR. GALVAN: As early as the 1870s and '80s
10 was when it first came to light. And it came to
11 light at the time because it was being observed that
12 a number of people from the western part of the
13 country had extremely low levels of dental decay,
14 very low incidents of decay, but they had high
15 incidents of stained teeth. The stained teeth got
16 the nickname of Colorado brown teeth. That was what
17 they were called at the time. That was -- this was
18 the disease, Colorado brown teeth.

19 In doing studies, they found that the
20 flouride, which naturally occurred in the water in
21 Colorado at very high levels was preventing decay
22 but it was also staining the teeth so they started
23 looking at, okay, how can we arrive at a level that
24 optimally decreases decay but doesn't harm the teeth
25 otherwise like with staining.

1 So, no, those studies went on for 20 or 30
2 years before the introduction of community water
3 fluoridation in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

4 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Okay. When I was
5 reading the Center for Disease control and looking a
6 little bit at the background, I'll quote, it said in
7 the 1930s scientists began to examine the
8 relationship between tooth decay in children and
9 naturally occurring flouride in drinking water.

10 DR. GALVAN: Yes.

11 COMMISSIONER PERRY: So I stand corrected
12 and, you know, I'm sure that they probably were
13 doing it before the CDC says they were. But I guess
14 my question is, what is that predicated on, that
15 exponential, you know, formula, that .4 percent
16 reduction equates to a 75 percent reduction in tooth
17 decay?

18 DR. GALVAN: If we are achieving a certain
19 level of percentage reduction in decay rates and we
20 drop the level of flouride in the community water,
21 those levels of decay, those rates of decay tend to
22 go up then. And so that's a measure if we are able
23 to reduce decay to a certain level then we --
24 allowing it to rise back up is a loss of efficacy.
25 Am I -- are you following me? I'm sorry.

1 COMMISSIONER PERRY: I'm trying to follow
2 you. For the most part I am.

3 DR. GALVAN: Okay.

4 COMMISSIONER PERRY: What I'm interested in
5 is why I couldn't find any science that actually
6 studied that. You know, you referred to a study
7 back in the 1940s or '30s, whenever, that looked at
8 what that proportionate measurement was, and I would
9 think that the technology that actually, you know,
10 measured precision calculations like that was
11 probably a lot less than what we have available now.

12 DR. GALVAN: It was probably a lot less
13 than what we have now, yes.

14 COMMISSIONER PERRY: And I'm just wondering
15 why no one took another look at it, I guess is --

16 DR. GALVAN: Yeah.

17 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Why, do you -- do you
18 know of any studies more recently, maybe perhaps in
19 the last 20 years that looked at what the factor is
20 as it relates to the portionality of a reduction --
21 a quantitative reduction in the fluoridation rate as
22 compared to its impact on tooth decay?

23 DR. GALVAN: I'm sorry. I don't think I
24 followed you there.

25 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Okay. Do you know of

1 any recent studies that have looked at if you drop
2 the fluoridation rate by maybe .1 that that will
3 reduce the effectiveness on flouride as a treatment
4 or a deterrent for tooth decay?

5 DR. GALVAN: I can only say that I'm
6 assuming that there are those studies. One thing
7 that does come to mind was a recent study with a
8 recent cessation of fluoridation in a community in
9 Canada, Calgary. I think it's the third largest
10 city in Canada. Calgary's water, the supplemental
11 fluoridation or the community water fluoridation
12 Calgary's water was discontinued. And it was
13 discontinued in, I don't know if it's coincidence,
14 but it's 2011.

15 And so they looked at what has happened
16 over the last few years in Calgary and compared
17 Calgary to a neighboring city, Edmonton, and looking
18 at the two cities they did observe that for the
19 period of time that they studied that there was an
20 increase in the rates of decay in both cities. The
21 increase in the rate of decay in Calgary versus the
22 increase in rate of decay in Edmonton, Calgary's
23 increase in rate of decay went up 81 percent more
24 than Edmonton did.

25 So that sort of speaks to what can be the

1 short term effect of cessation of flouride and how
2 the rates of decay can change. It's not exactly
3 speaking to your question, but, you know, it's
4 some --

5 COMMISSIONER PERRY: No. I think it's a
6 good comparison. I certainly understand the point
7 of that. Thank you. I appreciate it.

8 DR. GALVAN: Oh, sure. Thanks a lot.

9 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you. And,
10 Commissioner Hart Stebbins, if I may, we have one
11 more question for Dr. -- thank you.

12 Councilor Sanchez.

13 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: I have one more
14 question, Dr. Galvan. There were many people
15 tonight here speaking against the additional
16 flouride in the water stating that it would be a
17 detriment to people's health. Increasing that
18 optimum to 0.7 percent scientifically and looking at
19 history, would that cause a detrimental impact on
20 individual's health?

21 DR. GALVAN: They have looked at the impact
22 on health all of the maladies that have been, you
23 know, brought up here. They've looked at the impact
24 of flouride on the health and, yes, flourine as an
25 element is extremely toxic. It's probably second

1 only to chlorine, which we do add to our water to
2 protect us from diseases. But these are toxic
3 chemicals, but when used for public health measures
4 at a level that is subclinical, in other words that
5 it doesn't have that toxic or physiological effect
6 on the body, we can achieve levels of community
7 health improvement without ever incurring the
8 destructive parts that could happen at higher
9 levels.

10 And we have -- you know, obviously with
11 flouride occurring at naturally high levels in many
12 areas of the country, these things have been
13 studied.

14 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's a different kind
15 of flouride.

16 MADAME CHAIR: Excuse me. Excuse me,
17 please, this is not for the audience to participate.
18 Everyone has had an opportunity to speak. Thank
19 you.

20 Thank you, sir. Thank you.

21 DR. GALVAN: Thank you.

22 MADAME CHAIR: Councilor Sanchez.

23 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: I have a question
24 also for the staff. Do we have a methodology on
25 this particular issue or any of these issues that

1 are going to impact over half a million people to
2 take this to the voters of our community? I know
3 that the citizens of Albuquerque voted on this years
4 ago to add flouride to the water because this option
5 was not given to this Board.

6 MR. ALLRED: Madame Chair, Councilor
7 Sanchez, we do not.

8 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: So there's nothing,
9 nor structure or organization that would allow this
10 policy board to take issues to the voters of this
11 magnitude that are that important?

12 MR. SANCHEZ: Madame Chair, Councilor
13 Sanchez, this body itself could not, but it could
14 certainly recommend to the city council or to the
15 county commission that this be placed on the ballot
16 for consideration.

17 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: Thank you.

18 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you. And back to you,
19 Commissioner Hart Stebbins.

20 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Thank you,
21 Madame Chair. So I've got a question. I'm not sure
22 who -- maybe, Mark, you can answer this. So when
23 the Water Utility -- before the Water Utility
24 discontinued adding the supplemental flouride, what
25 was the -- what was the rate? What was the PPM that

1 the water utility was adhering to at that time?

2 MR. SANCHEZ: Madame Chair, Councilor Hart
3 Stebbins, again, I think historically the target by
4 the CDC and EPA has been .7 to 1.1. Historically
5 Mark Kelly could probably give you a better answer
6 than I, but it was probably very much like what
7 we're reporting today.

8 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you.

9 MR. KELLY: He was really close. It was
10 0.7 to 1.2 was the target for when flouride was
11 added. Those were the targets that we're trying to
12 achieve.

13 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: So somewhere
14 between .7 -- so between .7 and 1.2, so it would
15 vary.

16 MR. KELLY: It would vary based on --
17 depending on the natural flouride coming in from
18 wells, which wells are operating, things of that
19 nature.

20 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: All right.
21 Thank you. Thank you, Madame Chair. And I'm just
22 going to state that I'm going to oppose this
23 proposed amendment. I represent a district that
24 includes three very significant pockets of poverty.
25 And this was first brought to my attention by

1 doctors and dentists who practice in my district who
2 serve the constituents of my district as well as
3 people throughout Bernalillo County who actually
4 were beginning to see the impacts of the reduction
5 that the -- see the impacts of the supplemental --
6 of discontinuing the supplemental fluoridation and
7 really asked me to look at the information, look at
8 the data, look at what we accept as scientific
9 evidence and urge the Water Authority to go back to
10 at least meeting that .7 standard.

11 You know, when the CDC made its
12 recommendation, it's .7 recommendation it pointed
13 out that, you know, good oral health is an important
14 part of overall health but there are profound
15 disparities in oral health, particularly for some
16 population subgroups, such as the poor, the elderly,
17 and many members of racial and ethnic minority
18 groups. And we certainly have those here in
19 New Mexico. We certainly have those in Bernalillo
20 County when you look at the number of individuals in
21 this community who are served by the medicaid
22 program. Those are people who probably would fall
23 into that category as being the poor, people who
24 don't have good access to oral health care,
25 individuals who aren't served by the medicaid

1 program who just don't have the money to take their
2 kids to the dentist.

3 And, you know, the CDC made this
4 recommendation because it has been, you know, shown
5 to improve oral health, to reduce the number of
6 carries and the long term effects of carries and
7 not -- not treating them. And, you know, I think
8 it's particularly salient at this point in time with
9 New Mexico's budget what it is, we're all hearing
10 about what is all the cuts in New Mexico's medicaid
11 program, how we're over budget. You know, there is
12 a figure that, you know, for every dollar that's
13 invested in community fluoridation there is a
14 significant return.

15 I don't have it here but it's like \$25, a 1
16 to 25 return on investment. And, you know, I think
17 we can take into that consider -- we can look at
18 just from a purely bottom line point of view what
19 will have do to our budgets as local governments, as
20 state government. We also look at the human cost
21 of, you know, we have the opportunity to save
22 children, pain and suffering adults, seniors,
23 individuals who don't have the opportunity to get to
24 a dentist. And I think that, you know, at the last
25 meeting that we -- when we considered this were

1 people who got up and said, well, why can't these
2 people just buy a toothbrush, why can't they buy
3 toothpaste for their kids, why don't they just take
4 their kids to the dentist. But I think that in
5 reality it's beyond the capacity of some people in
6 this community and individuals suffer because of it.

