

4

Public Participation in the Planning Process

This chapter describes how the public participated in the water planning process, including events, activities, and participants. It shows what was actually done to fulfill the public participation strategy identified in Chapter 3. Because the water planning process was directed largely through the volunteer efforts of the Middle Rio Grande Water Assembly (Water Assembly), it was de facto a public effort, as opposed to a government-led effort. More than 2000 individuals contributed many tens of thousands of person hours, some paid, mostly volunteer. Throughout the process, the Water Assembly has used the term public participation to mean providing numerous opportunities for residents in the region to provide input at every stage of plan development.

The authors have made every attempt to identify all the stakeholders, participants, events and materials that were part of this process. Any omissions are inadvertent. This chapter includes the following:

- List of Stakeholders and Participants
- Public Water Planning Events
- Materials Prepared for Public Dissemination
- Negotiation Process

4.1 List of Stakeholders and Participants

The coordination between the Water Assembly and the Water Resources Board, which the Mid-Region Council of Governments (MRCOG) established, made the process collaborative from the outset. As described in Chapter 1, the Water Assembly was responsible for working with non-governmental entities and the general public for generating the plan. The Water Resources Board has the responsibility for working with local governments to implement the plan.

The Water Assembly had active volunteers from throughout the region, thus providing input to the plan that represents the values and concerns for the entire planning area. Additionally, to ensure that various perspectives were well represented, the Water Assembly established five constituency groups, each advocating for particular interests in the region. These groups were:

- Specialists—including but not limited to academics, researchers, data managers, consultants, and agency staff
- Managers—representatives of firms, agencies or jurisdictions responsible for water provision or management
- Environmental Advocates
- Agricultural, Cultural and Historical Water Use Advocates
- Urban Users and Economic Development Advocates

The Water Resources Board includes representatives from local governments and other decision-making bodies through the region. The following local governments and other entities are active WRB members:

- Bernalillo County
- Sandoval County
- Valencia County
- City of Albuquerque

Middle Rio Grande Regional Water Plan

- City of Rio Rancho
- Town of Bernalillo
- Village of Bosque Farms
- Village of Corrales
- Village of Cuba
- Village of Los Lunas
- Village of Los Ranchos de Albuquerque
- Village of Tijeras
- Albuquerque Metropolitan Arroyo Flood Control Authority
- Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District
- Southern Sandoval County Arroyo Flood Control Authority
- Village of Jemez Springs
- Village of San Ysidro
- City of Belen
- Isleta Pueblo (early in process)

Additionally, the Water Assembly, the Rio Jemez Subregion, and the Rio Puerco Subregion are ex-officio members. This highly representative structure ensured that the plan would be inclusive and represent the diversity within the region. To generate an even more inclusive process, the Water Assembly dedicated tremendous time and energy to presenting information to and requesting feedback from numerous stakeholder groups as well as the general public.

4.1.1 Stakeholder Constituencies

Everyone in the Middle Rio Grande Region is a stakeholder when it comes to regional water planning. One measure of public participation, however, is how many specific stakeholder groups were involved. The Water Assembly and the Mid-Region Council of Governments delivered numerous presentations and discussed the relevant issues with many different stakeholder groups. These meetings gave stakeholder groups the opportunity to ask questions and to comment on the planning process and plan contents.

In the Middle Rio Grande Region there are several categories of stakeholders, and within each category a number of different entities represent different water interests. Following is a list of these categories and stakeholders.

Federal Entities

The Mid-Region Council of Governments had the responsibility to keep the New Mexico congressional delegation informed about the water planning process. They submitted information as appropriate to:

- Senator Pete Domenici
- Senator Jeff Bingaman
- Representative Heather Wilson
- Representative Tom Udall

Additionally, the Water Assembly formally briefed Representative Udall on August 26, 2003.

The Water Assembly structure included the External Coordination Working Team, which had a responsibility to reach out to federal and state agencies to keep them informed about the planning process

and to request feedback on various activities. In an 8 October 2002 meeting, representatives from the following federal agencies received an update on the regional water plan:

- U.S. Geological Survey
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- Bureau of Indian Affairs
- Kirtland Air Force Base
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
- Sandia National Laboratories
- U.S. Department of Agriculture (Natural Resources Conservation Service)

A similar group of representatives were also briefed on 11 September 2003. Additionally, MRCOG staff met with several federal agencies concerning various specific aspects of the planning process.

Tribal Entities

Tribal entities were invited to participate in both Water Assembly activities and to be members of the Water Resources Board. Water Assembly volunteers invited pueblo representatives to all meetings and have consistently had tribal representatives speak at the Annual Assemblies. Representatives from the planning group have discussed the water planning process with the pueblos and other tribal entities on various occasions. Additionally, following Water Resources Board meetings concerning the plan, the MRCOG sent information the pueblos to keep them apprised of planning activities and to reiterate that the pueblos were welcome to join the process at any time. See Historical Archive B for sample correspondence.

The tribes were reluctant to participate directly in the water planning process, perhaps due to concerns that such participation could jeopardize their legal positions and set a precedent for engaging in government to non-government relations. Tribal entities have prior and paramount water rights. What this means for the future is uncertain and most likely will become mired in the courts. Although this uncertainty of rights imposes uncertainty upon the planning process, the water plan can still make recommendations for how water should be used in the region while deferring the not inconsequential issues of who pays and who gets paid for the water.

State Entities

The Water Assembly and MRCOG interacted regularly with various state-level organizations about the plan. Provided here are examples of this interaction:

- The Water Assembly gave presentations to the Interim Committee on Water and Natural Resources in the State Legislature in November 2001 and September 2003
- The External Coordination Working Team invited the sitting New Mexico State Senators and State Representatives from the region, as well as the candidates for State Representative positions to an informational meeting held on 8 November 2002.
- The State Engineer and the Director of the Interstate Stream were regularly kept apprised of the planning progress from both the Water Assembly volunteers and the MRCOG staff. Most recently, there were focused briefings held on 5 February 2002, 18 June 2002, and 16 May 2003.
- The Water Assembly and the MRCOG had regular ongoing discussions with ISC staff during execution of contracts for Phase I and Phase II (see Historical Archives A-1 and A-2 for contracts). Additionally, the regional ISC Commissioner regularly participated in Water Assembly Action Committee meetings through 2002.

Middle Rio Grande Regional Water Plan

- A briefing was presented to personnel from the following State agencies that are concerned with water issues in late May 2003:
- John D'Antonio – State Engineer
- James Davis - Surface Water Quality Bureau, New Mexico Environment Department (NMED)
- Marcy Leavitt – Ground Protection and Remediation Bureau, NMED
- Howard Lundstrom, NMED
- Rhea Graham - Interstate Stream Commission
- Estavan Lopez – Director, Interstate Stream Commission
- Mary Helen Follingstad – Interstate Stream Commission
- David Ruiz – Director, Local Government Division, Department of Finance and Administration (DFA)
- Ken Hughes, Local Government Division, DFA
- Jim Condis – Director of Information, Solid Waste Department
- John O'Connell, Enforcement Division, Solid Waste Department

Local Governing Bodies

Besides the monthly meetings of the Water Resources Board, which includes representatives from many local governments, there has been significant interaction with local governments through presentations to their governing bodies. The following is not a comprehensive listing, but provides examples of the types of agencies that Water Assembly volunteers or MRCOG staff met with throughout the planning process.

- Valencia County, County Commission—1 May 2001; 3 June 2003, 5 August 2003
- City of Belen, Ralph Sigula—6 March 2001; City Council—6 May 2002, 19 May 2003, 21 July 2003
- Town of Estancia—18 November 2001
- Village of Los Lunas, Village Council—6 June 2002, 24 July 2003
- Bosque Farms, City Council —16 January 2003, 17 July 2003
- Bernalillo County Commission—10 June 2003
- Town of Bernalillo, Board of Trustees —15 June 2002, 28 July 2003
- Albuquerque/Bernalillo joint city/county Utilities Board—27 October 2000
- Albuquerque City Council—22 Jan 2003, 18 August 2003
- Village of Los Ranchos de Albuquerque, Board of Trustees—12 December 2002, 31 July 2003
- Sandoval County, County Commission—6 December 2001, 19 June 2003
- City of Rio Rancho, Planning and Zoning Board—29 August 2000; Mayor Owen—14 February 2002; City Council—8 October 2002, 28 May 2003, 10 September 2003
- Village of Jemez Springs—30 April 2002; Water Co-op—18 May 2002, Board of Trustees—13 August 2003
- San Ysidro Board of Trustees—12 August 2003
- Cuba Village Council—29 July 2003
- Tijeras City Council—11 August 2003

- Corrales Village Council—22 July 2003
- Sandia and Manzano Regional Acequia Association gave a presentation to Action Committee—21 May 2003
- Water Assembly gave a presentation to Sandia and Manzano Regional Acequia Association—14 June 2003
- Water Resources Board membership request from Acequia La Rosa de Castilla, Inc. to Mid-Region Council of Governments—24 September 2002.
- Water Assembly gave a presentation to Las Placitas Acequia Association—20 February 2003
- Water Picture Show Presentation for San Antonio de las Huertas Acequia—30 August 2000
- Albuquerque and Bernalillo County Ground Water Protection Advisory Board—14 August 2003

Special Districts

- Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District Board—25 November 2002
- Albuquerque Metropolitan Arroyo Flood Control Agency, Presentations to Directors—30 October 2001, 26 September 2002
- Southern Sandoval County Arroyo Flood Control Agency, Presentation to Directors – 19 August 2003

Neighboring Regions

- Socorro-Sierra Region—August 2002; April 2003; gave presentation to the Water Assembly Action Committee—19 July 2000
- Estancia Region—21 December 2000, 18 January 2001, 15 March 2001, 19 April 2001
- Jemez y Sangre Region gave a presentation to the Water Assembly Action Committee—19 July 2000

Non-Governmental Organizations

Throughout the planning process representatives from a diverse array of organizations participated in Water Assembly presentations, public meetings or were more actively involved in developing this plan. Additionally, Water Assembly volunteers gave formal presentations and frequently discussed the planning process with leaders from these various organizations.