7 So, you know, this is 70 years this has
8 been in place in this country. If you look at any
9 report, you know, we have the CDC, we have the --
10 you know, a whole list of organizations, the
11 National Cancer Society, most of -- you know,
12 organizations that we -- you know, that most people
13 in this community tend to respect, tend to accept
14 their position on health issues, you know, they're
15 all in favor of this. I wish I could find the list.
16 I know it's here somewhere.

17 You know, I think certainly as community
18 leaders, we have -- when we talk about education in
19 this community we really focus on stem, you know,
20 how our kids really need to learn. Have, you know,
21 the science and tech and education, science and
22 math, and yet here we have what is considered, I
23 think in this country, to be, you know, the
24 organizations we look to for scientific guidance.
25 And, you know, they are all -- they've all come out

1 in favor of community fluoridation and the .7
2 recommendation, so I certainly appreciate the
3 arguments that have been brought to us tonight but I
4 think that we have a really great opportunity to
5 impact this community, impact the overall health of
6 this community by opposing this amendment.

7 Thank you, Madame Chair.

8 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you.

9 Commissioner De La Cruz?

10 MR. DE LA CRUZ: Thank you, Madame Chair.

11 I think this initiative is well intentioned but I
12 think it's fraught with unintended -- potential
13 unintended consequences. I can't feel comfortable
14 trying to legislate a health effort with the science
15 not being completely settled, particularly when you
16 consider newborns, infants, and children, people, by
17 the way, who don't have teeth yet. And personally,
18 I don't want to have something in the water.

19 My family and I drink Water Authority
20 water, and I personally don't want to have something
21 in the water that I don't feel comfortable with and
22 that I don't feel that I need. Granted, there are
23 some that may not be able to afford toothpaste and
24 toothbrush. I appreciate that. I understand that.
25 I'm sensitive to that. I represent a community of

1 need in the South Valley. At the same time, to
2 legislate, to force everyone to ingest flouride to
3 me is unconscionable, and I can't support doing it.
4 I have been open about this for a long time. I will
5 continue to oppose it. I don't think that it will
6 benefit us in the long run. And, by the way, it's a
7 slippery slope because at this juncture I read about
8 things that are very good people on multiple levels.

9 I -- I read that aspirin is becoming a bit
10 of a miracle. Maybe we should just add aspirin to
11 all the water, so not just worry about teeth, maybe
12 we should worry about hearts and other things, but
13 that's not a good idea because we're forcing
14 everyone to ingest something that they may not want.
15 And so while I appreciate that it may benefit teeth,
16 I also appreciate that it may harm other parts of
17 the body, particularly those most vulnerable and
18 that are newborns and infants.

19 Thank you, Madame Chair.

20 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you. Please, please.
21 This is not the appropriate place for applause.
22 Please, I understand everyone has very strong
23 feelings in this, but please don't applaud.

24 Councilor Davis?

25 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Madame Chair, thank

1 you. Very briefly, and I appreciate the comments
2 from the members of this commission who have been
3 looking at this for years. I think this commission,
4 as one of the members of the audience spoke about
5 earlier, I think that this authority board probably
6 aired on the side of caution several years ago when
7 the CDC decided to go back and to answer some of the
8 concerns about 1930s and 1940s-type data that needed
9 to be updated with more modern standards.

10 And I think having read some of those, and
11 all of us have received them in our e-mails and
12 others, but I also -- you know, I also understand it
13 so much nowadays with the Internet and things that
14 we understand can get taken out of context. And I
15 was so disappointed to see that so many of the folks
16 who were most fascinate and engaged on this issue,
17 one were not from Albuquerque, and sending us
18 information that -- that quite frankly some of those
19 links showed up on websites next to things about
20 black helicopters and the UN taking over Kansas and
21 all kinds of things.

22 But underlying those was a real fear that
23 people want to understand more about what happens in
24 our community and what's happening in our water and
25 they want to be more engaged. I think this Water

1 Board did the right thing by looking in 2011 when
2 the CDC wanted to take a new look and say we're
3 going to put that on pause and let that happen. But
4 the CDC has come back. It's reaffirmed the science
5 with modern techniques. I think it is important and
6 I share Commissioner Hart Stebbins' concerns and
7 other commissioner's concerns that there are people
8 in our community who through no fault of their own
9 have no access to basic public health and preventive
10 care.

11 As public servants it's our job, I think,
12 to really look at the science. We're all educated
13 people and can make our own determinations, but
14 looking at that, as Mr. Perry and others said, we've
15 done the right job. I think our staff has done the
16 due diligence here, and each of us has looked at the
17 science. I will support this amendment because I do
18 think it's important for the people who, despite our
19 best efforts to add and make toothpaste and other
20 things available in our schools and others, I think
21 it's clear that the science here says that this is a
22 public health benefit that our community can benefit
23 from given New Mexico's condition and our people,
24 and I think it's right for us to support our
25 community that way.

1 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you.

2 Councilor Sanchez.

3 Okay, Mr. Perry? And then Councilor
4 Sanchez.

5 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Thank you, Madame
6 Chair. I want to first express my true appreciation
7 for everyone that has come out tonight to speak on
8 this. We've heard a vast -- you know, a variety of
9 different folks from the community that just have a
10 personal feeling about it, people that have been
11 active in organizing folks on this issue, people
12 from the science and dental community, and I think
13 it speaks well to the interest and public
14 involvement when I, you know, see the cross section
15 of folks that have come to talk on it.

16 And I actually was paying attention and at
17 the same time I was reading some external
18 information from CDV and some other places, and I
19 counted nine people that were in support of it and
20 ten people that were opposed to it. So it shows
21 various -- you know, it shows basically the divide
22 is very close surrounding this issue.

23 And when I hear Dr. Eaton and Dr. Galvan
24 and dental hygienists, folks that do this every day
25 for a living, that they're familiar with the

1 practice of the various professions involved, the
2 public health issues that are attending to it, the
3 science and research behind it, I don't think I can
4 basically substitute my very limited knowledge and
5 what probably is more of an ignorance for their
6 expertise in this field. I don't doubt what they
7 say in the least. That isn't my issue to any shape
8 of form.

9 I think the CDC has -- has endorsed
10 flouride. I think that they are very cautious in
11 what they put in their literature. That was kind of
12 pretty obvious to me. I think that there is a
13 health benefit that is probably in line with what
14 their research indicates as being, you know, it
15 reduces 25 percent tooth decay in children and
16 adults. That's a significant amount.

17 But I guess at the end of the day it's also
18 an ethics question for me. And I was going to ask
19 Dr. Galvan, and I'm kind of glad I didn't, but I'll
20 just pose it as a rhetorical question, if you gave
21 dental or medical advice to somebody and they didn't
22 follow it, don't they have the right to do that?
23 And I'm in a troubled position if I want to impose
24 my authority as a government official with a vote
25 tonight to basically require folks that don't want

1 to take flouride to take it. That's the problem I
2 have. If there was a tap at my house and I could
3 turn it on, I would. But what would happen if my
4 wife and my kids, half of them wanted to and half of
5 them didn't want to is? And at that point I think
6 that flouride is naturally present and will continue
7 to have a benefit for the dental health of our
8 citizens, but I think it's difficult in talking with
9 the mayor about the vote tonight to force this on
10 people as government officials.

11 I don't disagree with Councilor Davis and
12 Councilor Hart Stebbins in what they've said, that
13 the science supports it, that there are issues
14 surrounding at risk communities that could benefit.
15 But from a more perspective of liberty and
16 imposition of something like a medical course of
17 treatment or a chemical compound or a drug on
18 somebody, I can't -- I can't get there and so I have
19 to support the amendment, basically, that would take
20 this out of the budget.

21 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Perry.

22 Councilor Sanchez?

23 Ladies and gentlemen, please.

24 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: Thank you, Madame
25 Chairman. I have some of the same feelings and

1 perspectives as CAO Perry does. One of the concerns
2 that I have is, again, my issue right now is there
3 are six of us up here tonight. There are other
4 500,000 people that live within Bernalillo County
5 and the City of Albuquerque. I think that this
6 issue should be a voter initiative proposition that
7 should go to the voters of Albuquerque. I don't
8 think this should die because, I mean, I think the
9 healthcare professionals and the dentists, some of
10 the dentists that I've spoken to think that this is
11 a good idea.

12 Some of the dentists that I spoke to said
13 that this was a terrible idea. But, again, I think
14 that in this particular case this will have some
15 impacts on a lot of our young children, I think, if
16 we don't do this. And yet at the same time there
17 are families out there that don't support this, but
18 I think it should be an initiative not by six
19 individuals up here on this panel but the people of
20 Albuquerque in Bernalillo County to make this
21 decision.

22 This is a very complex decision. For
23 myself, I still don't know if it would go to the
24 voters how I would vote on this initiative. I
25 probably would support it, but I don't feel it's

1 right that I make a decision for over 500,000 people
2 in this community although I am an elected official.
3 I think this issue is that complex and we have
4 cities across America that are now going to vote on
5 this initiative, and they should have that same
6 right -- we should have that same right and
7 opportunity as cities across this country.

8 I think, again, I will support the
9 amendment for that reason and that reason only, but
10 I hope that this issue does not die tonight and we
11 will not be here for another two years to discuss
12 this issue. But, again, my perspective on this
13 issue is let's allow the people of Albuquerque and
14 Bernalillo County working with the Albuquerque City
15 Council, working with the Bernalillo County
16 commissioners to try to get this on the general
17 election ballot.

18 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you. And with that I
19 will, as a sponsor of this amendment, I will do a
20 little closing and that is, you know, there are so
21 many factors that effect our health, to include our
22 teeth, our oral hygiene, what we eat, what we drink.
23 And one of the comments made by some of the who talk
24 to me, very interestingly, they talked about the
25 fact that the children, the young people today who

1 are now getting more cavities don't actually drink
2 water. They drink soda and soft drinks and slushees
3 and whatever it is that they drink to include
4 bottled water. If you've noticed that most of our
5 young people today and far too many of our adults
6 walk around with bottled water in their hands.

7 The statistics that I read say that very,
8 very, very few bottled water companies, in fact none
9 have flouride in the bottled water unless it says
10 specifically that it contains flouride, and I don't
11 believe that very many of us who drink bottled
12 water, which I don't, I love our water, I think it
13 tastes like real water, very few of us look to see
14 and choose bottled water for our children that says
15 that it contains flouride. That's a choice. Those
16 are the choices that we get to make, and that's why
17 I brought this amendment forward to take this out of
18 our budget because I think it is a personal choice
19 that we all get to make.