- League of Women Voters, Water Assembly delivered a formal presentation—19 June 2001.
- National Council of Churches, presentation—8 January 2003
- Intel Corporation, presentation—2001, 25 February 2002
- American Water and Wastewater Association, Water Assembly gave a presentation—27 November 2001.
- City of Albuquerque, Chamber of Commerce —30 October 2002, 13 December 2002, 5 June 2003
- Economic Forum —20 February 2003
- Hispano Chamber of Commerce —19 June 2003
- Master Gardeners, Water Assembly gave a presentation—6 June 2003
- Friends of Placitas, Water Assembly gave a presentation—8 November 2000
- New Mexico Water Dialogue

Middle Rio Grande Regional Water Plan

- NM Rural Water Association
- Sierra Club
- National Association of Industrial and Office Properties
- Business Water Task Force
- ESA Collaborative Program
- Rio Grande Restoration
- 1000 Friends of New Mexico
- Association of Rate Payers (Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District)

Other Outreach Efforts

There were other places and events where the Water Assembly presented information on the water planning process. Examples include:

- Presentation to a seminar at the University of New Mexico—26 April 2001
- State Fair Booth—20 September 2002
- Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District (MRGCD) Irrigation System Tour—2002
- Santa Fe Opera Wetlands Tour—8 June 2003

4.1.2 Individual Participants

This water planning process involved thousands of people at different times and in different capacities. Tracking all individuals who actively participated in the planning process was a monumental task and hence, there are undoubtedly inadvertent omissions in the following lists.

Approximately 3000 individuals have attended Water Assembly activities as indicated by sign-ins at annual Assemblies, Community Conversations, and other gatherings. MRCOG has documented who attended in order to maintain a mailing list so that interested individuals received pertinent information about the planning process and opportunities for continued public input. Additionally, as part of their contract with the Interstate Stream Commission, the MRCOG was tasked with maintaining a public comment database to record individual comments on the plan as the process unfolded. More than 2300 comments were received in this planning effort.

Each of the constituency groups who advocate for one viewpoint or another met through the course of the planning process. Active participants for each group are listed below:

Specialists

Lee Brown	B.J. Brock	Corinne Brooks
Brian Burnett	Cliff Crawford	Cliff Dahm
Chuck Easterling	Bob Grant	Sterling Grogan
Steve Hansen	Michelle Henrie	Ed Kelley
Mike Kernodle	Steve Kolk	Dick Kreiner
Jamie McCall	Joanne McEntire	Mike McGovern
Dwight Miller	Suzanne Mills	Ken Muller
Howard Passell	Frank Robinson	John Shomaker
Gail. R. Stockton	Howard Stone	Amber Tafoya

Middle Rio Grande Regional Water Plan

Frank Titus

Erik Webb

Bob Prendergast

Managers

Mary Murnane

John Stomp

Subhas Shah

Dee Fuerst

Ed Whaley

Jaqueline Guilbault

Bob Swartwout

Betty Behred

Matt Holmes

Susan Kelly

Larry Webb

Lorri Skeie-Campbell

Environmental Advocates

Kevin Bean

Danny Hernandez

Reid Bandeen

Sue Sayton

Mike Hightower

Marty J Mitchell

Thomas E. Luebben

Steve Harris

Martin Zehr

Maya Key

Ed Payne

Elaine Hebard

Maggie Seeley

Leanne Leith

Cynthia Gomez

Terry Hicks

Larry Shore

Harry Day

Peter Neils

Simone Seiler

Marcus Hopkins

Andrew Homer

Dee Fuerst

Agricultural, Cultural and Historical Water Use Advocates

Janet Jarratt

Jessie Fitzgerald

Glen Young

Ann Rustebakke

Lisa Robert

Will Ouellette

Marcia Fernandez

Rip Anderson

Ted Hewes

Elizabeth Chestnut

John Brown

Carlos Madrid

Urban Users and Economic Development Advocates

Andy Smith

Bill Keleher

Bob Simon

Brian Burnett

Bud Williams

Carol Hart

Chuck Barnhart

Chuck Gara

Dave Hill

Dave Simmons

Donna Detwile

Eileen Grevey Hillson

Elaine Hebard

Fred Ambrogi

Helen Wright

Jennifer Schuetz

Jim Mocho

John Henderson

John Hooker

Julia Fitzsimmons

Julie Stephens

Kate Southard

Keith Bandoni

Larry Shore

Leslie Kryder

Lilly Otto

Lora Lucero

Marianne Woodard

Martin Haynes

Martin Zehr

Michael Kelly

Pauline Gubbels

Scott Throckmorton

Scott Whittington

Stan Euston

Trudy Jones

Middle Rio Grande Regional Water Plan

Water Assembly working teams completed most of the actual planning work. As their respective names imply, each team had a different functional role in the planning process (see Section 1.3.9). Participants in those teams are listed below:

Public Participation and Communication

Kevin Bean	Bob Prendergast	Bob Wessely
Danny Hernandez	Don Rudy	Elaine Hebard
Janet Blair	Jennifer Schuetz	Jessica Ciddio
Joanne McEntire	John Brown	Kim Greenwood
Larry Shore	Linda Jackson	Lisa Robert
Marty Mitchell	Elizabeth Chestnut	Eric Roth
Kristan Cockerill	Susan Gorman	Steve Harris
Ric Richardson	Joe Quintana	Jim Gross

Alternatives Working Team

Mary Murnane	Ed Payne	Frank Robinson
Joanne McEntire	Bob Prendergast	Andy Smith
Joe Quintana	Lynn Montgomery	Mike McGovern
Sue Umshler	Marilynn Cooper	Leslie Kryder
Mike Voorhees	Reid Bandeen	Richard Barrish
Marty Mitchell		

Analysis Team

Lee Brown	Howard Stone	Frank Robinson
Sterling Grogan	Howard Passell	Brian Burnett
Bob Wessely	Mike Kernodle	Michelle Henrie
Elaine Hebard	Marty Mitchell	Frank Titus
Mike McGovern	Corinne Brooks	Janet Jarratt
Ed Payne	Glenn Young	Scott Hak
Gary Stansifer	Suzanne Mills	John Stomp
Subas Shah	Frank Jones	

Cooperative Modeling Team

Howard Passell	Celina Jones	Andy Smith
Bob Prendergast	Bob Wessely	Charles M. Easterling
Elaine Hebard	Janet Jarratt	John R. Brown
Marilyn O'Leary	Matthew Holmes	Mike Kernodle
Reid Bandeen	Vincent Tidwell	Lee Brown

External Coordination Working Team

Pauline Gubbels	B.J. Brock	Mary Anne Woodard
Bob Swarthout	Danny Hernandez	Elaine Hebard
Brian La Motta	Bob Wessely	Bob Prendergast
Lee Brown	Larry Blair	Mike Trujillo
Joe Quintana		

Administration and Finance Team

Bob Prendergast	B.J. Brock	Sharon Aller
Elsa Bumstead	Larry Webb	Lee Brown
Sterling Grogan	Marty Mitchell	Joe Quintana
John Shomaker		

Over the seven years, several people served as officers for the Water Assembly. These people are listed below.

Chairs:	Bob Swartwout, Lee Brown, Bob Wessely
Vice Chairs:	Frank Robinson, Bob Prendergast
Treasurers:	James Burson, Marty Mitchell, Howard Stone, Elaine Hebard
Secretaries:	Marty Mitchell, Lisa Robert, Betty Behrend, B.J. Brock

4.1.3 Organizational Participants

Mid-Region Council of Governments staff supported the planning process. One of the key tasks that MRCOG completed was to maintain the Public Comment Database (see Supporting Document D). For the community conversations, regional forums and annual assemblies, public comments were captured and entered into the database for use in developing this plan. Following MRCOG staff members who contributed to this plan at some point during the process:

- Lawrence Rael, Executive Director (2002-2003)
- Fabrizo Bertoletti, Acting Executive Director (2000-2001)
- Chris Blewett, Acting Executive Director (2001)
- Dennis R. Foltz, former Executive Director (-2000)
- Joe Quintana, Regional Planning Manager
- Steve Burnstein, former Senior Regional Planner
- James Gross, former Director of Water Planning
- Mike Trujillo, Water Planning Coordinator, Administrative Services Director
- Janice Carolan, former Administrative Services Director
- Linda Jackson, former Communications Specialist, Accountant
- Dave Abrams, Information Systems Manager
- Carol Earp, GIS/Cartographer
- Wendy Vigil, Office Manager

Middle Rio Grande Regional Water Plan

Barbara Thomas, Secretary

Deborah Eckert, former Secretary

Lily Montoya, former Secretary

Barbara Yelle, former Secretary

Hope Neelson, Secretary

Jerilynn Sans, Secretary

Nicole Ortiz, Clerk

Following are the individuals who have served on the WRB at various points since its inception.