20 And with that I would close and urge your
21 support, supporting this amendment means that we are
22 voting to take the flouride question out of our
23 budget, both CIP and operating. And there will be
24 another amendment that takes it out of another
25 budget. But that's what this does. It does not

1 vote -- the vote for does not vote for fluoridation,
2 it votes for not adding additional fluoridation. So
3 with that I urge your support.

4 All those in favor of amendment one, say
5 yes. Yes.

6 MR. DE LA CRUZ: Yes.

7 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Yes.

8 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: Yes.

9 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: No.

10 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: No.

11 [Motion carries on a 4 to 2 vote.]

12 MADAME CHAIR: I would then like to put
13 forward for amendment number 2, which on page 2
14 delete line 17. And what this does in R-16-5 is
15 remove that \$250,000 from the CIP budget.

16 Do I hear a second?

17 MR. SANCHEZ: Madame Chair?

18 MADAME CHAIR: Yes, sir.

19 MR. SANCHEZ: I think you need to vote on
20 the operating budget first.

21 MADAME CHAIR: Oh, I'm so sorry. I'm so
22 sorry. That was an amendment, therefore I will make
23 a motion to approve number R-16-4 as amended. All
24 those in favor say yes.

25 MR. DE LA CRUZ: Yes.

1 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Yes.

2 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: Yes.

3 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: No.

4 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: No.

5 [Motion carries on a 4 to 2 vote.]

6 MADAME CHAIR: Motion carries on a 4-2.

7 Now I'm going to go to R-16-5, offer floor amendment
8 number one to R-16-5, which on page 2 deletes line
9 17.

10 May I have a second?

11 MR. DE LA CRUZ: Second.

12 MADAME CHAIR: All those in favor say yes.

13 ALL COMMISSIONERS: Yes.

14 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Can you just
15 please repeat what we're voting on?

16 MADAME CHAIR: Of course. We are voting on
17 R-16-5, which is the CIP budget, and this removes on
18 page 2, line 16, it removes the \$250,000 in the CIP
19 budget which we've already voted to not transfer.

20 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Okay. So you
21 have moved and seconded the R-16-5.

22 MADAME CHAIR: Yes.

23 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: And you're now
24 proposing an amendment to R-16-5, correct?

25 MADAME CHAIR: Yes.

1 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Got it. All
2 right. And so now we're voting on the amendment.

3 MADAME CHAIR: Now we're voting on the
4 amendment. Are there any comments?

5 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Thank you for
6 your clarification.

7 MADAME CHAIR: There are no comments,
8 therefore I would ask your support for R-16-5 as
9 amended. All those in favor say yes.

10 MR. DE LA CRUZ: Yes.

11 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Yes.

12 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: Yes.

13 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: No.

14 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: No.

15 [Motion carries on a 4 to 2 vote.]

16 MADAME CHAIR: Motion carries on a 4-2.

17 Thank you.

18 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Do we have to
19 vote on the amendment.

20 MADAME CHAIR: We did.

21 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Okay. Okay.
22 So now we're going to vote on the --

23 MADAME CHAIR: No, we just voted on the
24 bill as amended.

25 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: We just

1 finished, okay.

2 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you. Let's move back
3 to the agenda, and that would be to introductions.
4 Yes?

5 COMMISSIONER PERRY: We were just trying to
6 catch up. I apologize.

7 MADAME CHAIR: No problem.

8 COMMISSIONER PERRY: We did move and second
9 your amended. We need to move 16-5 as well.

10 MADAME CHAIR: We did. We did both on
11 both.

12 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Can we just
13 clarify that, that we actually had a vote on the
14 amendment and then a vote on R-16-5.

15 MR. DE LA CRUZ: As amended. You said --

16 MADAME CHAIR: As amended.

17 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: But we need to
18 vote on the amendment as well, approve the amendment
19 before we can vote on the bill as amended, right?

20 MADAME CHAIR: We did. But we'll do it
21 again if you'd like, just in case. All right.

22 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Because I
23 think we had two votes on R-16-4. I'm not sure we
24 did on 5.

25 MADAME CHAIR: Yes, we did, but let's do it

1 again.

2 COMMISSIONER PERRY: It's on the record.

3 MR. DE LA CRUZ: Just for clarification
4 let's go ahead and do it again.

5 MADAME CHAIR: Let's just do it again.

6 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Right.

7 MADAME CHAIR: So I would, once again, move
8 amendment 1 to R-16-5, which is on page 2, delete
9 line 17.

10 MR. DE LA CRUZ: Second.

11 MADAME CHAIR: There's a motion and a
12 second. All those in favor say yes.

13 MR. DE LA CRUZ: Yes.

14 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Yes.

15 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: Yes.

16 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: No.

17 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: No.

18 [Motion carries on a 4 to 2 vote.]

19 MADAME CHAIR: That passes on a 4 to 2.

20 Now I would like to move R-16-5 as amended.
21 Is there a second?

22 MR. DE LA CRUZ: Second.

23 MADAME CHAIR: There's a motion and a
24 second. All those in favor of R-16-5 as amended say
25 yes.

1 MR. DE LA CRUZ: Yes.

2 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Yes.

3 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: Yes.

4 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: No.

5 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: No.

6 [Motion carries on a 4 to 2 vote.]

7 MADAME CHAIR: That passes on a 4 to 2.

8 Thank you.

9 Let's go back to the agenda as it was
10 originally set forth, and that means introductions
11 or first readings of legislation.

12 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Before we get to that,
13 Madame Chair, as it relates to Councilor Sanchez's
14 comments --

15 MADAME CHAIR: Yes.

16 COMMISSIONER PERRY: -- I think the
17 submission of the voters to that issue is important,
18 and I'm just wondering if perhaps we can give some
19 direction to Mr. Sanchez to give us what that would
20 entail.

21 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: I think that should
22 probably come before the ABCGC for discussion and
23 then take it to our respective bodies. I think
24 right now, based on this being a county and state
25 election, that it would be the county commissioners

1 that would get this initiative on the ballot based
2 on the decisions and the room to place this
3 proposition and put it to the voters.

4 MADAME CHAIR: Commissioner De La Cruz.
5 Thank you, Councilor.

6 MR. DE LA CRUZ: Thank you, Madame Chair.
7 I agree with Mr. Perry. I do think, Councilors,
8 Commissioners, that we should have Mark Sanchez work
9 and help us determine what is the best venue course
10 forward at least as a recommendation for this board.

11 Thank you, Madame Chair.

12 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you.

13 So do we need to vote on that, Mr. Sanchez,
14 or do we just --

15 MR. SANCHEZ: Madame Chair, if that's the
16 direction of the vote. We will research that and
17 send you the document.

18 MADAME CHAIR: I think that's a great idea.
19 I think we're -- I think that's a unanimous decision
20 up here.

21 Commissioner Hart Stebbins, did you want to
22 say something?

23 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: No.

24 MADAME CHAIR: All right. Thank you.
25 Thank you.

1 Thank you, Councilor Sanchez, for bringing
2 that forward.

3 All right. Now let's move to the new --
4 the introductions, the first reading of legislation.
5 And the first will be R-16-6 authorizing an
6 agreement with Woodmont Paseo LLC for the Durango
7 unit's 4 and 5 subdivision for water and sewer
8 service.

9 MR. CADENA: Hello.

10 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you for being here.

11 MR. CADENA: Hi, Madame Chair, Members of
12 the Board, I'd like to present to you a development
13 consisting of 39 residential lots on the west side.
14 It's a development located within the City of
15 Albuquerque in the 4W pressure zone on the west
16 side. The developer is building a subdivision and
17 will require extensions of public water and sanitary
18 sewer proximate to the site.

19 There will be utility expansion charges
20 paid by the developer as well as water supply
21 charges and there is no fiscal impact to the Water
22 Authority.

23 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is just a
24 discussion.

25 MR. CADENA: Correct.

1 MADAME CHAIR: Are there any --

2 MR. CADENA: Should I move on to the second
3 item?

4 MADAME CHAIR: Are there any questions of
5 the first item?

6 Please move on to the second item.

7 MR. CADENA: I'd like to introduce a
8 development entitled Holly Estates located between
9 Paseo Del Norte and Holly just west of Eubank. This
10 is a subdivision consisting of 16 lots. The
11 property will be served by the 60 pressure zone in
12 the Alameda trunk. It's contiguous to other
13 development, water and sanitary sewer infrastructure
14 will be extended from adjacent infrastructure. The
15 property will be assessed UBCs and water supply
16 charges, and there is no fiscal impact to the Water
17 Authority.

18 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you. That was a first
19 reading. Are there any questions? All right.
20 We'll address that, I assume, at the next meeting?

21 MR. CADENA: Correct.

22 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you. Thank you very
23 much.

24 Next agenda item is the consent agenda.
25 Any board member may request that a consent agenda

1 item be replaced under -- be placed under approvals.

2 MR. DE LA CRUZ: So moved.

3 MADAME CHAIR: There's a motion and a
4 second to move approval. Are there any questions?
5 All those in favor say yes.

6 ALL COMMISSIONERS: Yes.

7 MADAME CHAIR: Opposed. Motion carries.

8 [Motion carries 5 to 0.]

9 We have one approval item, 0-16-1, amending
10 the Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility
11 Authority and sewer rate ordinance to update the
12 utility expansion charge and the water supply charge
13 by 2.9 percent based on the engineering news report
14 index and change, the fire hydrant application
15 process. Is.

16 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Move final approval.

17 MR. DE LA CRUZ: Second.

18 MADAME CHAIR: There's a motion and a
19 second. Does anyone have any questions? Motion and
20 a second on 0-16-1. All in favor say yes.

21 ALL COMMISSIONERS: Yes.

22 MADAME CHAIR: Opposed?

23 [Motion carries 5 to 0.]

24 Motion carries.

25 Other business? This would be a

1 presentation, 0B-16-7, water resources management
2 strategy, the 2017 update. John Stomp and David
3 Jordan, the presentation.

4 MR. STOMP: Madame Chair and Members of the
5 Board, thank you very much for the opportunity to
6 keep speaking on the update to the water strategy.
7 I'm going to talk earlier about a request that
8 Commissioner Hart Stebbins made a couple meetings
9 ago about updating you on the operation of the
10 drinking water project and those issues that effect
11 our ability to take surface water and new surface
12 water. So I'm going to start with that.

13 There's a number of issues that effect our
14 ability to take the surface water and use it from
15 the river, the primary -- the primary issue that
16 effects us is the state engineer's permit. There's
17 five different conditions that the state engineer
18 placed on us with respect to our permit, and each
19 one of those conditions adds a level of complexity
20 to it, and two of the conditions actually requires
21 certain flows on the river for us to continue to
22 operate, and that has significantly effected our
23 ability in the last six years of drought.

24 Well exercising is another issue that
25 effects us. And this is something that came about

1 recently in the last five years is the DWP came
2 online. A lot of our wells are 50 or 60 years old,
3 and in order to continue to run those wells and make
4 sure they're operational throughout the winter so
5 that when we need them in the summer months, we call
6 that well exercising. With our 60-plus wells, if we
7 use each one of those wells and exercise one -- each
8 one of those once a month, that's two wells every
9 day. That ranges between 5 and 10 million gallons a
10 day of groundwater that we're pumping that we
11 wouldn't have anticipated that we're pumping in an
12 effort to keep those 50 and 60 year old wells
13 running.

14 We have water quality issues that effect
15 us. Not only is it just the sediment in the river
16 but when we have storm water flows that come down
17 the north diversion channel that are in excess of
18 300 CFS we shut down the diversion for about five
19 hours to allow that first flush of storm water, the
20 bad stuff, to get through the diversion facility.
21 That's a condition that we placed on ourselves.

22 Yes, Madame Chair.

23 MADAME CHAIR: Mr. Stomp, we're going to
24 interrupt you here.

25 Commissioner De La Cruz.

1 MR. DE LA CRUZ: Thank you, Madame Chair.

2 Mr. Stomp, for the benefit of the viewing
3 public and some of those in the audience, what is
4 the window of time that your strategy is
5 encompassing?

6 MR. STOMP: Madame Chair and Commissioner
7 De La Cruz, the window of time for the water
8 strategy update is 100 years, and it starts in 2017
9 and goes to 2117, so it's a 100-year timeframe.

10 MR. DE LA CRUZ: So have you taken into
11 consideration, and this may be a bit rhetorical, but
12 have you taken into consideration the population
13 that we're talking about that you will be serving
14 into that future starting with 2016?

15 MR. STOMP: Madame Chair and Commissioner
16 De La Cruz, you did ask this question at the last
17 update. We do actually have a slide to address the
18 population question that you asked. It's later in
19 the presentation, but I would glad to go to that
20 slide now if you'd like.

21 MR. DE LA CRUZ: No, that's fine. I will
22 wait. I just wanted to do -- kind of make sure we
23 covered those two issues because a lot of times
24 people see strategy and they miss the 100-year part,
25 so thank you. I can wait.

1 Thank you, Madame Chair.

2 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you.

3 Okay, Mr. Stomp. It's all yours again.

4 MR. STOMP: Well, thank you very much.

5 Those are important questions, and I hope we've
6 addressed those but if we have not addressed those
7 or any of the other questions that you have, please
8 ask us as we go along.

9 There is a significant issue that faces us
10 in the future. Right now it has not been an issue,
11 but as the silvery minnow issue has been in the
12 middle Rio Grande for many years, we're actually
13 required in our permit that we received from the
14 Fish and Wildlife Service to check to see how many
15 eggs are produced upstream of our diversion
16 facility. So the entire month of May we have
17 biologists out in the river with screens, they call
18 them scenes, and they actually collect eggs.

19 And as that population of eggs increase
20 over time, which we're hoping because we're hoping
21 to move the minnow from downstream in the lower
22 sections of the river upstream where we have more
23 water, we have an agreement with the Fish and
24 Wildlife Service that we will begin to look at even
25 shutting down our operations during those periods

1 where we have high river flows or high egg
2 production. To date that hasn't happened. In the
3 entire month of May so far we've collected two eggs,
4 so that hasn't been an issue at least at this point.

5 And then --

6 MADAME CHAIR: Mr. Stomp, I was going to
7 ask you, who counted them? Two is no big deal.
8 Thanks.

9 MR. STOMP: Madame Chair, even my brain at
10 this hour can count to two. I don't know if I can
11 get to three or four, but we'll see about that.

12 And then there is one issue, of course,
13 with ongoing maintenance at the water plant. We're
14 required to make sure that we take care of all the
15 maintenance at the plant. Sometimes that
16 maintenance occurs and we have to shut down the
17 plant, and that is one of the issues that happened
18 last year.

19 So I'm going to go through this example
20 with you of what actually happened last year so we
21 can kind of get a flavor of it. This picture of the
22 next slide shows our actual demand, and the demand
23 is less in the winter months. And that's January
24 and February there on the left. And then as it
25 rises in the summer, as you know in the summer --

1 the summer gets hotter, it rises in the summer and
2 then it goes back down in the winter again. So
3 that's sort of bell curve that you see there, the
4 blue represents the amount of surface water that we
5 could use under our state engineer's permit. You
6 see that dotted line is the limit that the state
7 engineer has put on our ability to take water out of
8 the river. So we're never allowed to take more than
9 that amount of water in any given day.

10 So if you place that limit on us, the
11 maximum amount of surface water that you could use
12 based on the amount of water that we actually use in
13 Albuquerque is that blue area underneath the curve.
14 And we're calling that the theoretical operations.
15 So if we had captured every single drop of surface
16 water, that's the amount that we would use. That
17 doesn't account for losses that we have at the
18 plant. We have ponds, as you know, at the plant.
19 They evaporate. We also lose water when we process
20 the solids. It doesn't include for that. This is
21 just the theoretical number.

22 Go ahead.

23 MADAME CHAIR: Mr. Stomp.

24 MR. STOMP: I see a question.

25 MADAME CHAIR: Commissioner De La Cruz?

1 MR. DE LA CRUZ: Thank you, Madame Chair.
2 So if you could make it a little bit simpler for --
3 again for everyone so that we're not talking about
4 the theory but the actual use, give us some kind of
5 way to grasp that idea of what you're actually
6 using, what you theoretically could use. Give us
7 some idea what that means.

8 MR. STOMP: Okay. Thank you very much,
9 Madame Chair and Commissioner De La Cruz. I
10 apologize up front. A lot of this is very
11 technical. I'm going try to do my best to make sure
12 that people can try to understand it. I deal with
13 this every day so it's not -- I talk about it a lot
14 so sometimes I think I'm communicating well but I
15 may not be communicating very well, so I apologize
16 for that.

17 The amount that we use theoretical would be
18 about 80 percent, so the maximum amount of water
19 that we could probably use in a year is about 80
20 percent surface water. So those red areas that are
21 groundwater are the amount of groundwater that we
22 would use every single year whether the drinking
23 water project was operated or not. So I think the
24 point of this slide is to try to tell the Board that
25 when you're comparing our surface water use to our

1 overall use, you shouldn't really be doing that
2 because that's not really a fair comparison. There
3 is an amount of groundwater that we're going to use
4 every year because the state engineer actually puts
5 limit on our ability to use surface water.

6 MR. DE LA CRUZ: So, Mr. Stomp, in the
7 years where you're not allowed to use it, is it
8 always because you're not allowed to use, you can't
9 use it, it's more than you need? Help me
10 understand.

11 MR. STOMP: Madame Chair and Commissioner
12 De La Cruz, there's actually a variety of different
13 conditions in our permit. The majority of them say
14 you have to stop use. So when we have a low flow in
15 the river, for example, which we've had every year
16 for the last six years, the state engineer says if
17 you don't have this flow rate at Central Avenue,
18 shut down the plant. And that's based on --

19 MR. DE LA CRUZ: How does that correlate
20 with the amount of water we're allowed to store and
21 any water that is in excess that we can't store
22 because we don't have the storage capacity and what
23 we have to allow to go down the river because we
24 can't use it because of that reason, or is that a
25 different slide later?

1 MR. STOMP: Madame Chair and Commissioner
2 De La Cruz, the fact is when we can't use our
3 surface water we do store it in Abiquiu, so we don't
4 really actually lose the water. So the state
5 engineer doesn't say release San Juan Chama water
6 for any other purpose other than when we can divert
7 it. So when we're not in operation, we leave it in
8 Abiquiu for future use, so we never actually lose
9 the water.

10 MR. DE LA CRUZ: I've understood in the
11 past that we actually don't have all the storage
12 capacity that we need. Are you saying that we do
13 have all the storage capacity that we need and that
14 we're capturing and holding the water that is --
15 that belongs to the Water Authority and we do not
16 send it down the river?

17 MR. STOMP: Madame Chair and Commissioner
18 De La Cruz, we never have enough storage capacity.
19 Storage is one of those issues where in times of
20 plenty you wish you had more, so we're seeking
21 additional storage both in Abiquiu. We have enough
22 for the water that we have now but in the future we
23 clearly need additional storage, and that additional
24 storage could be in Abiquiu, it could be in Elephant
25 Butte or it could be right here in Albuquerque.

1 And, you know, and you've seen in the summer months
2 when we get a lot of rain, there's a lot of
3 capacity, if we could use some of that water, pull
4 it off, store it, then we could use it for other
5 times. So we're going to be asking this board at
6 some point to put a policy in place in the strategy
7 to increase the amount of storage that we have.

8 MR. DE LA CRUZ: So the answer is that we
9 do lose water that we own because we can't store it?

10 MR. STOMP: Madame Chair and Art --
11 Commissioner De La Cruz, I apologize, no, we don't
12 lose it right now but we could actually lose it in
13 the future if there are those peak times when we
14 don't have the additional storage.

15 MR. DE LA CRUZ: Have we lost some in the
16 past?

17 MR. STOMP: Madame Chair and Commissioner
18 De La Cruz, no, we have not lost any. We have,
19 however, provided a lot of water to other users,
20 like MRG, the irrigation district, so that would
21 help that -- that has helped us.