Special Districts and Authorities

Hector Gonzales, MRGCD

Joseph Griego, MRGCD

Subhas Shah, MRGCD

Daniel Hernandez, Albuquerque Metropolitan Arroyo Flood Control Authority (AMAFCA)

David Stoliker, Southern Sandoval County Arroyo Flood Control Authority (SSCAFCA)

Municipalities

City of Albuquerque

Ted Asbury

Larry Blair

John Stomp

City of Belen

Julie Baca

Eric Hill

A. Terese Ulivarri

Richard Jaramillo

Town of Bernalillo

Charles Aguilar

Ida Fierro

Village of Bosque Farms

Kenneth Bishop

Ginger Eldridge

Village of Corrales

F. Lee Brown

Ed Richardson

Village of Los Lunas

Betty Behrend

Village of Los Ranchos de Albuquerque

Leo Bartolucci

John Hooker

Marianne Woodard

Donald Lopez

City of Rio Rancho

Frank Faustine	Dee Fuerst
Larry Webb	Henry Pacelli

Counties

Bernalillo County

Mary Murnane	Jeff Peterson	Juan Vigil
--------------	---------------	------------

Sandoval County

William Sapien	Brad Stebleton
----------------	----------------

Valencia County

Alicia Aguilar	James Fernandez	Al Padilla
----------------	-----------------	------------

The Pueblos

John Sorrell, Isleta Pueblo

Ex-Officio Members

F. Lee Brown, Water Assembly	Emmett Cart, Rio Jemez Subregion
Robert Cordova, Rio Puerco Subregion	Robert Swartwout, Water Assembly
Robert Wessely, Water Assembly	Marion Woolf, Rio Puerco Subregion

Other people, as contractors or subcontractors, made significant contributions in various roles. They include:

Howard Passell, Sandia National Labs, Regional Modeler
Vincent Tidwell, Sandia National Labs, Regional Modeler
Steve Conrad, Sandia National Labs, Regional Modeler
Erik Webb, Sandia National Labs, Regional Modeler
Marilyn O’Leary, UNM/Utton Transboundary Center, Director
Celina Jones, UNM/Utton Transboundary Center, Modeling Facilitator
Lucy Moore, Lucy Moore and Associates, Facilitator
Ric Richardson, Lucy Moore and Associates, Facilitator
Ed Moreno, Ed Moreno and Associates, Facilitator
Lilly Irvin-Viteal, Ed Moreno and Associates, Facilitator
Leslie Kryder, LesLie Consulting, Technical Editor
John Shomaker, John Shomaker & Associates, Hydrologist
John Brown, UNM Institute for Public Policy, Opinion Surveyor
Amelia Rouse, UNM Institute for Public Policy, Opinion Surveyor
Amy Goodin, UNM Institute for Public Policy, Opinion Surveyor

Middle Rio Grande Regional Water Plan

Dominique Cartron, D.B. Stephens & Associates, Program Manager

Mark Miller, D.B. Stephens & Associates, Analyst

Joanne Hilton, D.B. Stephens & Associates, Analyst

Rob Leuthauser, Natural Resources Management, Consultant

Myra Siegal Friedman, Public Policy Administration, EJJ Communications

Phyllis Taylor, Senior Planner, Sites Southwest

Mike McGovern, Bohannon Huston, Inc., Analyst

Brian McDonald, Consultant, Economist

Ted Jojola, University of New Mexico, Professor of Planning

Susan Kery, JD, Sheehan, Sheehan & Stelzner

John, Utton, JD, Sheehan, Sheehan & Stelzner

Peter Chestnut, JD, Sheehan, Sheehan & Stelzner

Amy Miller, Rick Johnson & Company, Public Outreach

Alexis Kerschner, Rick Johnson & Company, Public Outreach

4.2 Public Water Planning Educational Events

Crucial to ensuring opportunities for the general public to participate in the planning process, the Water Assembly and the Mid-Region Council of Governments hosted numerous public events. The diverse opportunities for the public to provide input or otherwise contribute to the plan are described here.

Annual Assemblies – From 1997 through 2003, seven annual assemblies were held on the University of New Mexico campus. These sessions, with attendance ranging from 100 to 300, served to present various aspects of the regional water situation and the status of the water planning process to interested parties. The sessions also provided an opportunity for the various constituencies to select Action Committee representatives and bring their interests/issues into the process. Representative advertising flyers and posters for annual assemblies are in Historical Archive G-1.

Roadshows – The first series of presentations to community groups and the general public were called Roadshows. Primarily educational, they were designed to provide background information on regional water planning, the conclusions reached in previous water supply studies, and the essential questions that a regional water plan would have to address. The Roadshow was presented 27 times throughout the region from January through September 1999. The slides, script and a list of the sessions are in Supporting Document C-3.