22 MR. DE LA CRUZ: So if we don't have a
23 strategy then I do suggest to the Board that we
24 direct staff to start developing a strategy. That
25 will give us some guidance into the future of how

1 we're going to -- or what strategy will be to secure
2 more storage space.

3 Thank you, Madame Chair.

4 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you.

5 Mr. Stomp?

6 MR. STOMP: Okay. Madame Chair, and
7 Members of the Board, I am on the next slide, and
8 the next slide is another very difficult condition
9 that the state engineers placed on us. The what the
10 state engineer said is we're going to allow you to
11 take native water out of the river, but you're going
12 to have to return that native water back at the
13 wastewater treatment plant simultaneously with the
14 amount that you take out of the river. So that
15 means that in any given second of any given day how
16 much water we're taking out of the water at the
17 diversion facility has to be returned down at the
18 wastewater treatment plant.

19 In the graphic that I've showed you today
20 shows the wastewater flows into the plant, they're
21 not consistent. They change on an hourly basis, and
22 you guys understand that. You take a shower in the
23 morning, you flush the toilets, whatever, you leave,
24 you come back. That hits the plant at a certain
25 time. We have low flows and high flows. So what

1 this says is we have to constantly change the amount
2 that we're diverting at the river in response to the
3 amount that's actually being returned on an hourly
4 basis. And so if we have, I'm using this as an
5 example, 20 million gallons a day coming out of the
6 wastewater plant, the state engineer says you can
7 take 20 million gallons a day at the water plant.

8 Oh, five hours later when it's 60 million
9 gallons a day, you can take 60 million gallons a
10 day. So we're constantly fighting that battle with
11 the exact amount that we take out of the river. So
12 he's placed the maximum limit on how much we can
13 take out and then he's also said you have to return
14 back the exact amount that you did, so we've got two
15 major constraints placed on us.

16 The third and fourth most difficult
17 constraint is the minimum flow condition in which he
18 said if you do not have a certain flow rate at
19 Central Avenue of at Burveda diversion you need to
20 shut off. And since 2011 we've shut off about seven
21 months total over the last five years, mostly in the
22 irrigation season in the summer months, July,
23 August, and September. In fact we believe this year
24 will be another year that we'll be shut down in
25 October. So what that means is that picture that I

1 showed you theoretical where you saw the blue
2 graphic in July, well, that graphic becomes red. It
3 becomes a groundwater because we're not allowed to
4 divert the water in the summertime.

5 This next graphic shows you the picture
6 that -- the revised picture when you start to factor
7 in the groundwater use that we use when we exercise
8 our wells. Like I said, that's about 10 million
9 gallons a day. So this is just graphically trying
10 to show what happened. So in 2013 we used about 55
11 percent of surface water. We had shutdowns for our
12 maintenance both in February -- January, February,
13 and again in December -- I'm sorry, October we
14 exercised our wells.

15 And so from a theoretical standpoint, if
16 you compared how much we used to the theoretical
17 max, we were very close. We still have some room
18 for improvement, and we're doing -- we're doing that
19 every day. We're working to get that right every
20 day. This year, so far to date, we've used about 80
21 percent surface water and 20 percent groundwater, so
22 every single day we continue to get better, but we
23 never know what's going to face us when we hit --
24 when the river hits us or the state engineer places
25 these conditions in which we have no control.

1 So I apologize for the technical nature in
2 this, but I was just trying to explain the
3 challenges that we have and the challenges that we
4 face in trying to get surface water out of the
5 river. And I tried to do my best to explain, and I
6 hope I did a fair job at that at least.

7 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you.

8 MR. STOMP: In terms of the strategy
9 update, we have four --

10 MADAME CHAIR: Mr. Stomp.

11 MR. STOMP: I'm sorry.

12 MADAME CHAIR: Mr. Stomp, I'm sorry.

13 Commissioner Hart Stebbins?

14 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: I don't want
15 to interrupt you, but I do want to say thank you for
16 answering my question. That was very helpful in
17 understanding sort of the relationship between
18 surface water and groundwater and what your
19 restrictions are, so thank you.

20 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you.

21 Go ahead, Mr. Stomp.

22 MR. STOMP: And thank you. Again, if
23 anybody ever wants to talk offline with this, I
24 could talk a lot more in detail if you're really
25 interested.

1 So in updating the strategy, we are
2 actually holding a series of public meetings.
3 There's four customer conversations that are called
4 out. They're all in different quadrants of the city
5 in June, so we're starting on Tuesday, June the 14th
6 and we're going until Thursday, June 30th, and we've
7 posted those. We actually have got a bill insert
8 that's going out to our customers and anybody that's
9 interested can get on our website and sign up for
10 that. And the whole idea of this is to give us your
11 feedback on what the future of Albuquerque might
12 look like in terms of our water supply.

13 We've planned a town hall on July 22nd, and
14 we're hoping to bring the new policies to town hall
15 and have the public have an opportunity to weigh in
16 on those. And as we bring the new policies to you
17 in August we're hoping to get really good public
18 feedback from our customers and from other
19 interested parties prior until we bring in the new
20 policies to you in August in an attempt to update
21 the strategy in September.

22 So where are we now? We've talked about
23 this before. This is a review, so I apologize. We
24 have implemented the drinking water project as we
25 just talked about. We've done reuse in ASR. As you

1 know the aquifer is rising in Albuquerque. It's
2 going to continue to rise for at least a decade
3 longer, and then as it begins to rise and it begins
4 to come back down, that's the point at which we're
5 asking you to help us develop those policies that
6 can set the stage for the next 100 years.

7 I would like to talk about our groundwater
8 management. Our groundwater management plan that's
9 been discussed on a number of occasions is not only
10 unique in its nature, nobody else in the country is
11 even looking at managing their groundwater in such a
12 way as to place your own limits on that and adding
13 new supplies in the future as you address and manage
14 your aquifer around a level as opposed to just
15 allowing it to be completely exhausted like the rest
16 of the -- like a lot of areas in the west are doing.
17 So this is unique in nature, and probably the first
18 time that it's ever happened where somebody is
19 actually proposing to manage an aquifer around a
20 level as opposed to just continuing to watch it go
21 down and wondering, wow, what are we going to do
22 next. So I think our plan is we have a plan to go
23 what are we going to do next.

24 I'm going to turn it over to David Jordan
25 now and I'll be available to answer questions. And

1 David is going to go over the next step of this,
2 which is to talk about the gaps and the
3 alternatives.

4 MR. JORDAN: Thank you for the opportunity
5 to present. Thanks for your patience. I know it's
6 been a long night.

7 So I wanted to give a little bit of an
8 update on the water resources management strategy,
9 and when we first started this process about six
10 years ago, we were faced with a pretty fundamental
11 couple of questions: How much water do we have and
12 how much water do we need? So supply and demand,
13 and those are really the fundamental questions that
14 we were faced with.

15 Around that same time John Stomp
16 articulated a vision of trying to secure a 100-year
17 water supply, which you just mentioned a few years
18 ago. And at the time I, and I think the other
19 members of the technical team, thought that was a
20 very lofty goal but we were -- you know, we were
21 very excited to try and work towards that goal. And
22 really what I'm here to talk to you tonight about is
23 the fact that we believe we've reached that goal.

24 So with implementation of the 2017 water
25 resources management strategy we have the ability to

1 leave the legacy of a 100-year water supply for the
2 rate payers so there aren't a lot of other
3 communities out there that are doing that. So just
4 think for a minute about that, about that 100-year
5 supply and the ability to leave that legacy to the
6 rate payers.

7 So how did we get here? We really didn't
8 get here on our own. We really got here through the
9 work of a lot of other people on the San Juan Chama
10 Project of the '50s and '60s, work by the USGS in
11 the '70s and '80s and '90s characterizing the
12 aquifer and modeling the basin, work in the '90s and
13 the 2000s planning for the drinking water project
14 and subsequent construction of the drinking water
15 project.

16 So we are in a very good spot because
17 there's been a lot of good work done in the past and
18 we want to continue down that path and continue
19 looking into the future. So let's talk a little bit
20 about some of the recent things that we've done.
21 We've -- excuse me, we've showed this figure to you
22 before, and it's really a road map for this adaptive
23 management process that we're following where we've
24 looked at demand, how much water are we potentially
25 going to need in the future? Supply, how much water

1 do we have available? We've conditioned that supply
2 on this concept of a groundwater reserve, and John
3 Stomp mentioned that a minute ago. We want to keep
4 a certain amount of water in reserve, like a savings
5 account in that groundwater reserve, and we want to
6 keep a minimum balance or a minimum level, if you
7 will, of groundwater so that we can access that
8 water in times of need.

9 And in times of plenty when we have plenty
10 of surface water, we would like to add water into
11 that groundwater reserve. So looking at differences
12 between water demands and water supply, that allows
13 us to identify gaps and supply, and we've seen some
14 of those gaps into the future under a number of
15 different scenarios. We've looked at a whole series
16 of water supply alternatives to fill those gaps, and
17 we've built those alternatives into several
18 portfolios which we'll share with you tonight.

19 We're doing an economic analysis to look at
20 relative costs of all of those portfolios. And then
21 what we will do is develop policies which will then
22 feed into the 2017 strategy that will support the
23 portfolios to meet the supply gaps and then we'll be
24 bringing those before this Board in September.

25 There was a question earlier about

1 population and demand, and so I wanted to try and
2 put some of the population growth and demand growth
3 numbers into context. So this is the medium growth
4 projection which is based on the number of new
5 connections that the water authority has gotten in
6 the recent past and continues to get and as
7 projected into the future. So our current surface
8 area population is about 660,000 people.

9 By about 2060 we expect that to be about a
10 million people, so that's 350,000 more people. And
11 we're not really making any kind of distinction as
12 to geography so that could be infill development, it
13 could be development on the outskirts of the service
14 area. So we're really not making a distinction
15 there. We're just saying that we're planning for
16 this many more people to be served by the Water
17 Authority.

18 MADAME CHAIR: Yes, Commissioner De La
19 Cruz?

20 MR. DE LA CRUZ: Thank you, Madame Chair.
21 Where did you get those numbers?

22 MR. JORDAN: They're based on a couple of
23 different things, based primarily on empirical data
24 of new connections at the Water Authority, and
25 they're very consistent with the BBER numbers and

1 Mr. Cog numbers, so they represent about a 1 percent
2 growth. So they're very consistent with all of the
3 other growth projections that have been done by some
4 of the other organizations, and they're based on
5 real data and actual number of new connections that
6 the water authority is getting.