Water Picture Show – The Water Picture Show was an updated and expanded version of the Roadshow, which provided a more detailed explanation of the water situation. The slides for the Water Picture Show presentations appear in Supporting Document C-4.

Community Conversations – From 2000 through 2003, there were six series of facilitated community conversations. Each series consisted of well-advertised public meetings conducted in the region's three counties. The themes/topics for the six series were: Issues and Problems, Goals and Objectives, Preliminary Alternatives, Alternative Actions, Alternative Action Evaluations, and Alternative Scenario Convergence. The community conversations were designed to be more intimate settings to allow the public to ask questions and interact with technical experts and to then express their opinions and concerns related to developing the plan. Advertising flyers and posters for various community conversations are in Historical Archive G-3.

Regional Forums – Following several series of community conversations, facilitated regional forums were held, inviting participants from across the entire region. These well-attended sessions were used to refine and coordinate the feedback that had been received from the respective community conversations.

Advertising materials for forums are in Historical Archive G-2 and summaries from forums are in Supporting Document C-5.

Open Houses - To gather public comment on the actual plan, there were three Open Houses , one in each county. Attendees had the opportunity to provide feedback on the final draft of the plan.

Public Opinion Surveys – The Institute for Public Policy at the University of New Mexico conducted two public opinion surveys on water issues. One was conducted in late 1999 and the other in late 2002. Both surveys were conducted on a statewide basis, with an oversample in the Middle Rio Grande Region. Survey results were worked into the overall water planning decision processes. The first survey looked at respondents’ relative values for water, and the second focused on asking how the respondents would trade off uses in a water-short situation. A summary of the first survey results is in Appendix C-5 and a full report from the survey is in Supporting Document H-7.

Action Committee Meetings – The Action Committee of the Water Assembly was the primary decision-making body. It consisted of five representatives and five alternates from each of the five constituency groups, and the four officers (59 people in all). As noted previously, the constituency groups are:

- Specialists
- Managers
- Environmental Advocates
- Agricultural, Cultural and Historical Water Use Advocates
- Urban Users and Economic Development Advocates

The Action Committee met at least once each month and like all meetings, they were open to the public. At these meetings, attendees reviewed and discussed all of the diverse aspects of water planning, including public attitudes and feedback. The group negotiated among the constituency groups to reach resolution as to what elements became part of the regional water plan. Meeting agendas are presented in Historical Archive D-1.

Executive Committee Meetings - The Executive Committee of the Water Assembly was the administrative body and consisted of the chairs of the five constituency groups and the four officers (nine people in all). The Executive Committee met at least once each month. These public sessions addressed managerial and logistical issues in the water planning process. Meeting agendas are presented in Historical Archive D-2.

Constituency Group Meetings – The constituency groups were established to ensure that the diverse opinions found throughout the region had a strong voice in the planning process. Each constituency group met at a frequency that was comfortable to the group. This frequency ranged from quarterly to monthly. At constituency group meetings, attendees reviewed issues and advocated a position to take back to the larger planning body. These groups completed several tasks to contribute to the water plan, including developing a water balancing budget and creating scenario vision statements that reflected each groups’ advocacy position. In addition, the groups regularly provided feedback and guidance to the water planning process and activities. Information from the Water Balancing Exercise is in Supporting Document I. Constituency group meetings were not formal and minutes were usually not kept.

Working Team Meetings – The Water Assembly working teams were the non-advocacy groups whose role was to ensure that the planning process stayed on track. The Water Assembly has six permanent working teams:

- Public Participation and Communication
- Alternatives Working Team
- Analysis Team
- Cooperative Modeling Team
- External Coordination Working Team
- Administration and Finance Team

Middle Rio Grande Regional Water Plan

Typically, these working teams met once or twice per month to accomplish their respective tasks. Meetings were not formal and minutes were usually not kept.

Water Resources Board Meetings – The Mid-Region Council of Governments established the Water Resources Board with a representative and an alternate from many of the government entities within the region. The Water Resources Board served as an information conduit to and from the local governments in the region. The Water Resources Board met on a monthly basis and received regular briefings on various aspects of the water planning program. A selection of minutes or summaries are presented in Historical Archive D-3.

Joint Action Committee and Water Resources Board Meetings –Public joint meetings were held with the Water Assembly Action Committee and the Mid-Region Council of Governments’ Water Resources Board. The first was an all day working session at Intel in January 2001 to develop the outline and annotated table of contents for the regional water plan. The second was a series of in-depth briefings, mostly for the Water Resources Board people, at the South Valley Community Center in July 2002. Several more sessions were held in 2003 to develop the preferred scenario and resolve other issues. Reports from these joint sessions are in Historical Archive G-4.

Media Interaction – In addition to providing regular press releases and a full media kit (see Supporting Document C-7), including story ideas, Water Assembly volunteers participated in several local radio and television publicity events and delivered presentations to print media outlets. These included:

- Regional Forum Series 3 was televised by KRQE TV, Channel 13—4 November 2000
- “Hell or High Water - I” KNME TV Channel 5, KRQE Channel 13 Specials—26 October 2000 and Channel 5—19 April 2003
- “Hell or High Water - II” KNME TV Channel 5, KRQE Channel 5 Specials—April 2003
- “Hell or High Water - III” KNME TV Channel 5, KRQE Channel 5 Specials—April 2003
- KNAT Channel 23 Interviews—October 2002, September 2003
- “In Focus” KNME TV Channel 5 Regular Program—March 2003
- Regular call-In Program, KUNM Radio—April 2002
- Albuquerque Journal Editorial Board —February 2002
- Albuquerque Tribune Editorial Board—August 2002

4.3 Educational Materials Prepared for Public Dissemination

The Water Assembly prepared written materials to distribute at meetings and/or to mail to the general public. The materials also formed the basis for collecting media kits that were presented to editorial boards, and other media personnel. These materials addressed particular topics in and around the water planning process and the water planning issues. The printed materials included:

- The Water Budget – A public readable booklet with the results of an analysis showing where water comes from and where it goes
- Middle Rio Grande Regional Water Plan Background - a handout containing some history, progress and plans
- A Water Plan for the Middle Rio Grande – a handout addressing what, why, and who of regional water planning
- Water Budgeting and Planning for the Middle Rio Grande: Information Summary and Water Budget Facts – a handout identifying multiple aspects of the water planning problem
- Water Budgeting and Planning for the Middle Rio Grande: Questions and Answers – handout describing water planning

Middle Rio Grande Regional Water Plan

- Some Statistics on Attitudes and Preferences of Residents of the Middle Rio Grande Water Planning Region Regarding Water Issues – a handout summarizing the results of the first public opinion survey
- Monthly Meeting Schedule Public Notice – a handout announcing the various standard working team and other regular meetings along with contact information
- Middle Rio Grande Regional Water Plan Publications Listing – a list of references on various water planning topics
- Candidate Alternative Action Descriptions for the Regional Water Plan – a booklet defining and describing the 44 candidate alternative actions
- Alternative Action Database – a matrix showing the results of an analysis with 28 attributes for each of the 44 candidate alternative actions
- Feasibility of Candidate Alternative Actions - a booklet providing summaries, technical details, and analyst ratings for the 44 alternative actions
- Summary Tabulation of Technical Attributes of Alternative Actions – a matrix showing the analysts' summary data for each alternative action
- Press Releases (numerous) – summaries for the press to announce meetings or other key events
- Water Alternatives Fact Sheet – a handout listing the 44 candidate alternative actions
- Water Planning FAQ's – a handout updating the previous questions and answers
- Water Budget Fact Sheet – a handout depicting the water budget situation for the region
- Most Valued Water Uses – a handout extracting a key preferences tabulation from the first public opinion survey
- Today's Water Use Picture – pie chart showing the allocation of consumptive uses in the region
- Story Ideas – a handout focusing on some of the key issues and problems in the water planning process
- Newsletter —July 1999 - summarizing 3rd Assembly
- Newsletter—February 2000 - report on water planning activities
- Newsletter —May/June 2000 - summarizing water budget information from the 4th Assembly
- Newsletter —October 2001 - summarizing tale of contents and goals and objectives for the plan
- Mailer – November 2002 - summarizing information from the 4th and 5th series of Community Conversations.
- Newsletter – December 2002 - summarizing all activities in 2002
- Mailer – April 2003 - summarizing the March Forum.
- OpEd and Other Articles – Numerous media articles written by Water Assembly volunteers have appeared in the local press

The Water Assembly developed and maintained an Internet website, www.WaterAssembly.org to provide information relevant to the water planning process. MRCOG also developed and maintained an Internet website www.mrcog-nm.gov. Among other things, these websites provided access to numerous relevant studies including:

- Historical and Current Water Use in the Middle Rio Grande Region, prepared by John Shomaker & Associates, Inc. and PioneerWest
- Middle Rio Grande Water Supply Study, prepared by S.S. Papadopoulos & Associates, Inc.

Middle Rio Grande Regional Water Plan

- Future Water Use Projections for the Middle Rio Grande Water Planning Region, prepared by the Middle Rio Grande Council of Governments (now the Mid-Region Council of Governments)
- Attitudes and Preferences of Residents of the Middle Rio Grande Water Planning Region Regarding Water Issues, prepared by the University of New Mexico Institute for Public Policy
- Alternative Action Analysis Report, prepared by Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.
- Assessment of Regional Water Quality Issues and Impacts to the Water Supply, prepared by Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.
- Overview of Water Law Applicable to the Middle Rio Grande Water Planning Region and Legal Issues Specific to the Middle Rio Grande Water Planning Region, prepared by Daniel B. Stephens & Associates.