7 MR. DE LA CRUZ: So is there any other
8 types of information gathering systems versus --
9 this is from the University, right, University of
10 New Mexico Beaver?

11 MR. JORDAN: Madame Chair, Commissioner De
12 La Cruz, yes, that's correct. So we've looked at
13 the beaver data, we've looked at the mid region
14 Council of Government's data, and all that compares
15 very well with these --

16 MR. DE LA CRUZ: And you're very confident
17 that these numbers are fairly solid based on their
18 expertise?

19 MR. JORDAN: Yes. Yes, very solid. And
20 we've also -- as you know, and we've discussed this
21 a little bit in the past, we're looking at a range
22 of growth, so we've looked at a low growth option
23 and then a high growth option. So we know we don't
24 know exactly what the future will hold, so we've
25 looked at a range of growth projections, and this is

1 the medium growth projection.

2 MR. DE LA CRUZ: Have you considered the
3 past, the same number of years in the past and how
4 they jive or relate to current population today?

5 MR. JORDAN: Madame Chair, Commissioner De
6 La Cruz, I'm not sure I understand your question.

7 MR. DE LA CRUZ: 40 years ago, what was the
8 population of Albuquerque then, 40 years into the
9 future, how do those compare?

10 MR. JORDAN: Yes, Madame Chair,
11 Commissioner De La Cruz, you know, as I said, these
12 medium growth projections are really based on
13 looking at a plot of the number of connections of
14 the Water Authority itself and making a projection
15 into the future, so --

16 MR. DE LA CRUZ: You said something that I
17 think is very important. I want people to
18 understand this, at least from what you just said,
19 is that it didn't matter whether people lived within
20 the current confines of the city geographically or
21 whether it was additional acreage outside of the
22 existing geography of the city now, and so you're
23 still going to have the same amount of population.
24 There's going to be the identical need for water
25 regardless of where they live; is that correct?

1 MR. JORDAN: Madame Chair, Commissioner De
2 La Cruz, yes, that's correct. This is irregardless
3 of any sort of geography, so these additional people
4 and the additional water demand that they associated
5 with them could happen anywhere geographically.

6 MR. DE LA CRUZ: Thank you, Madame Chair.

7 MR. JORDAN: Thank you.

8 So let's talk about supply. And we'd like
9 to talk about the medium supply availability. And
10 if we remember from last time, that actually
11 includes some average climate change based on work
12 done by the Bureau of Reclamation. So when I say
13 medium supply of availability, that includes surface
14 water availability subject to some average climate
15 change, so it does consider some climate change.

16 In terms of looking at supply alternatives
17 to meet the potential supply gaps in the future, I
18 just want to talk about the process here, I won't
19 get into too much of the detail, but we currently
20 have 31 different supply alternatives that we're
21 looking at, 31 different potential water supplies,
22 and we looked at 11 different criteria to rank
23 those, everything from how much water is a
24 particular alternative expected to yield to what are
25 its socioeconomic impacts.

1 So the technical team in conjunction with
2 the Tkek spent a lot of time looking at this. And
3 so we came up with a relative ranking for the
4 alternatives, and the purpose of this really is to
5 look at -- to allow us to select what are generally
6 the best alternatives that we can build into water
7 supply portfolios to take us into the future. And
8 we've color coded them green, yellow, and red. The
9 green ones were really the alternatives that floated
10 to the top that are generally easier to implement.
11 We can use existing infrastructure, we can do it
12 under existing permits.

13 The yellows with a little bit more
14 difficult to implement. We might need new
15 infrastructure, we might need new permits.

16 The reds, some of the alternatives sort of
17 sank to the bottom. There are things that we think
18 we do at some point in the future but they are
19 potentially more expensive, we need new technology.
20 We would need very different permits than we hold
21 now, so we want to kind of -- we want to hold those
22 for consideration into the future at some point.

23 So going back to the 2007 water resources
24 management strategy, it actually had a portfolio as
25 well and it included, of course, groundwater,

1 surface water, San Juan Chama water, conservation
2 reuse, and aquifer storage or recovery. So when I
3 show you in the next slide the portfolio that we're
4 proposing, it's actually going to be quite similar
5 to this. So of course we're going to take advantage
6 of current supplies, groundwater and surface water.

7 We are proposing a conservation of 110
8 gallons per capita per day over the next 20 years.
9 Our current goal is 135. We're actually at about
10 127 last year. We're proposing doing some reuse,
11 wastewater use, ASR, taking advantage potentially of
12 some compact relinquishment water, which is credit
13 water from the Rio Grande compact that the state may
14 distribute to the Water Authority.

15 New storage, there was some discussion
16 ability that earlier. And that new storage could be
17 aquifer storage and recovery, it could be surface
18 storage, it could take a variety of different forms.
19 But the idea with the new storage is to capture
20 access water when it's available to use it later on.

21 Watershed management, we've been working
22 with a nature conservancy and talking to them about
23 doing some watershed management. And watershed
24 management doesn't necessarily yield any water, per
25 se, but it's more of an insurance policy, so you

1 take the forest, you thin it out, and you reduce the
2 risk of having forest fires and subsequent run off
3 and ash into the system and things like that, so
4 it's more of an insurance policy.

5 So how does that work? How does portfolio
6 one actually work? I talked a little bit about the
7 groundwater reserve. And the groundwater reserve,
8 think of it like a savings account with a minimum
9 balance below, which you don't want to go below, and
10 that's our management level that we've talked to you
11 a little bit about in the past. So that orange line
12 shows with the portfolio one we can keep the level
13 of the groundwater working reserve above the
14 management level for the entire plan period, so
15 that's all the way out to 2117.

16 Under current practice, if we didn't do
17 anything at all, if we just kept doing what we're
18 doing, we would see those groundwater levels drop
19 off, and you can see by the dotted light blue line
20 there. So they would -- we would use quite a bit
21 more groundwater than what we're proposing to do
22 under this portfolio one if we continued with
23 current practices. So a very big difference there
24 in terms of our ability to have this savings account
25 of groundwater versus current practices.

1 What about filling in the gaps? We talked
2 to you a little bit the last time we were before you
3 about potential supply gaps into the future. This
4 medium supply, medium demand gap, which the medium
5 supply is an average climate change supply
6 availability, medium demand based on, of course,
7 data from the Water Authority. That was showing a
8 need for new supplies in about 2080. If we can
9 implement portfolio one, that entire gap goes away.
10 That entire need for new supply goes away. So we
11 have for the medium, medium we have covered all the
12 supply we need for the entire 100-year planning
13 period.

14 If we -- one of the things about this
15 adaptive management process that I shared with you,
16 the flowchart from a little bit ago, is that if we
17 find ourselves in a situation where there's more
18 climate change than we expect or growth is higher,
19 demand is higher than we expect and we need more
20 supply, we can really run through the same process
21 again and create essentially another supply gap
22 triangle. So if we did that with the low supply,
23 high demand scenario then you can see that where it
24 originally was, the purple dotted line, it's much
25 smaller now into that shaded purple area.

1 So in this situation we've shown that given
2 the portfolio that we've developed we can meet the
3 medium supply and medium demand and really reduce
4 the need for supply under the low supply and high
5 demand.

6 Even under portfolio one we still have some
7 additional water available to us, should we be able
8 to take advantage of that by way of new storage or
9 other methods, so even with this portfolio one,
10 taking advantage of aquifer storage and recovery and
11 some new storage options we still have some
12 remaining resources that we can take advantage of,
13 so there's still some extra supply that we may be
14 able to access.

15 I'll show you a couple of other examples of
16 two other portfolios. They're essentially
17 variations on the same theme using existing
18 resources, a couple of different conservation
19 alternatives. We would use reuse and ASR in both
20 instances, compact relinquishment water and a few
21 different variations on the size of potential
22 storage and of course watershed management. So we
23 have a total of three portfolios at this point that
24 we're looking at.

25 So what's next? We plan to come to you in

1 June with a draft policy framework. And John Stomp
2 mentioned the four customer conversations in June.
3 We hope to get some good feedback from the public
4 and at Town Hall in late July. And with that I'm
5 happy to stand for questions.

6 MADAME CHAIR: Councilor Davis?

7 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Just briefly on that
8 last point. I see that the draft framework would be
9 available for this board on our June meeting, which
10 is the 22nd or something. But those public forums
11 will happen, will start really kind of before that,
12 a week or so before that, which is good. I wonder
13 if the public will have a chance to review that
14 framework or those recommendations in this in a way.
15 Is it currently available on the website or a place
16 that folks can look at before they come to those
17 meetings or will it be?

18 MR. JORDAN: Madame Chair, Councilor Davis,
19 I'm going to defer that to John Stomp.

20 MR. STOMP: Madame Chair and Councilor
21 Davis, the customer conversations that are going to
22 happen in June are going to be focused on the
23 portfolios and the alternative choices that our
24 customers would have. So we're going to ask our
25 customers do you think conserving down to 110

1 gallons per capita per day is better than 120 or
2 doing outdoor use only? And then we're going to ask
3 them to actually take triangles and formulate their
4 own portfolio to say if these were the gaps we had
5 and here's your pieces of pie, how would you put the
6 pieces of pie together? So it's sort of giving us
7 feedback on the portfolios that we have.

8 And then we're going to come back in June
9 with the framework, and then the Town Hall that
10 would happen in July would use that information from
11 your discussion we have with the framework with the
12 customer conversations and then go to the Town Hall.
13 So the Town Hall would be the first time the public
14 would be able to see it, however all of these
15 documents are going to be available on our website
16 and all of the documents that we've produced.

17 We'd certainly love to make them available
18 as soon as we get them to you or to the public, but
19 I hope -- that's our goal.

20 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: All right, thanks.

21 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Stomp.

22 Thank you. I think we have a question.

23 Are you wrapping up or are we finished?

24 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: We're done.

25 MADAME CHAIR: Okay. Mr. Sanchez,

1 Councilor Sanchez has a question of you.

2 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: Before we go to the
3 next presentation I have a couple of questions and
4 some concerns regarding the project on Central and
5 Yucca, and I know that part of the implementation of
6 the art project has started with some of the work
7 that the Water Authority is doing.

8 I was disappointed in the outreach to the
9 community. Now it's, I think, become a nightmare
10 for many of the businesses in the community. I met
11 with members of the business community yesterday and
12 some of these businesses are basically landlocked.
13 You know, they can't access their business. The
14 signages are starting to go up now, and they called
15 back one of the business owners yesterday saying,
16 you know, we have to go back to the city to get
17 the -- a new permit to make sure we can open some of
18 these areas to traffic and flow through a little bit
19 smoother to get to these businesses.

20 But I just want to say that I was extremely
21 disappointed on the work and the outreach by the
22 Water Authority, and I'm getting a lot of complaints
23 from members of the public. And we've just got to
24 make sure -- and we -- I made the commitment to the
25 business community that when we started this art

1 project, and now you have basically become part of
2 this art project because you're tearing out medians,
3 is that we can make sure that the businesses
4 continue to operate without taking a tremendous hit,
5 and I'm very concerned about that.

6 MR. SANCHEZ: Madame Chair, Councilor
7 Sanchez, criticism accepted. We'll certainly do
8 better. With regard to the medians, we didn't take
9 them out. We're actually replacing them, and John
10 can elaborate on that.

11 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: Some of those
12 medians are gone, and they said that was, you know,
13 basically part of the start of the art project and
14 some of the new piping is going in, which is going
15 to be great. But, again, I was told today by the
16 business owner that the Water Authority would have
17 to go back to the city and get a new permit, and
18 that could take up to a week if not longer.

19 MR. STOMP: Madame Chair and Councilor
20 Sanchez, I apologize to the businesses. We did try
21 to reach out to them but we clearly need to do
22 additional work for the -- so we will be doing that
23 work. With respect to the medians that were taken
24 out, there was one median that was taken out so that
25 we could cross traffic. We're going to be moving a

1 waterline behind -- that's behind the sidewalk into
2 the middle of the street, so the traffic that's
3 going to go eastbound is going to have to move over
4 to the westbound. So the median was taken out to
5 allow that to happen. When that traffic control is
6 completed we will be replacing the median just as it
7 was before, and our contractors have been told to
8 replace all of the existing medians and everything
9 that's been taken out in kind or better.

10 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: Why would we put the
11 medians back in when -- if this is phase one and the
12 medians are going to be torn back out?

13 MR. STOMP: Madame Chair and Councilor
14 Sanchez, that's a really good -- really good
15 question. The only answer I could give you is that
16 I don't know that the design is far enough along
17 that we would want to just leave these medians
18 totally taken out until we know specifically
19 where -- if that median is going to be necessary or
20 not necessary for art and so that puts us in a
21 difficult position. If we don't put it back then
22 the community thinks that we took it out and we're
23 not going to replace it.

24 If the city needs it to be gone then we are
25 going to spend a little bit of extra money to put it

1 back and tear it out again. So we're sort of in a
2 situation where we really can't win, so what we've
3 said is until we know exactly what the design is and
4 the city can actually tell us whether or not that
5 median is needed then we're going to put it back.
6 But if the city comes back and says, no, don't we
7 place that median then we won't replace that median.

8 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: Well, I would hope
9 that would be the case because if phase one starts
10 on Albuquerque's west side on Coors and, I think
11 it's like 63 Street, why would we take the medians
12 out and then put them back in and then pull them out
13 again? I think that's foolish and a waste of
14 taxpayer dollars.

15 MR. STOMP: Madame Chair and
16 Commissioner -- or Councilor Sanchez, I couldn't
17 agree with you more, however if the design is
18 incomplete and that median isn't going to be taken
19 out then we're in a situation where they're blaming
20 the Water Authority for taking out the median. So
21 we will not waste the money. We're going to hold
22 off on replacing the median until we know exactly
23 where all of the art stuff is going to go, but until
24 then we're -- our plan is to replace it so at least
25 we can tell the community if we're taking it out

1 we're going to put it back. If the city doesn't
2 want it back because it's part of the project we
3 won't spend the money to do it. So we're sort of in
4 a hold pattern, but we will replace it if it needs
5 to be replaced.

6 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: Mr. Perry, can you
7 discuss this briefly? I mean, it looks like we're
8 going to -- they're taking medians out and putting
9 those medians back in, phase one of the art project
10 will be on west Central and then we're going to take
11 those medians back out again? It just doesn't make
12 any sense to me.

13 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Madame Chair and
14 Councilor Sanchez, I've heard the conversation a
15 little bit. I think I'm going to have to talk with
16 Mike Reardon about that and I can get back with you
17 and the Board.

18 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: And regarding, say
19 that they need to come back for additional permits,
20 is it going to take over a week to get those permits
21 in place to basically get the traffic, you know,
22 back into the business community where they cannot
23 lose any more business? Because I mean -- if this
24 is going to be done they should be able to go back
25 and get a permit within one day or two days to get

1 that traffic flowing where these businesses aren't
2 losing any more business.

3 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Madame Chair,
4 Councilor, I absolutely agree with you. I think
5 we're kind of learning a little bit about some of
6 the gaps and the challenges and that we're going to
7 have to pay more attention to communications and
8 business streamlining, and I assure that I will get
9 with Mr. Reardon and by early next week, also talk
10 with Mr. Stomp, Water Utility Authority, and then
11 the other folks as far as what we can do to
12 coordinate this, streamline it, and try to eliminate
13 any sort of redundancy in permitting or otherwise.

14 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: I hope that's done
15 because this is only the beginning --

16 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Yes, sir.

17 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: -- of a project
18 that's going to start on west Central and go all the
19 way up to the Louisiana. And if we don't do it
20 right it will be a disaster.

21 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Yes, sir.

22 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Stomp.

23 MR. STOMP: Thank you.

24 MADAME CHAIR: We have one more
25 presentation tonight, and that is the customer

1 opinion survey by Mr. Roth and Brian Sanderoff.

2 Mr. Roth? Thank you.

3 MR. ROTH: Madame Chair, Members of the
4 Board, the Water Authority has been conducting
5 customer opinion surveys over the last 10 years
6 every two years, and we have contracted with
7 Research and Polling to conduct those surveys.
8 Today with us or tonight is Brian Sanderoff from
9 Research and Polling. He's going to give a summary
10 of the 2016 survey.

11 MADAME CHAIR: Welcome, Mr. Sanderoff.
12 It's nice to see you here.

13 MR. SANDEROFF: Thank you, Madame Chair,
14 Board Members. It's a great pleasure to be here.
15 And as Frank said, we've been conducting customer
16 satisfaction surveys for you for a while, and so
17 what we did here is we surveyed 500 of your
18 residential customers and 100 of your commercial
19 customers and asked them how they feel things are
20 going regarding customer satisfaction and the
21 importance of various services that you offer. I
22 think I've got some good news tonight to let you
23 know how things are going.

24 So basically let's get right to it. You
25 know, in survey research one of the questions we

1 always like to ask is overall how satisfied are you
2 with the services provided by whatever agency you're
3 looking at, in this case the Water Authority. And
4 I'm not going to do this with every slide, but just
5 to show you, here you're seeing a comparison between
6 2014 and 2016. We asked are you very satisfied,
7 somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied or very
8 dissatisfied, so you can see the categories are fair
9 and objective.

10 If you look at the 2016 and you combine the
11 very satisfied and the somewhat satisfied, that 56
12 and the 37, we find that 93 percent of your
13 residential water customers are satisfied. And if
14 we add up the 5 percent and the 2 percent that are
15 dissatisfied we find 7 percent are dissatisfied. So
16 overall residential customers, 93 percent satisfied,
17 7 percent dissatisfied, and the numbers didn't
18 change much from the prior study two years ago.
19 Those are nice numbers.

20 Then we asked the same thing on the
21 commercial side among your commercial customers, and
22 again you're seeing very similar percentages between
23 the two different years. But if we add up the very
24 and somewhat satisfied for 2016, we find that 96
25 percent of your commercial customers are satisfied

1 and 4 percent are dissatisfied overall.

2 If you look at the top half of this slide,
3 we measured satisfaction levels with reliability
4 issues. We learn when we deal with electric
5 utilities and gas utilities and even
6 telecommunications nothing trumps reliability.
7 People assume when they turn on the faucet they're
8 going to get water, when they turn the light switch
9 they're going to get power and when they don't get
10 it they're not very happy. When asked about
11 reliability and availability of water to your home,
12 and again here you're looking at the very satisfied
13 and the somewhat satisfied, so 97 percent of your
14 residential customers are satisfied with the
15 reliability and availability of water to your home,
16 3 percent are dissatisfied.

17 When it comes to reliability, the
18 wastewater from your home to the drain -- to the
19 sewer line, satisfaction levels are 92 percent to
20 5 percent dissatisfied, so this is nice. These are
21 strong numbers.

22 The bottom half of the page addressed to
23 infrastructure items, dealing with the condition of
24 infrastructure. First with the condition of the
25 sewer lines throughout the city, such as the number

1 of overflow and backups you observe and then the
2 condition of the waterlines. So here we see
3 65 percent satisfaction levels if you add up the
4 30 percent very satisfied and the 35 percent
5 somewhat satisfied and 15 percent dissatisfied, on
6 the condition of the waterlines 25 percent
7 dissatisfied. So although satisfaction levels have
8 dropped when it comes to the conditions as compare
9 today reliability, they did actually increase, the
10 very satisfied increased by 8 percentage points this
11 year compared to last year, and I know you've been
12 working on that. So that's one area where there's
13 been some nice improvements.

14 By the way, the results for the commercial
15 customers were almost identical, so we didn't bother
16 putting the bars on the page to make it too
17 burdensome to read.

18 How would you rate the satisfaction of the
19 quality of the drinking water that you get from the
20 Water Authority? Would you say you're very
21 satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat
22 dissatisfied, or very? And so we find that
23 79 percent of your customers, and I was hear for the
24 discussion on flouride, for part of it, and
25 15 percent of your customers are dissatisfied,

1 79 percent satisfied. In the follow-up survey that
2 we do in a year or two it might be interesting to
3 ask a why do you feel this way question about
4 whether a person says satisfied or dissatisfied, to
5 ask them in their own words why they feel that way.
6 It might be interesting. We used to include
7 questions on do you use bottled water and why but it
8 might be nice to add a why follow up to this
9 question and see what we get. Incidentally, the
10 results to this survey were similar to prior years
11 and the results were also similar among your
12 commercial customers.