4.4 Negotiation Process

The Middle Rio Grande water planning process mission was to decide how to balance water use with renewable supply through an open, inclusive and participatory process.

A partnership was established between the Water Assembly and the Mid-Region Council of Governments through a Memorandum of Understanding signed in 1998. This document determined that the Water Assembly would: 1) be the negotiating table for all non-government entities; and 2) build public support for the regional water plan so that elected officials could implement the plan. The Water Resources Board would be the vehicle for negotiating among local governments and for adopting and implementing the resulting regional water plan.

The first step in negotiating was to develop a credible understanding of the region's current water supply and water demand situation. This understanding was initially established through developing a Water Budget (see Chapter 6) describing the region's water sources, how much is available for use in this region, and how it's being used. More than two-dozen Water Assembly experts contributed to the water budget analysis. S.S. Papadopoulos & Associates (2000) and Bartolino and Cole (2002) confirmed the results in the water budget. Nearly all participants agreed that while there was some uncertainty in the budget numbers, they were sufficiently accurate and precise to understand that there already was a substantial deficit of consumptive demand over renewable supply, and that demand was increasing with time. In other words, the water budget revealed that the region uses more water that is renewed each year and than the numbers in the budget were reliable enough to use in the planning process..

Participants at a community conversation series and a regional forum built a mission, a set of supporting goals, and a set of supporting objectives during 2001. These were discussed and negotiated in Water Assembly committees and at the Water Resources Board. The mission and goals were adopted. Action on the objectives was deferred because they were seen to be at a level where we were doing the water planning, rather than setting targets for the water planning. In 2003 the objectives were resurrected, re-edited, and approved.

Using a projection that showed the annual deficit approximately tripling during the next 50 years, each of the constituency group used a simple computerized graphic spreadsheet tool to see how, and in what sectors, to bring the consumptive use into balance – in essence to establish sector-by-sector budgets for water consumption. In addition to the constituency groups, the general public was asked to perform similar balancing exercises in a series of community conversations. While these budgets were established at a very coarse level, and with limited understanding of their real impacts, they provided participants with an indication of the difficulty of balancing the budget and the Water Assembly with some reference guidelines for further negotiation steps.

Having an array of budgetary targets, the next step was to look at what could be done to ameliorate the budget deficit. Through a series of community conversations and technical discussions, attendees identified 273 suggested actions. Water Assembly working team experts merged these into a set of 44 candidate alternate actions, which became the basis for creating this plan. At the 5th Series of Community Conversations, attendees “voted” for their most and least preferred of the 44 alternative actions. People unable to attend a meeting could mail their votes.

In October 2002 the Mid-Region Council of Governments awarded a contract to D.B. Stephens and Associates to provide detailed analyses for 25 of the 44 alternatives. Ideally, all 44 would have been subject to an expert assessment, but funding constraints precluded this. Based on a preliminary review, including the results of the public preferences, the Water Assembly selected 25 of the 44 for consultant review. The other 19 alternatives were evaluated by the Water Assembly's Alternatives Working Team and the Analysis Team. (Supporting Documents Series G and Supporting Document J). The analysis results for all alternatives were presented to the public in a regional forum, and to the Action Committee and the Water Resources Board at their regular meetings.

At about the same time, the constituency groups created a vision of the future around which a scenario would be built. The scenario was to be a collection of alternative actions. Aiding this process was a computerized model of many of the alternative actions. The model allowed participants to see what the aquifer, downstream delivery, and cost implications were for various combinations of alternative actions.

Several scenario development committees were established. Using all available analytical and public preference data, as well as the computerized model, each such committee developed a draft scenario. One scenario was based on the urban user and economic development vision; one was based on the agricultural vision; one was based on the environmental vision; and one was based on a synthesis of the three visions. Two other committees built a scenario based upon their own visions.

Each scenario development committee had members drawn from each of the constituency groups, so that their product scenario would itself be somewhat balanced as the result of a negotiation. These draft scenarios, representing an array of viewpoints, were reviewed by the Action Committee and then presented to the public in Community Conversations Series 6 for their review and input.

The Action Committee then developed a single converged scenario to serve as the framework for this plan. This scenario was presented at a June 2003 regional forum. It was refined based on input received at that forum and from input at a joint Water Resources Board and Action Committee meeting. The result became the basis for the recommendations that appear in Chapter 10 of this plan.

Chapter 4 References

Bartolino, James R. and James C. Cole. Ground-Water Resources of the Middle Rio Grande Basin, New Mexico. U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1222, 2002.

S.S. Papadopoulos & Associates, Inc. Middle Rio Grande Basin Water Supply Study. Prepared for the New Mexico Interstate Stream Commission and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Albuquerque District, under contract no. DACW47-99-C-0012. Boulder, CO, August 2000.