13 Satisfaction levels with educational and
14 water issues and satisfaction levels with water
15 conservation programs that the Water Authority
16 provides to its customers, again, 73 percent
17 satisfied, 10 percent dissatisfied, and similar
18 numbers with the water conservation programs.
19 Again, the results you can see in the bottom
20 left-hand corner on that note are similar among
21 commercial customers.

22 What about the effectiveness of repairs and
23 odor alcohol? We had three items on this topic.
24 Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with controlling
25 odors from sewer lines or treatment facilities?

1 72 percent satisfied, 10 percent dissatisfied. And
2 within the report, we've got a 100-page report that
3 takes all of these questions and segments the
4 results by region of the district, it segments the
5 results by age, ethnicity, education level, so
6 within the report you can slice and dice this
7 information in lots of different ways, satisfaction
8 with repairs and leaks. You can see 11 percent
9 dissatisfied only, and then responding to overflows
10 or backups, 58 percent satisfied, 9 percent
11 dissatisfied.

12 Billing was the highest satisfaction levels
13 besides reliability. We asked three different items
14 on how satisfied are you with billing. The billing
15 payment options, understanding the format of the
16 bill and the accuracy of the bill, about
17 80-some-odd percent satisfied and approximately
18 10 percent or less dissatisfied with those items.

19 We asked people have you contacted the
20 Water Authority in the last two years with any
21 problems or issues, and we found that 17 percent of
22 your customers are contacting the Authority. We
23 asked, well, how are you doing it? Are you doing it
24 on the telephone, are you doing it in person? And
25 you can see the numbers there. 76 percent say the

1 telephone is the best -- their means of choice
2 still. Over time that will continue to drop, but in
3 person 17 percent say they come down to the office
4 and ask their questions. The website, 7 percent and
5 so on. So you have nearly one in five people
6 contacting you with some issue relating to questions
7 or problems. The phone and in person are the
8 preferred ways of choice.

9 How would you rate the customer service
10 representatives when contacting the Water Authority?
11 So among those people who called on the phone or
12 among those people who came down in person we asked
13 how would you rate them. And 69 percent, excellent
14 or good, 14 percent fair, and 16 percent poor or
15 very poor. So this is an area we should look at in
16 the future, just further tweak the issue on customer
17 service rep. One of the cautions here is the size
18 dropping because we started out with a sample size
19 of 500. By the time you get down to just those who
20 contacted the Authority you're down to 71, so the
21 sampling error starting rising on these matters.

22 But still 69 percent excellent, good, and
23 it was 79 percent in the last study, so this is
24 something to watch. But then again last year was a
25 peak year, and one of the reasons it was a peak

1 because you really worked hard at it due to the
2 results from the two studies ago, but this is
3 something to watch.

4 We read eight items and asked people how
5 important it is regarding water conservation and
6 environmental issues. And here you're looking at
7 the percentage of people who said these items are
8 very important or somewhat important. The one that
9 rose to the top was dealing with a providing with a
10 long-term water supply for future generations. So I
11 heard the prior presentation talking about what
12 exactly you're doing there. That's what your
13 customers are saying is most important to them, that
14 you should be providing a long-term water supply for
15 future generations, 94 percent say that's important.
16 Other ones that really scored high, the quality of
17 treated water being returned back to the river,
18 investing and repairing and replacement of old water
19 and sewer lines and reusing treated wastewater for
20 irrigated public spaces. Those are the ones that
21 faired a highest percentage of your customers said
22 is most important.

23 Again, we don't show the commercial
24 customers here only because the results were so
25 similar between commercial and residential.

1 These are some interesting questions on
2 water conservation management. We read statements
3 and asked people to agree or disagree with them.
4 Agree or disagree, the cost of water is an important
5 factor for me when deciding how much water to use.
6 So how much you charge, does that impact usage?
7 76 percent agree with that statement. Yeah, what
8 you charge me does impact my usage and 20 percent
9 disagreed. They're going to use whatever they want
10 regardless of what you charge them. Okay?

11 Again in the report you can look at these
12 results by region, socioeconomic status. Households
13 would conserve more water if they had an easier way
14 to monitor its use. 72 percent agree with that
15 statement, 21 percent disagree. But when it comes
16 to strong financial penalties for people who use too
17 much water, the majority do agree, 61 percent, but
18 there is a group of people, 35 percent, who are a
19 little nervous of making the penalties a little too
20 high. So interest results there.

21 This is an important question: Agree or
22 disagree, water and sewer services are a good value
23 for the amount of money I pay. So do people feel
24 they're getting a good value services for what they
25 pay? In this most recent study in 2016, 78 percent

1 strongly or somewhat agreed with that statement that
2 the value is good, 17 percent disagreed. Now,
3 notice two years ago it was 87 percent saying it was
4 a good value. So the percentage of people who feel
5 they're getting a good value for what they pay has
6 dropped from 87 percent to 78, but you had a couple
7 rate increases in there in the last two cycles so
8 that doesn't surprise me. If you go a year without
9 a rate increase that 78 will probably, based on my
10 experience, jump back up to the 87. But for now
11 17 percent disagreed on the value proposition
12 compared to only 10 percent in 2014.

13 But still those are good numbers. Believe
14 me, if you ask that question about, I won't mention
15 any types of utilities, about a value for what you
16 get, but these are stronger numbers than you
17 typically see.

18 Here's some interesting things on attitudes
19 toward water rate increases. I get a kick of the
20 bottom one first. Agree or disagree, water rates,
21 the bottom one, should be increased to encourage
22 water conservation. When we asked that to folks
23 34 percent agree but 63 percent disagree. Don't
24 raise my rates to encourage me to conserve more.
25 And of course we hear anecdotally from people that

1 sometimes with their conservation they're rewarded
2 with higher rates, and I think we see some of that
3 in here. But on the top item, because water is a
4 scarce resource -- resource, excuse me, water rates
5 should be designed to reflect the value of water in
6 our daily lives. To that most people agree.

7 What about the next one? Water rates
8 should be increased to cover the true costs to treat
9 and deliver water to our homes. There it gets a
10 little more divided, 56 to 40, and water rates
11 should be increased to cover the costs of providing
12 reliable water supply. People want water
13 reliability. They want you to plan for the future.
14 They probably are willing to increase rates if they
15 see you're running into a deficit. They want you to
16 plan, though, for the future, but it's only at that
17 point when they see that the day-to-day costs are
18 exceeding the revenue coming in that I think they
19 would be more receptive, because look at the next
20 question, agree, disagree, the water utility should
21 plan and take necessary steps to ensure that our
22 community has safe, adequate supplies of water for
23 the next 10 to 40 years. Well, 91 percent agree you
24 need to be planning and taking steps to ensure our
25 community has safe and adequate water supplies.

1 There's no doubt about it. They're committed to it.

2 Then when we ask what are you willing to
3 pay for it and how much are you willing to pay,
4 42 percent say none and then you can see below the
5 mean they're willing to pay monthly is \$4.30 for the
6 commercial, \$12 they're willing to pay. But
7 essentially what that tells us is people are
8 obviously recognizing they need you to plan for the
9 future. When you do in the future have to raise
10 rates because of that planning or when you do have
11 to raise rates because of the continuing renovation
12 program, they just need to be educated and sold on
13 the fact that you're doing it for the right reasons.

14 So with that, I'll just conclude and say
15 overall satisfaction is high, particularly when it
16 comes to your reliability, particularly when it
17 comes to the reliability of getting water to the
18 home and getting the drainage from the home to the
19 sewer, that people do perceive good value from their
20 bill. It slipped a little because of a couple of
21 rate increases, and the vast majority of residents
22 and commercial customers want you to take the
23 necessary steps to plan ahead to ensure future water
24 supplies, however many customers oppose a rate
25 increase and you just need to educate them any time

1 you do it as to why you really need the money.

2 Any questions, comments on it?

3 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you.

4 Commissioner Hart Stebbins?

5 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Yeah, just a
6 quick question. Who do you suppose answers no to
7 the question about should we plan and take steps to
8 secure a safe adequate water supply? I mean, who
9 says no to that?

10 MR. SANDEROFF: Yeah. No, it is a question
11 that's designed to see if people agree with what
12 would be the obvious, and -- and they do. There are
13 some people who are no growers, and there are some
14 people who don't want to use water as a tool for
15 growth and we wanted to just test how big that group
16 was, and it wasn't that big.

17 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Thank you.

18 Thank you, Madame Chair.

19 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you.

20 Mr. Sanderoff, it's always a pleasure to
21 have you here. Thank you.

22 MR. SANDEROFF: Oh, thank you.

23 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: I have one question
24 for Brian. You've got 42 percent that are saying
25 nothing and there are 20 percent that are saying

1 don't know and won't say, so there's still hope
2 there that we can keep it down to 50 percent.

3 MR. SANDEROFF: Yes, and that's sort of my
4 point. If you explain to them and educate why there
5 is that other group. And when it comes to the don't
6 knows we excluded them from the mean. The 0s are in
7 the mean but the don't knows we didn't include it in
8 the mean. We didn't give them a value.

9 MADAME CHAIR: Thank you. And thank you to
10 administration for doing this. This is extremely
11 helpful.

12 And seeing no more business, the meeting is
13 adjourned. Thank you.

14 [Meeting adjourned.]

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF NEW MEXICO
2 COUNTY OF BERNALILLO
3
4

5 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

6 I, Paul Baca, New Mexico Certified Court
7 Reporter, No. 112, do hereby certify that I reported
8 the foregoing proceedings in stenographic shorthand
9 and the pages are a true and correct transcript of
10 those proceedings and were reduced to preinted form
11 under my direct supervision.

12 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither employed by
13 nor related to any of the parties or attorneys in
14 this matter and that I have no interest in the final
15 disposition of this matter.
16
17
18

19 PAUL BACA

20 Certified Court Reporter, #112

21 License Expires: 12/31/16
22
23
24
25